

A STATISTICAL IDENTITY FOR THE TEACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

(Data is available on Request at dpardo@ncfweb.net)

David A. Pardo¹

Abstract

More than sixty years of intensive research on the Dead Sea Scrolls have not yet yielded up a satisfactory identity for the mysterious Teacher of Righteousness. This paper claims the simplest yet most plausible argument so far for an identity. The results of a comprehensive inferential survey are first discussed, followed by the argument that the murdered Onias III is the first Teacher of Righteousness, the title being then transmitted where, unbeknownst to the Essenes, their last forecasted one or the “star” is Christ. The star’s “seed” finds expression in the papacy. The first Wicked Priest is identified as Menelaus where probably that epithet was also transmitted to the non-Zadokite high priesthood in Jerusalem. According to the hypothesis of this paper, the “scepter” or king was supposed to have installed the “star” and to have inaugurated the new age of Temple Zadokite/Essene high priests. The argument concludes with the introduction and relevance of new rules as promised by Jeremiah. The importance of these rules is briefly discussed for current Israeli foreign and domestic policy.

An enormous amount has been written about the Teacher of Righteousness (TR) in the Dead Sea Scrolls. A survey of recognized academic religion experts in North America was conducted in lieu of the traditional literature review. The methodology has distinct advantages. Aside from generating ideas, the approach can appraise relatively quickly whether there is any consensus of opinion. The list of suggested candidates can also be explored and argued more thoroughly by the experts. Since the out-of-pocket budget was limited to US\$1000, I sampled the experts to arrive at a new composite theory. But, simply blindly tallying the degrees of popularity of a potential candidate obviously contains a flaw. There always exists the problem of group think. We find the classic one in the failure to recognize Joseph of Arimathea (the birthplace of Samuel) as Christ’s biological father.[14] And the question of the resurrection is not one of theological but practical necessity to attract attention.

The Survey

The survey was conducted from April 1 to May 10, 2008 with a cutoff response date of July 20, 2008.

The Research Question: What is the current climate of opinion of mainstream academic religion in North America on the identity of the Teacher of Righteousness (TR)?

The Data Source: The proxy list--Watson E. Mills, 1992 Directory of Departments and Programs of Religious Studies in North America, Council of Societies for the Study of Religion, Macon GA, 1992. The 1992 list, not the 2002 list, was chosen to rule out “fly by night” operations. There were 1001 schools. The Internet and the school catalogs were then searched from February 1 to March 20, 2008 to find specific individuals for the proxy. These individuals were found using the following algorithm:

- (1) undergraduate department chair of the religious or philosophy/religious program. If none,
- (2) graduate department chair. If none,
- (3) both undergraduate and graduate chair. If none,
- (4) the director of the religious study program or, if two directors, a randomly chosen one. If none,
- (5) dean of the school, if the dean worked in the religious department or, secondarily, the theological studies department. If none,
- (5) theology department chair.

The U.S. individuals were each sent a stamped return post card and a token US dollar with a letter and instructions by regular US mail. The Canadian individuals were each sent 3 US dollars (not 1 US dollar) to cover the postage for the return post cards. US individuals were urged to respond by May 1, while Canadian individuals were urged to respond by May 10th. The post card asked for up to 3 choices for the TR and the felt level of knowledge (beginner, intermediate, and advanced). As an added incentive, all individuals chosen were offered the opportunity to see the survey results immediately when ready.

The Sampling Method: Systematic sampling of the 1001 US and Canadian schools was used, every other one chosen starting from the first on the list.² The first name (and not the second name) was chosen by the toss of a

coin. The sample size of 501, therefore, ensured proper inference and possibly external validity. One individual from each school was sampled, preferably the chairman, since each individual school may promote a collective position on the questions asked. The return post card guaranteed strict anonymity if the participant so desired.

The Response Rate Technique: Very little or no scientific research has been done on survey mail-out response rates when hand written envelopes are used. It was assumed that the marginal benefits with a higher response rate would equal or exceed the additional costs in labor. This, I think, bore fruit but more research needs to be done in this field of research. I surmised that (1) I had avoided the look of spam mail (2) the money, in this case \$US 1, would not be destroyed and (3) once the envelope was opened, there would be a disincentive to “sitting on the fence”, i.e. no opinion, or deigning not to participate, since the individual would then be obligated to send back the money, the post card, and presumably an explanation. In such an event the respondent’s identity would have been compromised so that the standard statistical technique of resending the questionnaire and irritating the non-respondent could be undertaken at my discretion.

Pre-test?: No pre-tests were needed because only two questions were asked each requiring an unambiguous response. The topics were (1) “Do you know about the Dead Sea Scrolls and, if so, do you feel you are a beginner, intermediate, or advanced researcher?” (2) “Who or what do you think was the Teacher of Righteousness?” The respondent was given at most three rankable choices and a “lost to history” option. Respondents could ventilate, if they so wished.

The Results:

**Tolerated proportion error= .05; two tailed; alpha= .05
p, the proportion, at the maximum likelihood state of .5.
(Unknowns: response rate; number of different candidates for the TR; level of knowledge of the respondents; number of schools closed)**

	<u>Without Finite Correction Factor</u>	<u>With Finite Correction Factor</u>
Optimal Sampling Size	385	279
Actual Sample Size Chosen:	501	
Overall Mail-out:	429	
Overall Response Rate:	42.5%	

**Table 1
Data Breakdown**

	Mail Out	Colleges Closed	Duplicate Names	Dropped all Religion/Theology	Inappropriate (online etc.) ^a	Response ^b	No Opinion	Return to sender	Total
US of A	406	28	4	27	6	170 (43.7%)	7	1	471
Canada	23	1	1	4	1	3 (19.0%)	1	2	30

a. Inappropriate means that the program did not have any permanent faculty owing, for example, to an online service, to the fact that the college was merged so that no courses were taught on campus, or to the fact that individuals could not be identified.

b. The response rate was calculated as (responses+no opinion)/(mail-out – return to sender). It includes one person who died and answered through an associate.

The Ventilation:

Judging from the response rate, there is a considerable lack of general interest in the TR of the Scrolls. Future periodic surveys are required for time series analysis to see if interest fades away as the problem of the TR is increasingly viewed as intractable. However, it also appears that specialization has not peaked interest in the scrolls. Table 2 shows the breakdown of self-considered specialization.

Table 2
Self -Considered Specialization on the Dead Sea Scrolls

None	55	32.4%
Beginner	43	25.3%
Intermediate	45	26.5%
Advanced	27	15.9%

Table 3 presents the breakdown of responses. Those who responded that they did not believe they had any knowledge on the subject would suggest that they showed an interest in the subject and/or were considerate enough to answer the questionnaire. The responses also revealed a considerable amount of pessimism that the probable identity of the TR would ever be discovered. One, self-considered an advanced student, did not even bother to put anything down on the postcard.

Table 3
First Choice^c

Probable that the TR is not or never will be known	56 (33.1%)
Don't have any knowledge	55 (32.5%)
Don't know	13 (7.7%)
Suggested Guess(es)	45 (26.6%)

c. I will assume that nothing, “Pat Robertson, Hillary Clinton, and O’Reilly”, “Angela Davis and Barack Obama” and “Jonathan Edwards, Calvin, and Luther” from a physical point of view surpass our current understanding of engineering and biology and are not serious candidates for inclusion.

Table 4 examines whether beginning or advanced students of the subject would differ in venturing a guess as to the identity of the TR. The chi square p value shows that this definitely is not the case. The null hypothesis of independence is not rejected. Neither beginning nor advanced students were more apt to venture a guess.

Table 4
Specialization vs. Suggested Answer

	Beginner	Advanced
Lost	24	18
Ventured an Answer	17	9

Chi Square p value = .4997

I will now start by including the ventilation on the TR identity since I think this section appears the most instructive part of the study, despite one response that non-canonical works are not to be speculated upon. It should be noted at once that virtually all the responses suggested a priest, not a priest-king. There was only one third choice that explicitly suggested a political figure. Here we have an almost unanimous consensus that the TR acted almost exclusively in the area of religion. Other highlights:

- (1) A priest hostile towards Onias IV.
- (2) There were two first choice responses that explicitly argued for the TR as a title.
- (3) Eight gave first choice to a Hasmonean/Maccabean priest.
- (4) A messianic figure of the line of Aaron or a messianic priest figure. There were nine first choice responses for an eschatological/messianic figure. One suggested a Christ-like figure of the first century BC. In addition, respondents suggested the “spirit of God”, “the unfolding wisdom of creation” or “a spirit at the communal meals”. A priest or more, an ex-high priest of some kind either acting at/or prior to Qumran or formerly at Jerusalem, was written all over the responses. A Zadokite was definitely favored over an Essene.
- (5) A “suffering servant” garnered two choices, although they were not the first choice, while one argued for “the Star” (I suspect something like “a shooting star” although no responses ever explicitly mentioned this).
- (7) An unknown priest after Alcimus but before Jonathan. There were three choices for c. 162 BC (and another one of them for prior 150 BC)
- (8) The author of the Thanksgiving hymns.
- (9) There were several responses that suggested a prominent Christian—James the brother of Jesus, John the Baptist or Paul. Christ was entertained but this was countered by others that ruled out a Christian, particularly Christ himself. There seems to be considerable disagreement here.

- (9) A disgruntled priest of Pharasaic influence.
 (10) A very early member or founder of the Qumran community.
 (11) One response suggested that the priest is known—we just have not figured it out. This also happens to be my position.

Table 5 presents explicit names and the number of times they are mentioned in the questionnaire responses. A cursory look at the data reveals that (1) certain of them can probably be eliminated relatively quickly and (2) interestingly Onias III and Christian characters seem to surface as the leading TR candidates. (This assumes that we take the Hasmoneans/Maccabeans one at a time) The results lead me to believe that the Qumran group was looking to the future as well as to the past and provide confidence to the probabilistic theory of this paper. The word “renewal” or “until the decreed end and the renewal” in IQS IV,25 plays a prominent role. However, we must not fall into the fallacy of Cartesian elimination since there may be other options, although perhaps less likely or currently unknown, that could present potential candidates. It is my opinion, however, that the TR is known by us; we have not yet mustered a very plausible and probably very simple argument.

Table 5
Names and Respective Frequencies Mentioned in the Responses

Onias III	3 (1 1 st , 2 nd , and 3 rd choice)
Simon III	1 (2 nd choice)
Eleazar (Maccabeus?)	1 (3 rd choice)
Jose Ben Joezer	1 (3 rd choice)
Maccabeus (too vague?)	1 (1 st choice)
Christ	1 (1 st choice)
John the baptist	4 (1 1 st choice, 3 2 nd choice)
Paul	1 (3 rd choice)
James the Just	3 (2 1 st choice, 1 2 nd choice)
Demetrius III	1 (3 rd choice)
Judah (Maccabeus?)	1 (1 st choice)
Onias the Just	2 (1 1 st choice, 1 2 nd choice)
NOT Christ, John the Baptist, Paul or Christian	3 comments

All in all, the present stage of research and opinion paints a confusing and disparate picture. Beyond stating that the TR was a priest, more than sixty years of intensive research still have not yielded a consensus on his/her identity.

The Teacher of Righteousness

The first clue in discovering the elusive figure is given in the Damascus Document. The proto-Qumran group was formed in August 196 BC. The group remained leaderless for twenty years until the TR arrived. This means that the group came into existence latest August 195 BC and the date of the TR’s arrival was latest August 174 BC. Most academics have not taken this time reckoning seriously claiming that (1) Jews were not very reliable in their calculations for the post-exilic era and (2) Jewish intellectuals were heavily influenced by the book of Daniel and his magic 490 years. Claims have been made that, if the TR conducted his ministry for 40 years, a customary round number, we arrive at 490 years. I think these claims are completely ungrounded—and without the given clue the TR cannot and probably will not be identified satisfactorily. My reasons are as follows:

- (1) Why were not the numbers juggled differently? Instead of 390 years, albeit a canonical number, why not 410 and use 20 years for the ministry of the TR? The numerology becomes ludicrous. When we add in that word “about”, we throw in another monkey wrench. St. Luke, for example, a highly respected historian, uses the word in Luke 3:23 when we know with more than 83 1/3% certainty that Christ began his ministry at 35 or 36 years old.[17]
- (2) There is no indication whatsoever that the Essenes were imprecise in any of their calculations. Furthermore, they displayed an almost fanatical preoccupation with the timing of their festivals. Jewish historians may have been careless, but the Zadokite/Essene priesthood certainly was not.
- (3) The process of Hellenization began in earnest in Israel with the Seleucids just after c. 200 BC. This would match the dating of the reactionary growth of unorganized groups of Hasidics.

(4) Weaker arguments perhaps could be advanced that (1) the Damascus Document was a centennial pep talk on the founding of the group on the eve of the 490 years and (2) the academic is denying the unity, the song, of Creation—contradicting current physics. Why could not the dates be accurate? After all, Eleazar Sukenik traveled to Bethlehem to purchase the Hymn, War, and smaller Isaiah scrolls from Kando on November 29, 1947, the same day the UN passed the resolution allowing the creation of the State of Israel. [13, pp. 26] After all, the “common heritage of mankind” concept introduced by Malta was born 20 years later, a little more than three months after the Jewish capture of Jerusalem. After all, the span of Christ’s ministry coincided almost exactly 40 years before the Jewish-Roman war that ended the Second Temple period. (3) Historically, the discernible outline of an organized religion has an incubation period of at least a decade from its conception. (4) Why did the Qumran community continue long after the 490 years were up? Obviously, it was not making up numbers to follow the book of Daniel. On probable palaeographic grounds 1QpHabVII,5-10 would support this position.

From Maccabees, we can review certain facts, albeit perhaps colored. Simon the Temple Captain, the brother of Menelaus, was directly responsible for instigating the Heliodorus incident in 176 BC by appealing to the concupiscence of Seleucus. He was labelled a “liar” and a “traitor”, a capital offense in Essene eyes, particularly since he, like Menelaus, had presumably achieved his high position on the basis of trust. Onias III was deposed by his brother Jason in 175 BC, probably in the autumn in the first month of the Seleucid calendar. Jason himself was deposed by Menelaus who had appealed to Antiochus IV’s greed in the autumn of 172 BC. The following year Onias III accused Menelaus of embezzlement of Temple property presumably for purposes of the tribute. He was murdered by Andronicus at the behest of Menelaus outside the temple of Daphne in 171 BC. Onias III was the model **and** last self sustaining legitimate hereditary Zadokite high priest since the days of Solomon.

These facts would seem to corroborate certain inferences that have been drawn from the Dead Sea Scrolls. According to Vermes,

The Zadokite affiliation of the Teacher of Righteousness may be supported by circumstantial evidence. According to the older version of the Community Rule, represented by 4Q258 and 4Q259, the democratic “Congregation” (the “Many”) constituted the supreme authority of the Community with ordinary priests (sons of Aaron) forming the doctrinal and legal administration. This position is attributed to the “sons of Zadok”, members of the high-priestly family, in the revised 1QSv. In other words, at some early stage in the history of the sect there was a Zadokite takeover. Combining this information with the account of CDI (supported by HQD), we may reasonably surmise that the change occurred with the arrival of the Teacher of Righteousness sent by God to take care of the “plant” of Aaron and Israel...who had been groping, leaderless, for twenty years. [19, pp. 63]

This would mean that, if the TR were Onias III, his followers took over the group at the end of 175 BC or shortly thereafter. The daring chastisement by the Liar must mean that the “House of Absalom” was Jason who by 171 BC was already deposed and had to save face. The Liar himself must have been Simon the Temple Captain since Menelaus, a veritable Alexander VI, had nothing to prove and was too clever and ingratiating to risk a direct confrontation with the “congregation”. Menelaus, in any event, had already made his decision. *It is the contention of this paper that Onias III in his defense vowed that the “scepter” would one day come back to claim his own and install the “star” who would restore the former glory of the Zadokite monopoly.* (I infer this from 1QpHabII,1-10 and, less so, from the Damascus Document). This must have been a far fetched theory to Simon and his incredulous followers given the recent assumption of pontifical power by Menelaus. But, this theory, I argue, runs through all the theological doctrines of the Zadokites/Essenes, now the “outsiders” albeit still the “pious”.³ In this scenario Onias III’s accusation of Menelaus’ embezzlement must have taken place most likely shortly before the tribute became due in the autumn of 171 BC. Onias III “had to go”. He left his place of exile for the temple of Daphne presumably in the eventual hope of justifying his accusation to the Seleucid authorities. It is not clear from Maccabees, however, whether he had already taken refuge at Daphne when he had made his accusation public. In his anger Menelaus also tried to win Onias III’s followers over by trying to confuse them over their solar (as opposed to the lunar) calendar. With the subsequent murder and with the disqualification of Onias IV the Essene feud with the Jerusalem high priesthood had begun and would continue until the final destruction of the Second Temple. Code words would now be needed to avoid the stampede of a schizophrenic society to trample down any divine possibilities.

The exact role of the “scepter” is never explicitly spelled out in the Scrolls. He seems to be relegated to an almost trivial role in the War Scrolls. Yet, he is always a figure lurking in the background. The “Jonathan Prayer” would suggest a military leader. The choice between Jonathan Maccabeus and Alexander Jannaeus at

this point depends upon reading the mind of the writer. Albeit eventually executed, Jonathan was the first high priest since Onias III who saved Israel as a whole from the corrosive influence of Hellenistic religion and philosophy. On the other hand, Jannaeus expanded his empire to the largest in Jewish history, encompassing the land of Damascus.⁴ Jannaeus was a friend of the Sadducees and perhaps the Essenes during the civil war; he fit the timeline of Daniel. But, rather than selecting a Zadokite as high priest, he installed himself. The “scepter” was also portrayed as a man who smites with words, not a mass murderer or in the case of Jannaeus a man who proved to be an incompetent empire builder. The perhaps ambivalent Essene position towards Jannaeus—and even the problem of dyadic messianism—explains why he may have been praised, but considered an unacceptable messianic candidate.

The identity of the “scepter” can be pinpointed not simply in a messianic name. Phrases such as “guiding them in the way of His heart” and “seeking God with a whole heart and soul” (1QS1,1-2) seem strangely reminiscent of the Old Testament, just as the selection of Kittim for Chittim suggests the Philistines not merely the Romans. The fact that the Psalms must have been immensely popular would obviously indicate something to the modern day quantitative political scientist. The House of Judah seems to take preference.(1QpHabVIII, 1-2) And then the adamant adherence to the solar calendar and the precise rituals from the cult of the Solomonic Temple must have been logically connected to the Essene messianic choice. Without a suitable candidate and with the destruction of the Second Temple, the Essenes had no reason to ever return to Qumran.

Onias III’s vow claimed here in this paper eclipses any other novelty in Essene theology. The doctrine of the two spirits so cherished is rooted in [1, Isaiah 45:7] and is directly lifted from Zoroastrianism. The doctrine of the “star” and the “scepter” finds expression not only in the Torah but also in the Jacob and Israel of Isaiah. The doctrine of predestination can be easily developed from the big bang hypothesis of Genesis. And the eschatology rampant at the time of Christ or even earlier was probably fueled by Roman Mithraism based on the calculations of Hipparchus. Finally, there is nothing even approaching an original revelation in the Thanksgiving Hymns. These hymns may be a compilation of a series from earlier TRs, not from the first TR only—which would be sheer speculation.

The play on the words *haKohen haRosh* immediately tips the reader off to a dispute over the legitimacy of the high priesthood. And Menelaus immediately springs to mind as the real epicenter of the Hellenistic crisis. Certain less advertised facts about this figure should be spelled out. First, he understood the power of avarice and was himself subject to it. Second, he had a vile temper. Third, no other historical record or intimation in the Second Temple period exists of a priest or priest-king reneging on a promise of payment. And we know Menelaus did. Finally, like so many other Jewish leaders of the era, he suffered an ugly death. In vivid fashion 2 Maccabees 13, 4-9 recounts:

When the king was shown by Lysias that Menelaus was to blame for all the trouble, he ordered him to be taken to Beroea and executed there in the customary local method. There is at that place a tower seventy-five feet high, full of ashes, with a circular rim sloping down steeply on all sides toward the ashes. A man guilty of sacrilege or notorious for certain other crimes is brought up there and then hurled down to destruction. In such a manner was Menelaus, the transgressor of the law, fated to die; he was deprived even of decent burial. It was altogether just that he who had committed so many sins against the altar with its pure fire and ashes should meet his death in ashes. The king was advancing, his mind full of savage plans for inflicting on the Jews worse things than those they suffered in his father's time.....

One can only imagine what the Essenes must have thought!

Before turning to the relevant passages, it is instructive to point out the following. First, reference to the TR in CD MS A,I,11 indicates one of many TRs, although Charlesworth [7] footnotes that in this context he is generally supposed the unique TR intended in the Habakkuk pesher. Onias III was the last legitimate Zadokite high priest before going into exile. Certainly, the scribe of the commentary harbored a profounder hatred of the Wicked Priest than we see in any other scribe of the Scrolls. Menelaus naturally then fits the description of the infamous character. He robbed the Temple treasury earmarked for the poor who, no doubt, included widows and orphans. We must ask the question: why did the writer of the Habakkuk pesher immediately associate the Wicked Priest not only with “plunder”, but also with “pledges” and “creditors”? Second, the Habbakkuk pesher writes of the TR in the past tense, while the Psalms pesher writes in the past and future tense. This, along with the plural form for “priest of Jerusalem” in 1QpHab IX,4, can only mean that the TR was a title as well as an individual. We have a modified and extended version of the Groningen hypothesis—we have a series of wicked priests, anti-popes or anti-Dalai Lamas of a sort. Third, pertaining to the Wicked Priest’s death, “horrors of evil

diseases” cannot mean viral or bacteriological infections. Germ warfare outside primitive forms such as scorpion stings was unknown in the ancient world, so, if we must, we cannot rule out pre-existing syphilis or gonorrhea under the all encompassing “uncleanness” of “leprosy”. Finally, there is no explicit indication whatsoever that the TR mentioned in the Habakkuk commentary was pursued or died on the Day of Atonement in the solar or lunar calendar. All we can say is that (a) a serious crime, more than likely murder, was committed against him by the Wicked Priest in his anger and (b) adherence of the TR’s followers to their calendar was challenged. Is it likely that the TR’s followers were all massacred at the same time, on a Sabbath, and at the same place?

Now I compare Horgan’s translations in Charlesworth [7] with other major published English versions. Starting with the Habakkuk pesher and continuing with the Psalms pesher, Tables 6 through 10 show the variations. In terms of the composite theory of the paper none of them contradict the historical evidence. In fact, if anything, they support it.

Woe to the one who multiplies what is not his own! How long will he weigh himself down with debt? (Hab 2:5-6)....Will it not be....that your cre[di]tors will arise? And will those who make you tremble awake, and will you become their booty? (My note:Hab 2:7-8a) The inte[r]pretation of the passage] concerns the priest, who rebelled [and transgre]ssed the statutes of God. (1QpHabVIII, 7-16)

Table 6

Burrows[5]	Woe to him who heaps up, but it is not his own! How long will he load himself with pledges?...Will they not suddenly arise, those who torment you: will they not awake, those who torture you? Then you will be booty for them...
Dupont-Sommer[9]	And will not they say: woe to him who increases his goods whereas they don’t belong to him? How long will he burden himself with a pledge?
Gaster[11]	Woe unto him who amasses what is not his! How long shall it last! He is merely heaping pledges (which must someday be returned)...
Knibb[12]	Woe to him who heaps up what is not his own! How long will he load himself up with goods taken in pledge?...
Vermes[19]	Woe to him who amasses that which is not his! How long will he load himself up with pledges?...
Wise et al. [20]	You who grow large on what is not yours, how long will you burden yourself down with debts?... Look, suddenly your creditors will appear, your enemies will rouse themselves and you will become booty for them...

And horrors of evil diseases were at work in him, and acts of vengeance on his carcass of flesh...its interpretation concerns the last priests of Jerusalem, who amass wealth and profit from the plunder of the peoples;...its interpretation concerns the [Wi]cked Priest, whom—because of wrong done to the Righteous Teacher and the men of his counsel—God gave into the hand of his enemies to humble him with disease for annihilation in bitterness of soul, beca[u]se he had acted wickedly against his chosen ones. (1QpHabIX,1-12)

Table 7

Burrows[5]	...his scourge with judgments of wickedness; and horrors of sore diseases they wrought in him, and vengeance in his body of flesh...the last priests...this means the wicked priest whom for the wrong done to the Teacher of Righteousness and the men of his party, God delivered into the hand of his enemies, afflicting him with a destroying scourge, in bitterness of soul, because he acted wickedly against his elect.
Dupont-Sommer[9]	And they set upon him to smite him in virtue of the wicked judgments, and evil profaners committed horrors upon him and vengeance upon his body of flesh...last priests...because of the iniquity committed against the Teacher and the men of his council, God delivered him into the hand of his enemies to humble him with a destroying blow in bitterness of soul because he had done wickedly to His elect.
Gaster[[11]	The horrors of evil diseases acted upon him and he paid the price of his misdeeds in the body of his flesh...the final priests...that they might torture him with scourging and wear him out with bitterness of spirit for acting unrighteously against His elect.
Knibb[12]	And they inflicted horrors of evil diseases upon him and acts of vengeance upon his body of flesh...last priests...because of the iniquity committed against the Teacher of Righteousness...his enemies that they might humble him with a destroying blow, in bitterness of

	soul, because he acted wickedly...
Vermes[19]	And they inflicted horrors of evil diseases and took vengeance upon his body of flesh...the last priests...because of the iniquity committed against the Teacher of Righteousness...that he might be humbled by means of a destroying scourge, in bitterness of soul because he had done wickedly to His elect.
Wise et al. [20]	...perpetrating upon him painful diseases, acts of retaliation against his mortal body...later priests of...Because of the crime he committed against the Teacher of Righteousness God handed him over to his enemies, humiliating him with a consuming affliction with despair, because he had done wrong to His chosen.

Its interpretation concerns the Wicked Priest, who pursued the Righteous Teacher—to swallow him up with his poisonous vexation—to his house of exile. And at the end of the feast, (during) the repose of the Day of Atonement, he appeared to them to swallow them up and to make them stumble on the fast day, their restful sabbath. (1QpHabXI, 4-8)

Table 8

Burrows[5]	...who pursued the Teacher of Righteousness in order to confound him in the indignation of his wrath, wishing to banish him; and at the time of their festival of rest,...he appeared to them to confound them and to make them stumble on the day of fasting, their Sabbath of rest.
Dupont-Sommer[9]	The Wicked Priest who persecuted the Teacher of Righteousness, swallowing him in the anger of his fury in his place of exile. He appeared before them to swallow them up and to cause them to stumble on the Day of Fasting.
Gaster[11]	...who chased after the true exponent of the Law, right to the house where he was dwelling in exile, in order to confuse him by a display of violent temper, and who then,...appeared to them in full splendor in order to confuse them and trip them up...
Knibb[12]	...who pursued the Teacher of Righteousness to his place of exile that he might confuse him in his furious anger...He appeared to them to confuse them and to make them stumble on the day of fasting, the sabbath of rest.
Vermes[19]	...who pursued the Teacher of Righteousness to his house of exile that he might confuse him with his venomous fury. And at the time appointed for rest, for the Day of Atonement, he appeared before them to confuse them, and to cause them to stumble on the Day of Fasting.
Wise et al. [20]	...to destroy him in the heat of his anger at his place of exile...he appeared to them to destroy them and to bring them to ruin...

Its interpretation concerns the wicked ones of Ephraim and Manasseh, who will seek to lay (their) hand(s) on the priest and on the men of his counsel in the time of refining that is coming upon them. But God will ransom from their hand, and afterwards they (i.e. the wicked of Ephraim and Manasseh) will be given into the hand of the ruthless ones of the Gentiles for judgment. (4QpPs fr. 1-10,II,18-20)

Table 9

Allegro[2]	...the wicked ones of Ephraim and Manasseh, who seek to put forth a hand against the priest and against the men of his counsel in the time of trial that is coming upon them. But God will redeem them from their hand and afterwards they will be delivered into the hand of the ruthless Gentiles for judgement.
Burrows[6]	This refers to the wicked ones of Ephraim and Manasseh, who seek to put forth a hand against the priest and against the men of his counsel in the time of testing which is coming upon them; but God will redeem them from their hand, and afterwards they will be given into the hand of the tyrants of the nations for judgment...
Dupont-Sommer[9]	...who will seek to lay hands on the Priest and the men of his council at the time of trial which will come upon them. But God will redeem them from their hands and then the wicked will be delivered into the hands of the violent...
Gaster[11]	This refers to the wicked men of Ephraim and Manasseh who seek to assail the priest and the men of his counsel when this time of testing is come upon them. Howbeit, God will rescue the latter out of their hand.
Knibb[12]	Its interpretation concerns the wicked men of Ephraim and Manasseh who will seek to lay hands on the priest and the men of his council at the time of trial which will come upon them. But God will redeem them from their hand, and afterwards they will be given into the hands of the ruthless ones.

Vermes[19]	...who shall seek to lay hands on the Priest and the men of his Council at the time of trial which shall come upon them. But God will redeem them from their hand. And afterwards they will be delivered into the hand of the violent...
Wise et al. [20]	...who will try to do away with the Priest and the members of his party during the time of trial that is coming upon them. But God will save them from their power...

But God will not ab[andon him into his hand], nor [will he let him be condemned as guilty when] he comes to trial. But as for [him, God will] pay [him] his due, giving him into the hand of the ruthless ones of the Gentiles to do....(4QpPs fr. 1-10,IV,9-10)

Table 10

Allegro[1]	But God will not abandon him and will not condemn him when he is judged. But God will pay him his recompense by giving him into the hands of the terrible Gentiles to carry out judgement on him.
Burrows[5]	This refers to the wicked...who...to kill him...and the law...and will not...when he is brought to trial. He will render to the wicked his requittal, delivering him into the hand of the tyrants of the nations to do to him...
Gaster[11]	God will not abandon him nor suffer him to be condemned when he is arraigned, but will deal to that villain his deserts...
Knibb[12]	But God will not abandon him into his power or let him be declared guilty when he is brought to trial. But as for him God will pay him his reward by giving him into the hand of the ruthless ones of the nations to inflict vengeance on him.
Vermes[19]	But God will not abandon him and will not let him be condemned when he is tried. And God will pay him his reward by delivering him into the hand of the violent of the nations.
Wise et al. [20]	God will not leave him in his power...when he comes to trial...But to the wicked God will.

Why Christ Was Unacceptable

The stodgy strictures or rituals that Jewish religion imposed on human behavior and on the human spirit contrasted radically with Christ's teachings. The Dead Sea Scrolls reveal that the Essenes suffered no less from these strictures. (Projection theory would also indicate that from the preoccupation with fornication and riches the Essenes were mindful that they did not have what they themselves wanted. There may not simply have been a legitimate grievance against the Jerusalem priesthood, particularly Menelaus and Simon). But, this was not the only reason that the group did not recognize Christ, the Piscean "star" from Bethlehem. First of all, they knew or suspected that he was illegitimate. Christ was not at fault, his parents were—but this still disqualified him as the one the Essenes were looking for (4Q159 fr. 2-4). What would the community have thought when his family attended his matriculation into the community at, say, age twenty? It did not matter that Christ had one of the two messianic names. And, no doubt, Christ did not respect authority probably before and certainly, in his emotional maturity, after the discovery of his real biological father. Could he have tolerated the rigid, almost Platonic-like pecking order of the Essenes? I think not. Matthew 24:26 would support my position indirectly. Neither Christ nor any of his followers could have been a TR.

There exist other reasons, however. For one thing, where was the "prince of the congregation" that was to accompany him and presumably to install him as the Zadokite high priest hereditary or not. The Zadokites in my opinion never understood how "the spirit of Elijah", the "star", the prophet, and, finally the "scepter" would figure on the world stage. Just as Caiaphas never understood that Christ's final self affirmation of his own divinity was a deliberate provocation, the Zadokites did not understand that they had forecasted correctly but were unable to recognize their final TR! Ironically, the eschatological priest whom they had anticipated was to perplex them as much as he was everyone else. (4Q541 fr. 9) And thus they did not suspect that they would get back inadvertently at Pharasaic Judaism through the papacy, the "Holy Fathers" or Piscean TRs if you will, not through a new line of Zadokite/Essene Second Temple high priests (1QSb=1Q28b III; 4Q167 fr. 2). Yes, they had to suffer, but what about the incredible abuse of Christ and the prophets before him? Were they even amazed at the injustice of the crucifixion, that Christ would actually go through with it? (Matthew 27:52)

Rather than using the baser instincts of Man and uniting them in the service of nobler sentiments, the Zadokites/Essenes preferred to suppress them. They did not understand the psychological mechanism of repentance. Every thought, word, and action contains an economic externality direct or indirect. Christ experienced a spontaneous, unforced catharsis since the very existence of each and every one of us impinges upon the "moral" fabric of Creation. We can infer this not only from Luke 13:3 repeated in Luke 13:5 but also

from the famous question posed by Nicodemus.⁵ And then remember the story of the prodigal son—and the prodigal father. The hallucinatory experience, the waking dream, led to the discovery of his real biological father.

Christ knew he had to be a one-man show—the “scepter” would have to wait. He knew he was the real high priest. Act like one! We can draw an analogy here to current physics. With the catharsis Christ not only discovered his real biological father; he had also broken the speed barrier of light (1, Isaiah 43:2), while the Essenes were only approaching it. They were still operating on the utility model when after-life conceptions were included. Regardless of the Kantian elements (for example, Matthew 21:29-31), Christ was in the world, not of it. His spirit lived now in a universe of mass and energy, not trapped by it. In effect, the religious establishment in its hypocrisy did not know what it was doing, (1, Isaiah 42:16, Luke 23:24), a theme later to be taken up in the economic sphere by Adam Smith with the “invisible hand” and more generally by Hegel with the “cunning of reason”. And it seems to me we still do not know what we are doing—and the stars look down.

If rules are to be revealed now, they must set a new speed barrier, simple yet extensive and open-ended. And they must give us a *constructive, creative* purpose and relationship. Perhaps the following would do exactly and in the “right” order:

Love God with everything you’ve got.
The universe is our book. Figure it out.
Be yourself. Be true to yourself.

There is no room for substituting the “you get what you give” or “virtue is its own reward” principles for the ironclad expected utility model of social science and academia. There is no room for “moral” misinterpretation as all the religious books of the world fade into insignificance (4Q536; 4Q534 fr.7). There is no room for *rationalization and imitation*. (Man has the capacity of impartial judgment of himself [16]). Perhaps, if the human race were able to act on these rules en masse, the cycle of history might be broken.

The Conclusion

As of now, like historical study itself, the identity of the TR is a statistical proposition. But, given the 196 BC clue, the circumstantial evidence seems overwhelming, particularly the adamant and deliberate claim of legitimacy to the high priesthood. This paper has argued the identity with a very low type I and type II error, I believe. Every detail in the scrolls in their present state has been accounted for. I make the very reasonable assumption that the Habakkuk and Psalms commentaries were written by different scribes who used the epithet “Teacher of Righteousness” in different ways. Moreover, the composite theory accords well with the statistical results of the survey.

The tragedy of the Zadokites/Essenes lay in their inability to see that the “scepter” was not to install the “star” on the physical plane but on the spiritual one. The “star” and the “scepter” were signalling to each other from the river banks of time. In effect, the Essenes, like the rest of Jewish society, fell victim to their own hobby horses. For, the only conclusion we can draw from Isaiah [1, Isaiah 42] is that the “scepter” was destined to be a writer. The laws that he receives and gives have practical significance not only in everyday life and in social scientific implementation but also for the future of the world at large. With Jerusalem or at least the Old City under the “common heritage of mankind” concept first introduced by Malta in 1967 these rules have direct importance for Israel in particular.⁶ As the Europeans and the Chinese let the Americans sink slowly into oblivion amid an obsolete world of squabbling nation states, it becomes imperative for the Jewish people to take the first step on the long road to final global rapprochement. And that first step could be viewed as one of inestimable goodwill and interpersonal skill, not merely as one of national exigency.

Endnotes:

1. I would like to thank Robert Higby of the Predestinarian Network, Steven Loewenthal of Future Talk (Future Predictions), and Rabbi Nahum Schnitzer for valuable comments. I would also like to thank Louis Stone for his advice on Hebrew and paleo-Hebrew translation and, of course, to thank all the survey respondents.
2. A potential drawback behind automated random sampling occurs since number patterns start repeating themselves. Excel version 3 and higher versions have eliminated this problem by passing all randomizing tests up to the time of this writing.
3. Insightful psychology behind historical events in the Bible has, I think, been neglected. For example, why was Sennacherib murdered by two sons to be followed by Esarhaddon on the throne? Did the death of Bathsheba's child reveal the distinguishing characteristic of the king, his respect for the decisions of the prophetic/priestly wing and for the arduous search for religious truth? Did he understand the hopelessness of his own condition and mentality, that "without the gods man is nothing", he cannot survive? Why was the lie in John 19:35 inserted?
4. The land of Damascus in the scrolls probably means the whole Essene movement, not simply Qumran. This type of analogy is not uncommon. For example, even in table tennis, when players refer to "backhand city" they often mean the East European stars.
5. If the "scepter" were raised a Christian, he would be viewed as another pariah since he must undergo a bout(s) of acute paranoid schizophrenia. For a detailed psychological discussion and explanation see [3] and [15].
6. The Israelis through their delegation in New York could submit a proposal. Obviously, after initial baselines and the Area had been established, acceptable contractual agreements and side payments would have to be made not only between the Israelis and the Palestinians but also under international supervision. A smooth "play it by ear" transition might require an initial annual lease agreement to an international body like the United Nations or an agency such as UNESCO and/or UNICEF with an option to buy clause.

Bibliography

1. Abegg Jr., M., Flint, P., and Ulrich, E., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, Harper, San Francisco, 1999
2. Allegro, J. (with the collaboration of Anderson, A.), *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, vol. 5, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1968
3. Anon., "Astrological Ages and the Statistics of Intelligent Design", FutureTalkBlog, <http://futurepredictions.wordpress.com/tag/statistics>
4. Baumgarten, J. (on the basis of transcriptions by Milik, J.), *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, vol. 18, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1996
5. Burrows, M., *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, Viking Press, New York, 1955
6. Burrows, M., *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Viking Press, New York, 1958
7. Charlesworth, J. (ed.), *Dead Sea Scrolls, Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Texts with English Translations*, John Knox Press, Louisville, Kentucky, 1995
8. Charlesworth, J. and Rietz, H., *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Rule of the Community*, American Interfaith Institute, Philadelphia, 1996
9. Dupont-Sommer, A., *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, (translated from the French by Vermes, G.), Meridian Books, World Publishing Company, Cleveland, 1962
10. Eisenman, R., *The New Testament Code*, Watkins Publishing, London, 2006
11. Gaster, T., *The Dead Sea Scriptures*, Double Day Anchor Books, Garden City, New York, 1976

12. Knibb, M., *The Qumran Community*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987
13. Magness, J., *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2002
14. Pardo, D., "Was the Virgo really a Virgo?", University Center for Astrological Research, <http://cura.free.fr/xxx/27pardo3.html>
15. Pardo, D., "A Statistical Discussion of Biblical Genealogies", FutureTalkBlog, <http://futurepredictions.wordpress.com/tag/reincarnation>
16. Pardo, D. and Atkinson, R., "An Exploratory Survey Study into the Validity of Economic Assumptions", (Sept. 10, 2003), <http://ssrn.com/abstract:446140>
17. Pardo, D., "A Statistical Solution to the Star of Bethlehem Problem", University Center for Astrological Research, <http://cura.free.fr/xx/20pardo.html>
18. Ulrich, E., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature, Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1999
19. Vermes, G., *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, Penguin Classics, Revised Edition, Penguin Group, London, 2004
20. Wise, M. , Abegg, M., and Cook, E. , *The Dead Sea Scrolls (A New Translation)*, Harper Collins, San Francisco, 1996

© 2008 David A. Pardo. Published by permission of the author.

Prepared for the Web in December 2008 by Robert I. Bradshaw.

<http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/>
