



David (Dmitry) Kopeliovich¹
*Corresponding Author

THE TEACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS AS A SECOND JEREMIAH: THE MOTIF OF THE PROPHET'S PERSECUTION IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Abstract

The figure of Jeremiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls has been the subject of much research, which can be broadly divided to two groups. The first category includes the study of fragments from the book of Jeremiah found in Qumran and comparison to other texts such as the Masoretic or Septuagint versions. The second focuses on extrabiblical materials dealing with the figure of Jeremiah and the traditions connected with him and his prophecies (the so-called Jeremianic Apocrypha Corpus). Indeed, it is difficult to determine an exact boundary between these two fields, since it is not obvious which compositions were included in the Qumranic canon. One might prefer discussing the Qumranic Jeremianic Corpus in general.

Keywords

Jeremiah, Dead Sea Scrolls, Prophet, Persecution, Righteousness

¹The Open University of Israel

The Teacher of Righteousness as a Second Jeremiah: The Motif of the Prophet's Persecution in the Dead Sea Scrolls

Introduction

The figure of Jeremiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls has been the subject of much research, which can be broadly divided to two groups. The first category includes the study of fragments from the book of Jeremiah found in Qumran and comparison to other texts such as the Masoretic or Septuagint versions. The second focuses on extrabiblical materials dealing with the figure of Jeremiah and the traditions connected with him and his prophecies (the so-called Jeremianic Apocrypha Corpus). Indeed, it is difficult to determine an exact boundary between these two fields, since it is not obvious which compositions were included in the Qumranic canon. One might prefer discussing the Qumranic Jeremianic Corpus in general. In any case, it is clear that Jeremiah and his prophecies played an important role in the world of the sect (see, for instance, the New Covenant prophecy in Jer 31:30-33, the prophecy of seventy years of devastation and exile in Jer 25:11-12 and 29:10, and Jeremiah's invectives against the Temple and the priests in Jer 6:13 and 7:3-15)². This paper aims to evaluate another aspect of Jeremiah's heritage in Qumran: the motif of the prophet's persecution and the typological role of Jeremiah in shaping the image of the Teacher of Righteousness in some Qumranic texts. In other words, we are not relating to those fragments which mention Jeremiah or cite his prophecies explicitly, but largely to those which contain some implicit allusions to him and describe the Teacher of Righteousness as the persecuted prophet, like Jeremiah.

1. Was the Teacher of Righteousness considered to be a prophet?

First, we must determine whether the Teacher of Righteousness can be defined as a prophet (נביא), since this title is not explicitly applied to him in any of the scrolls³.

What we find instead, is the statement that his knowledge is received directly from God's mouth: ... they did not [believe the words of] the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of God (אֱלֹהִים)

² For references to Jeremiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see, for example: Emanuel Tov, "The Jeremiah Scrolls from Qumran," *RevQ* 14 (1989): 189-205; George J. Brooke, "The Book of Jeremiah and its Reception in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Book of Jeremiah and Its Reception*, ed. Adrian H.W. Curtis and Thomas Römer, BETL CXXXVIII (Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1997), 183-205; Devorah Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4, XXI, Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*, DJD 30 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001); Devorah Dimant, "From the Book of Jeremiah to the Qumran Apocryphon of Jeremiah," *DSJ* 20 (2013): 452-71; Kipp Davis, *The Cave 4 Apocryphon of Jeremiah and the Qumran Jeremianic Traditions: Prophetic Persona and the Construction of Community Identity*, STDJ 111 (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2014); Eibert Tigchelaar, "Jeremiah's Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Growth of a Tradition," in *Jeremiah's Scriptures: Production, Reception, Interaction, and Transformation*, ed. Hindy Najman and Konrad Schmid, JSJSup 173 (Leiden, Boston: Brill 2016): 289-306; George J. Brooke, "Modelling Jeremiah Traditions in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. A Response to Eibert Tigchelaar," in Najman and Schmid, *Jeremiah's Scriptures*, 307-18; Anja Klein, "New Material or Traditions Expanded? A Response to Eibert Tigchelaar," in Najman and Schmid, *Jeremiah's Scriptures*, 319-26; James Nati, "Unities and Boundaries across the Jeremianic Dead Sea Scrolls. A Response to Eibert Tigchelaar," in Najman and Schmid, *Jeremiah's Scriptures*, 327-29 (see the extended bibliography in the articles mentioned above from Najman and Schmid, *Jeremiah's Scriptures*).

³ Though Vermes suggested that the messianic prophet mentioned in the Community Rule (1QS IX, 10-11) can be identified with the Teacher of Righteousness (see Géza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, rev. ed. (London: Penguin books, 2004), 87), this suggestion can't be proved directly from any other text related to the Qumran community (see James I. Bowley, "Prophets and Prophecy at Qumran," in vol. 2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. Vanderkam, (Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 1999), 367).

מפיא⁴ ... They... will not believe when they hear everything that is to co[m]e up[on] the latter generation that will be spoken by the Priest⁵ in whose [heart] God has put [the abil]ity to explain all the words of his servants the prophets, through [whom] God has foretold everything that is to come upon his people and [his] com[munity]" (1QpHab II 2-3, 6-10)

From here we see that there is some connection between the Teacher of Righteousness and the prophets of the Bible, since the Teacher is able to interpret their words. Moreover, the author of the Pesher Habakkuk affirms that the Teacher understands the secret meaning of the prophecy better than the prophet himself:

Then God told Habakkuk to write down what is going to happen to the generation to come, but when that period would be complete he did not make known to him. When it says, 'so that with ease someone can read it,' this refers the Teacher of Righteousness to whom God made known all the mysterious revelations of his servants the prophets (ibid, VII 1-5).

Does this ability, however, turn the Teacher into a prophet; possibly even the greatest one? This question has been widely discussed by scholars⁸. Actually, the issue is much broader. In the Second Temple period, apocalyptic literature flourished. The apocalyptic heroes were visionaries, foreseers like Daniel or Enoch, whose activity was infrequently connected with reading and interpretation of the holy or divine books⁹. For example, Daniel "perceived in the books the number of years that, according to the word of the Lord to the prophet Jeremiah, must be fulfilled for the devastation of Jerusalem, namely, seventy years" (Dan 9:2). He also hears the interpretation of this prophecy from the Angel Gabriel (ibid,

⁴ The expression "from God's mouth (מפי אלהים)" designates the prophetic inspiration in the Bible: "He did not humble himself before the prophet Jeremiah who spoke from the mouth of the Lord (מפי ה') (2Chr 36:12). On the contrary, the prophets who prophesy falsely are described in the Bible as those who speak "from their own minds, not from the mouth of the Lord (לֹא מפי ה') (Jer 23:16). See also Gershon Brin, "The Concept of the Biblical Prophecy in the Dead Sea Scrolls" (in Hebrew), in "Sha'arei Talmon": *Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*, ed. Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns 1992), 110-11.

⁵ Also, in the Pesher Ps 37, the Teacher of Righteousness is described as a priest: "Its interpretation concerns the Priest, the Teacher of [Righteousness whom] God [com]manded to arise..." (4Q171 [4QpPs^a] 1, 3-4 III 15-16). See, about this issue, Bilha Nitzan, *Pesher Habakkuk (1QpHab): A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea. Text, Introduction and Commentary* (in Hebrew), (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1986), 154; Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 55. Brin, "The Concept of the Biblical Prophecy," 106, 110, on the contrary, suggests that the Teacher and the Priest are two different figures.

⁶ The English translation of the texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls is quoted according to Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, 6 vols. (Leiden, Boston: Brill 2004-2005) unless there is a reference to a different edition.

⁷ Cf.: "... and He raised up for them a Righteous Teacher] to guide them [in the way of His heart. And he made known to the latter generations that which] He did in the la[st] generation..." (4Q266 (4QD^a) 2 I 14-16 [CD^a I 11-12]).

⁸ See, for example: Millar Burrows, "Prophecy and the Prophets at Qumran," in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage, Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*, ed. Bernhard W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson (London: SCM Press LTD. 1962), 223-32; Gert Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*, SUNT 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1963), 141; David E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983), 132-135; John Barton, *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986), 197; Shaye Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah* (Westminster John Knox Press 1988), 195-200; Brin, "The Concept of the Biblical Prophecy," 101-12; Bowley, "Prophets and Prophecy at Qumran," 354-78; Alex P. Jassen, *Mediating the Divine: Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism*, STDJ 68 (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2007), 331-89; George J. Brooke, "Prophets and Prophecy in the Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament," in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity, Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 11-13 January, 2004*, ed. Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz, STDJ 84 (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2009), 31-48; George J. Brooke, "Was the Teacher of Righteousness Considered To Be a Prophet?", in *Prophecy after the Prophets? The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Understanding of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Prophecy*, ed. Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange (Leuven, Paris, Walpole: Peeters, 2009), 77-97.

⁹ Ephraim E Urbach, "When Did the Prophecy Cease?" (in Hebrew), *Tarbits* 17 (1946):1-11; Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Prophecy and Canon: A Contribution to the Study of Jewish Origins*, University of Notre Dame Center for the Study of Judaism and Christianity in Antiquity 3 (Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press 1977), 96-138; Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity*, 103-52; Thomas W. Overholt, "The End of the Prophecy: No Players without a Program," *JSOT* 42 (1988):103-15; Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 279-388.

24-27). So Daniel is described as the interpreter of the ancient biblical prophecy with the assistance of the heavenly messenger. From this point of view, the Teacher of Righteousness is very similar to Daniel. He even surpasses Daniel because the Teacher's interpretation of the holy texts springs from God Himself and not from His messenger.

The question is whether Daniel and other apocalyptic seers can be designated as prophets. Some scholars affirm that one must distinguish between the prophecy and the apocalyptic visions¹⁰. Others reason that the boundary between these two phenomena is vague, and "prophetic text and inspired exegetical interpretation are *coherent* with one another, so much so that the interpretation sometimes infected the presentation of the prophetic text and the prophetic text bears frequent repetition in the interpretation"¹¹.

But did the ancient writers themselves always make a clear distinction between prophets and apocalyptic seers? We find the explicit reference to the prophetic status of Daniel in one of the scrolls, namely Florilegium or Midrash on the Last Days:

That is the [] as it is written in the book of Daniel the prophet, "For [*the wicked*] to act [*wickedly*]" (Dan 12:10) (4Q174 [4QFlor] 1-3 II 3).

It is worth noting that in the Septuagint, the book of Daniel appears among the prophetic books (after the book of Ezekiel). Josephus also designates Daniel as a prophet (*Ant.* 10. 267-269). The authors of the Gospels treat Daniel in the same way (Matt 24:15, Mark 13:14). And even in rabbinic sources one can find a similar reference to Daniel (b. Megillah 15a, but cf. *ibid.* 3a), in spite of the fact that in the Masoretic Text the book of Daniel has been included in the Writings' section (Ketuvim). We can therefore conclude that at the end of the Second Temple period, and after the Temple's destruction there was no clear and obvious difference between the prophets and the apocalyptic interpreters of the prophetic words¹².

Moreover, even the biblical prophets themselves sometimes depended on heavenly support in order to understand God's message. For example, God explains to Amos and Jeremiah what they see in the prophetic vision (Amos 7:7-9; 8:1-2; Jer 1:11-14; 24). In the Second Temple period the role of the heavenly interpreter passed from God to one of his angels (for example, Zech 1:8-10; 2:1-4; 4:1-6, 11-14; 5; 6:1-6). From a typological point of view Daniel is very similar to Zechariah, since he too is assisted by the angel in order to understand the meaning of his visions (cf. Dan 7:16; 8:15-19; 9:21-23; 10:10-14, 21). Nevertheless, the Qumran writers refrained from designating the Teacher as a prophet due to the distinction they made between biblical figures and their contemporaries. The title "prophet" related to the past and concerned only the former. We can discern a similar situation in Josephus' writings. He occasionally describes some prophesying figures who lived and were active at the end of the Second Temple period, but he doesn't use the name "prophet" (*o prophētē*) regarding them, even though he testifies that they uttered prophecies or foresaw the future (for example, Jesus, the son of Ananias in *J.W.* 6.300-

¹⁰ See, for example: Urbach, "When Did the Prophecy Cease?", 6; Alexander Rofé, *Introduction to the Prophetic Literature* (in Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Academem Publishing House, 1992), 81-6.

¹¹ Brooke, "Prophets and Prophecy in the Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament," 41. See also Barton, *Oracles of God*, 35-95; Lester L. Grabbe, "Poets, Scribes, or Preachers? The reality of Prophecy in the Second Temple Period," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1998 Seminar Papers, Part Two: One hundred Thirty-fourth Annual Meeting, November 21-24, 1998, Walt Disney World Swan and Walt Disney World Dolphin, Orlando, Florida*, SBLSP 37 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 524-45; Shani L. Berrin, "Qumran pesharim," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*, ed. Matthias Henze (Grand Rapids, Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005), 110-33; Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 377-89.

¹² Cf. what Josephus tells about the Essenes: they are able to predict the future after long dealing with the Holy Scriptures and the words of the prophets (*J.W.* 2.159). Josephus also states that he himself can interpret dreams and understand the secret words of God, since he is a priest and expert in the Holy Scriptures (*ibid.* 3. 352). Later evidence of the connection between the prophecy and the interpretation is in the Tg. Eccl. 8:1: "Who is like the wise man, and who knows the interpretation (the meaning) of a thing" – "Who is a wise man who can stand in front of the מן הוא חכמה דיכיל (ללקח) wisdom of the Lord and know the interpretation (the meaning) of the words like the prophets קביל חכמתא דיי ולמד פשר מליא כנביא"

309). He also relates that he himself is able to foresee the future (ibid, 3.351-352, 354, 400; 4. 626, 629)¹³. In other words, the Qumran writers, like Josephus, did not deny the existence of the prophecy; but at the same time they did not venture to apply the biblical title to their contemporaries¹⁴.

It seems that the indirect proof for the prophetic (or prophetic-like) status of the Teacher is the evident similarity between the biblical book of Psalms and the Thanksgiving Hymns found in Qumran (*Megillat Hahodayot*). In Jewish tradition, the book of Psalms is ascribed to King David, who was perceived by the Qumranites as one of the prophets: "All these he [David] uttered **through prophecy** (בנבואה) which was given him from before the Most High" (the colophon of the Psalms Scroll, 11QPs^a XXVII 11)¹⁵. Concerning the Thanksgiving Hymns, presumably, the author of some of them was the Teacher of Righteousness (therefore, they are called "The Teacher Hymns"), or at least he could be perceived as their author by the Qumranites¹⁶. In light of the genre connection between the two compositions¹⁷, the Teacher might also have uttered his words "through prophecy". Indeed in the Thanksgiving Hymns, we find many repeated affirmations that the author discovered God's mysteries (for example, 1QH^a IX 23 [I 21]; XV 29-30 [VII 26-27]).

In conclusion: even though certain points differentiate between classical biblical prophecy on the one hand and the apocalyptic literature and literature of Qumran's Pesharim on the other, the chasm between them is not as deep as it appears at first sight. Therefore, the Teacher of Righteousness, who interprets "from the mouth of God... all the words of his servants the prophets" and "to whom God made known all the mysterious revelations of his servants the prophets" (when these mysteries were concealed from the prophets themselves) could be perceived by his followers as a peak or a summit of prophetic activity, greater than most of the biblical prophets. Jassen affirms: "Peshar Habakkuk relies heavily upon

¹³ See Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Prophecy and Priesthood in Josephus," *JJS* 25 (1974): 239-62; Louis H. Feldman, "Prophecy and Prophecy in Josephus," *JTS* 41 (1990): 386-422; Rebecca Gray, *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence from Josephus* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

¹⁴ For comparison, the rabbinic sages were also engaged in the interpretation of prophetic texts, but as a rule, they did not aspire to the "crown of the prophecy", and even affirmed that prophecy has ended at the beginning of the Second Temple period (b. Yoma 9b and parallels). The Rabbis stressed that they have autonomy from "heavenly authority" (b. Bava Metzi'a 59b; cf. to the rabbis' statement: "And a sage is more preferable than a prophet", b. Bava Batra 12a). For the discussion of this issue, see, for example: Urbach, "When Did the Prophecy Cease?", 1-11; Aunc, *Prophecy in Early Christianity*, 103-6; Overholt, "The End of the Prophecy," 103-15; Chaim Milikowsky, "The End of Prophecy and the Closure of the Bible in Judaism of Late Antiquity" (in Hebrew), *Sidra: A Journal for the Study of Rabbinic Literature* 10 (1994): 83-94; Yitzhak D. Gilat, "It is not in Heaven" (in Hebrew), in *Yitzhak Dov Gilat – In Memoriam: Collected Articles*, ed. Israel M. Ta-Shma and Israel Z. Gilat (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2002), 137-49; Daniel Boyarin, Daniel, "A Tale of Two Synods: Nicaea, Yavneh, and Rabbinic Ecclesiology" (in Hebrew), in *Continuity and Renewal: Jews and Judaism in Byzantine-Christian Palestine*, ed. Lee L. Levin (Jerusalem: Yad ben-Zvi Press, Dinur Center for the Study of Jewish History, The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 2004), 301-32.

¹⁵ The translation of the colophon is quoted from Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 313. Indeed, already in the Bible one can find some hint at the prophetic status of David: "The spirit of the Lord speaks through me, his word is upon my tongue" (2 Sam 23:2). Zakovitch suggests that there is another hint in this poetic fragment, namely in the introductive verse: "The oracle (נאם) of David, son of Jesse," the oracle of the man (נאם הגבר) (ibid, 1). This expression reminds us the words of Balaam in Num 24:3, 15: "The oracle of Balaam son of Beor, the oracle of the man (נאם הגבר)" (see Yair Zakovitch, *David: From Shepherd to Messiah* (in Hebrew), (Jerusalem: Yad ben-Zvi Press, 1995), 150). It is worth noting that before the colophon of the Psalms Scroll the verse from 2 Sam 23:7 appears. This verse is the last of the above-mentioned poetic fragments from 2 Sam 23:1-7, therefore the claim about the prophetic status of David in the colophon could spring from the interpretation of the biblical text. Qumranites and other groups and writers of that period and later thought that David was a prophet. For example, Josephus shared this view (*Ant.* 6.166). In the Rabbinic literature we also find this opinion (Tg. 1 Sam. 16:13; b. Sotah 48b). Cf. Yair Zakovitch and Avigdor Shinan, *Once Again: That's Not What the Good Book Says* (in Hebrew), Tel-Aviv: Miskal – Yedioth Ahronoth Books and Chemed Books, 2009), 263.

¹⁶ See Eleazar L. Sukenik, *The Scrolls from the Judean Desert, the Second Survey* (in Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1950), 32; Jacob Licht, *The Thanksgiving scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea. Text, Introduction, Commentary and Glossary* (in Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1957), 22-6; Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*, 168-267; Nitzan, *Peshar Habakkuk*, 141-3; Esther Chazon et al., *Qumran Cave 4. XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*, DJD 29 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 74-5; Julie A. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot*, STDJ 59 (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2006), 14-6; Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 364-6; Elisha Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls, The Hebrew Writings*, 1 (in Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Yad ben-Zvi Press, 2010), 59-62.

¹⁷ Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot*, 12-4, 21-4.

revelatory language in its description of the role of the Teacher of Righteousness as an inspired interpreter of Scripture... The Teacher of Righteousness is identified in Peshar Habakkuk as the only one who properly understands Habakkuk's words. In this sense, the Teacher of Righteousness both carries on the ancient prophetic role of Habakkuk and perfects it. Peshar interpretation was understood by its practitioners as a viable means of gaining access to the divine word and therefore the present-day realization of the ancient prophetic task. Prophecy continues in the Qumran community through the inspired interpretation of Scripture"¹⁸.

Was the Teacher of Righteousness a persecuted prophet like Jeremiah? The Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest

Now let us ask another question. If we admit that the Teacher of Righteousness could be perceived by the members of Qumran community as a semi-prophetic person, is it possible to find in his biography some events which are typical for the biblical prophets?

What do we know about the Teacher's life? Indeed, not enough. It is very difficult to reconstruct his biography according to the scrolls because of the general character and fragmentary nature of the data. In the Damascus Document it is written:

And they discerned their si[n] and knew that they were guilty, [and they were like the blind and those who grope for a way for twenty yea]rs. And God discerned their wor[k]s, for they sought him wholeheartedly, and he raised up for them a Righteous Teacher] to guide them [in the ways of his heart (4Q266 (4QD^a) 2 I 12-15 [CD^a I 8-11]).

A similar statement appears in the Peshar Ps 37:

For "by the Lo[r]d are Man's steps secur]ed, in all his ways does he delight; for though he f[all] he will not] be hurled headlong, for the Lo[r]d supports his hand]" (Ps 37:23-24). Its interpretation concerns the Priest, the Teacher of [Righteousness whom] God [com]manded to arise and [whom] he established to build for him a congregation ... (4Q171 [4QpPs^a] 1, 3-4 III 14-16).

One can infer from these fragments that the Teacher of Righteousness was chosen by God in order to establish the Qumran community, like Moses who also was chosen by God in order to lead Israel during the exodus from Egypt. So, the Teacher can be defined as Moses redivivus¹⁹.

Some researchers suggest that The Teacher of Righteousness and the Interpreter of the Law (דורש התורה), who is also mentioned in the Damascus Document (4Q266 (4QD^a) 3 II 14 [CD^a VI 7]; 4Q266 (4QD^a) 3 III 19 [CD^a VII 18]), refer to the same person²⁰:

[And they dug the well] of which Moses said, ["the well] [was dug by princes and excavated by the nobles of the people, with a r]uler (Num 21:18) – the "well" is the L[aw], and those who "dig" it] [these are the penitent of Israel who depart from the] land of Judah and dwelled in the land of Damascus]... And the "ruler" is the Interpreter of the Law..." (4Q266 (4QD^a) 3 II 10-12, 14 [CD^a VI 3-5, 7]);

And the "star" is the Interpret[er of the] Law [who comes to] Damascus, as it is written: ["A star]

¹⁸ Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 352-3.

¹⁹ For comparison between the Teacher of Righteousness and Moses see, for example: Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*, 141; Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity*, 132-135; Howard M. Teeple, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*, JBL Monograph Series 10 (Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1957), 29-73. I will relate to this issue later.

²⁰ Teeple, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*, 52-54; Bowley, "Prophets and Prophecy at Qumran", 371. Cf. what is told about the Teacher in the Peshar Micah: "... the Teacher of Righteousness who himself shall teach the Law to his party..." (1Q14 [1QpMic] 8-10, 6-7). On the contrary, Segal suggests that the Interpreter of the Law replaced the Teacher of Righteousness as the community leader. See Moshe H. Segal, *Tradition and Criticism: The Collection of Articles in the Bible Studies* (in Hebrew). (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1957), 297-9.

stepped forth [out of Jacob]... (Num 24:17a) (4Q266 (4QD^a) 3 III 19-20 [CD^a VII 18-19]).

If this identification is correct, then the Teacher of Righteousness is the leader who brought his community to the land of Damascus²¹. There they entered into the new covenant:

Thus all the men who entered the new covenant (בברית החדשה) in the land of Damascus and returned and betrayed and departed from the well of living water will not be accounted among the council of the people; and when (the latter) are written, they will not be written from the day the unique Teacher (מורה היחיד)²² was gathered... (CD^b XIX 33-35 – XX 1)²³.

It is worthwhile noting that we find a similar description in the Peshier Habakkuk:

... the traitors with the Man of the Lie, because they did not [believe the words of] the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of God (מפיא אל). It also refers to the trai[tors to the] new [covenant] (בברית) (החדשה), be[cau]se they did[not] not believe in God's covenant ... (1QpHab II 2-3).

From the last fragment of the Damascus Document one can conclude that the Teacher had most probably died ("was gathered"), but the circumstances of his death are not clear.

In any case, mention of the new covenant connects the Teacher of Righteousness with Jeremiah who prophesied about Israel entering into a new covenant in the future (Jer 31: 30-33)²⁴. Also the claim that "the traitors" reject the Teacher's words "from the mouth of God (מפיא אל)" reminds a similar description concerning Jeremiah in 2 Chron 36:12: "He (Zedekiah) did not humble himself before the prophet Jeremiah who spoke from the mouth of the Lord (מפיה)".

It seems, however, that in addition to this evident connection between the Teacher of Righteousness (and the entire Qumran community) and Jeremiah, there is also an implicit link. In general, Jeremiah is described in the Bible as a persecuted prophet, and the persecution becomes one of the main components in his biography. The biblical stories about Jeremiah, whose prophecies anticipated doom and destruction, depict in details how the Judeans, starting from the elite (kings, high-ranking officials, priests and prophets) on down to the simple people, persecuted him: he was injured and beaten, arrested and taken to court, and almost condemned to death (Jer 11:21; 18:18; 20:1-3; 26; 36; 37 – 38). Also some of the scrolls tell us that the Teacher of Righteousness was persecuted by one of the people's leaders, namely the Wicked Priest. This event is depicted in two main compositions: Peshier Habakkuk (three different fragments) and Peshier Ps 37 (one fragment). All are presented below:

- 1) "For the wicked man he]ms in the righteous man." (Hab 1:4b). ["The wicked man" refers to the Wicked Priest, and "the righteous man"] is the Teacher of Righteousness... (1QpHab I 12-13).
- 2) "For the murder of human beings and injustice in the land and all who live in it." (Hab 2:8b). This refers to the [W]icked Priest. Because of the crime he committed against the Teacher of Righteousness and the members of his party, God handed him over to his enemies, humiliating him with a consuming affliction with despair, because he had done wrong to His chosen (1QpHab IX 8-12).

²¹ For a discussion of the land of Damascus in the history of the Qumran community see, for example, Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. XII: The Damascus Document (4Q266 – 273)*, DJD 18 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 9-10.

²² The alternative reading: מורה היחיד – the Teacher of Yakhad Community. See Qimron, *The Dead sea Scrolls*, 20.

²³ The translation of this fragment is quoted according to James H. Charlesworth et al., eds., *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*, vol. 2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. by James H. Charlesworth et al. (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), 32-5.

²⁴ Interestingly, Jeremiah is mentioned in the Damascus Document before the passage about the new covenant (CD^a VIII 20-21). I will return to this point later.

- 3) "Woe to the one who gets his friend drunk, pouring out his anger, making him drink, just to get a look at their holy days²⁵." (Hab 2:15). This refers to the Wicked Priest, who pursued the Teacher of Righteousness to destroy him (לבלע)²⁶ in the heat of his anger at his place of exile. At the time set aside for the repose of the Day of Atonement he appeared to them to destroy them and to bring them to ruin on the fast-day, the Sabbath intended for their repose (1QpHab XI 2-8).
- 4) "The wicked watches for the righteous and seeks [to slay him. The Lo]rd [will not abandon him in his hand and will not] condemn him when he is judged." (Ps 37:32-33). Its interpretation concerns the Wicked [Pri]est who wa[tche]s the Righteous [One and seeks] to slay him [] and the Law which he sent to him. But God will not ab[andon 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 (4Q171 [4QpPs^a] 3-10 IV 7-10).

These general descriptions do not permit us to reconstruct the concrete circumstances of the Teacher's persecution (the third fragment only contains some details about the event, which will be discussed below). We are not even aware of an exact identity of the Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest. This has been the subject of much discussion by scholars of the Qumran Scrolls, and numerous suggestions have been raised. However, no consensus has been reached, and the enigma has remained unsolved²⁷. Therefore, I will not relate to the historical questions but instead will seek literary analogies between the Teacher of Righteousness and Jeremiah, and will thus attempt to discover the intended Jeremiah's typology in the story of the Teacher's persecution.

To begin with, Jeremiah, like the Teacher of Righteousness, was persecuted by priests. Jeremiah's clashes with priests are recorded several times: in Jer. 20, Pashhur, son of Immer, the priest and chief officer of the Temple, attacks and arrests Jeremiah because of his prophecy of doom. In Jer 26, priests and prophets together initiate Jeremiah's trial and demand that he be put to death, since Jeremiah has stated that the Temple will be destroyed and Jerusalem will be desolate. In the story about the clash between Jeremiah and Pashhur, son of Immer, the prophet threatens the priest with a serious punishment: "And you, Pashhur, and all who live in your house, shall go into captivity, and to Babylon you shall go; there you shall die, and there you shall be buried..." (Jer 20:6). Similarly, the Wicked Priest, who persecuted the Teacher of Righteousness, is delivered into the hands of the enemies (see the quoted fragments from 1QpHab IX 8-12; 4Q171 [4QpPs^a] 3-10 IV 7-10)²⁸.

Of course, these points on their own cannot prove the literary dependence of the Teacher's persecution story on Jeremiah's narrative. The motif of conflict between a prophet and a priest already appeared in the book of Amos. In Amos 7, Amaziah, the priest of Bethel, tries to expel Amos the Prophet from the Kingdom of Israel, since Amos has predicted disaster for King Jeroboam, the sanctuaries, and the People of Israel. Amos also threatens Amaziah with death in exile. So, not only is literary influence observed here, but also shared motifs (or shared literary conventions)²⁹. Both the Teacher of

²⁵ In the Masoretic Text we read here: "their nakedness" (מעוריות). The Qumran version (מעריות) can be explained as the graphic interchange of the similar letters: *resh* and *daleth*. However, the Peshar reading can also reflect the intention to connect the prophet's words to the dispute about the calendar which had taken place between different Jewish groups in the Second Temple period (see below).

²⁶ The Hebrew verb is לבלע in qal (literally "to swallow") or rather לבלע in piel ("to destroy, kill"). If this is also the meaning of the verb in the Peshar, then the passage under discussion describes the attempt of the Wicked Priest to kill the Teacher of Righteousness (see William H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk: Text, Translation, Exposition with an Introduction*, SBLMS 24 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979), 181-2).

²⁷ For the discussion, see, for example: Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*, 10-167; Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4. I: Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah*, DJD 10 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 116-21; Hanan Eshel, "The History of Qumran Community and Historical Details in the Dead Sea Scrolls" (in Hebrew), *Qadmoniot* 30 (1997): 86-93; Paul A. Rainbow, "The last Oniad and the Teacher of Righteousness", *JJS* 48 (1997): 30-52; Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 60-6.

²⁸ Perhaps, "the terrible Gentiles" from 4Q171 can be identified with Kittim mentioned several times in the Peshar Habakkuk. The term "Kittim" in the Peshar represents the Romans, and it replaces the Chaldeans (Babylonians) in the book of Habakkuk. So Babylon is an additional link which probably connects between Pashhur and the Wicked Priest.

²⁹ For connections between Amos' and Jeremiah's stories, see anonymous reference.

Righteousness and Jeremiah, however, were pursued specifically by the priests of the Jerusalem Temple³⁰. In addition, Amaziah the Priest doesn't behave violently towards Amos and tries only to stop his prophesying. On the contrary, Jeremiah, as we have seen, is treated violently by priests: they beat him, arrest him and try to kill him. By the same token, the Teacher of Righteousness is attacked by the Wicked Priest in order to put him to death.

It seems that an additional detail connects the Teacher of Righteousness and Jeremiah: both of them are also priests but of a special kind: those who don't participate in the Temple service. Like other priests from Anathoth (Jer 1:1) Jeremiah was supposedly related to the Abiathar priest family (Jer 1:1). According to 1 Kgs 2:26-27, Abiathar the Priest was expelled by King Solomon from Jerusalem to Anathoth because he supported Adonijah's attempt at a coup. The Teacher of Righteousness is referred to as priest several times (1QpHab II 8; 4Q171 [4QpPs^a] 1-2 II 18; 1, 3-4 III 15). The Teacher of Righteousness was also the leader of the community which left Jerusalem and separated from the people, so the Teacher, similar to Jeremiah, did not serve in the Jerusalem Temple. Both considered the Temple to be defiled by the people and the priests' sins³¹:

Will you steal and murder and commit adultery and swear falsely, and sacrifice to Baal, and follow other gods whom you have not known, and then come and stand before Me in this House which bears My name... to do all these abhorrent things (התועבות האלה)?! (Jer 7:9-10).

Because of all the wickedness of the people of Israel and Judah who have so acted as to vex Me – they, their kings, their officials, their priests and prophets, and the men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem... They placed their abominations in the House which bears My name and defiled it (לטמא) (Jer 32:32, 34).

As for the verse that says, "because of murder in the city and injustice in the land," (cf. Hab 2:17), "the city" refers to Jerusalem, where the Wicked Priest committed his abhorrent deeds (תועבות מעשי), defiling (ויטמא) the Temple of God (1QpHab XII 6-9).

Interestingly, we find a similar motif in the Apocryphon of Jeremiah from Qumran. For example:

... and the priests of Jerusalem will return] to worship oth[er] gods [and to ac]t according to the abominations [of the Gentiles] (כתועבות הגוים) (4Q388a [4QapocrJer Cc] 7 II 6-7).

... they will have for]saken me, and will have done what is evil in My eyes, and what I did not want they will have chosen: to pursue wealth and gain [and violence, ea]ch robbing that which belongs to his neih[b]our, and oppressing each other. The will defile (יטמאו) My Temple... Their priests will commit violence (4Q390 [4QapocrJer Cc] 2 I 8-10).

These fragments from the Apocryphon expressed in the future tense, relate to the events which took place in the Second Temple period (probably, in the early Hasmonaean period), while Jeremiah predicts them³². He condemns the same sins that the Qumranites abominated. So, the Apocryphon creates a close connection between Jeremiah and the reality which the Qumran community was involved in. Kipp Davis shows that the prophetic figure of Jeremiah in the Apocryphon served as the model of the

³⁰ Presumably, הכוהן הרשע (the Wicked Priest) is an expression of scorn in place of the normative appellation הראש כוהן (the Chief Priest of the Jerusalem Temple). See Karl Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer*, BHT 15 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1953), 266; Brownlee, *The Midrash Peshier of Habakkuk*, 49.

³¹ At the same time, from this point of view the Teacher of Righteousness resembles another biblical prophet: Ezekiel, who also was a priest and lived in exile. He also condemned the people of Jerusalem for defiling the Temple (see, for example, Ezek 5:11; 8; 23, 38). It is noteworthy that the name "the sons of Zadok (בני צדוק)" concerning the sect's members is borrowed from the book of Ezekiel (CD^a III 20 – IV 4). No ancient tradition, however, tells about Ezekiel's persecution by a priest.

³² See Dimant, *Parabiblical Texts*, 96, 100, 201-2, 235-6.

community “founder”, like the Teacher of Righteousness³³. Among other things, Davis notes that “Jeremiah’s priestly credentials may have served to convey his authority in matters of national leadership over and against the existing Jerusalem priesthood. His sharp criticism of the priests of Jerusalem in the last days of Solomon’s temple would understandably have distinguished him as a person of interest for the *Yahad* Essenes, who had their own differences with the presiding temple establishment”³⁴.

Another point lays groundwork for a comparison between Jeremiah and the Teacher of Righteousness. The Wicked Priest seems to serve, not only as a temple priest, but also as a ruler, whose power resembles that of a king:

This refers to the Wicked Priest who had a reputation for reliability at the beginning of his term of service; but when he became ruler over Israel, he became proud (רם לבו) and forsook God and betrayed the commandments for [וכאשר משל בישראל רם לבו ויעזוב את אלו] (riches of sake the had who lawless the of) (riches the force by amassed He) (והון עמים לקח), thus adding to the guilt of his crimes, and he committed ab[hor]rent deeds in every defiling impurity (1QpHab VIII 8-13; cf. 1QpHab XII 10: “he stole the assets of the poor (גזל הון אביונים)”³⁵).

This description of the Wicked Priest’s crimes is evocative of the bans imposed on a king, as mentioned in Deut 17:17, 20: “...also silver and gold he must not acquire in great quantity (לא ירבה-לו מאד) ... neither exalting himself above other members of the community nor turning aside from the commandment, either to the right or to the left... (ולכסף וזהב) ... (לבלתי רום-לבבו מאחיו ולבלתי סור מן-המצוה ימין ושמאל)” (cf. also the admonition of Samuel in 1 Sam 8:11-17 concerning a king who might take seize the property of his subjects). The crimes which are incriminated to the ruler/ the king both in the Peshar and in the Tora are arrogance, forsaking God and His rules and amassing the riches³⁶. Even though the Wicked Priest does not explicitly bear the title “king”, the verb “rule” (משל) appears in the Bible along with the verb “reign” (מלך) (Gen 37:8) and sometimes substitutes for the latter (Judg 8: 22-23; 9:2; 1 Kgs 5:1; Mic 5:1; Zech 6, 13; Dan 11:3-4). In the fragment from the Peshar Habakkuk one can therefore find an allusion to the king’s power. (It should be noted that in the Hasmonean period, the Jewish rulers, starting from Judah Aristobulus, took upon themselves the authority of king and high priest concurrently³⁷.)

How does this issue relate to Jeremiah’s story? In Jer 22:13, 17 there is a very strong invective against King Jehoiakim who is accused of similar crimes:

Woe to him who builds his house by unrighteousness, and his upper rooms by injustice; who makes his neighbors work for nothing, and does not give them their wages... But your eyes and heart are only on your dishonest gain, for בצעק-על (violence and oppression practicing for and blood, innocent shedding) (על-ועל רעל-ועל דם).

We find here the same sins of gaining material enrichment by robbing the poor, and of violence towards the defenseless. It is worth mentioning that Jeremiah’s prophecy about Jehoiakim contrasts this sinful king with his righteous father Josiah: “He upheld the rights of the needy and poor (אביון)” (Jer 22:16). As we have seen, the term אביון appears in the description of the Wicked Priest’s sins in 1QpHab XII 10.

³³ Davis, *The Cave 4 Apocryphon of Jeremiah and the Qumran Jeremianic Traditions*.

³⁴ Davis, *The Cave 4 Apocryphon of Jeremiah and the Qumran Jeremianic Traditions*, 44.

³⁵ The appellation אביונים relates here and in the other scrolls usually to the community members.

³⁶ It is worth mentioning that in the book of Daniel the “Greek” impious kings are also condemned for their arrogance and pursuit of profit (Dan 11 8, 12, 24, 28, 43).

³⁷ Indeed, there are scholars who tried to identify the Wicked Priest with some figures from the Hasmonean reigning dynasty. See, for example, Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar*, 226-74; Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*, 36-78; Nitzan, *Peshar Habakkuk*, 132-6; Qimron and Strugnell, *Miqsat Maase Ha-Torah*, 117-9; Igor R. Tiantlevskij, *The History and Ideology of the Qumran Community* (in Russian), (St. Petersburg: “Peterburgskoe Vostokovedenie” Center, 1994), 113-67.

Concerning the other and even the more serious sin – “shedding innocent blood” one can pay attention to the fact that Jeremiah’s trial took place during the reign of Jehoiakim (Jer 26:1). Jeremiah was almost condemned to death, and he said in his defense speech: “But know that if you put me to death, you and this city and its inhabitants will be guilty of shedding the blood of an innocent man (דם נקי אדם) (נתינים עליכם ואל-העיר הזאת ואל-כי ישרי). So, “shedding innocent blood” in the reproach addressed to Jehoiakim, can refer to prosecution of prophets and Jeremiah specifically³⁸.

According to Jer 36, Jehoiakim treated Jeremiah’s prophecies with disdain and burned the scroll in which they were written. Moreover, he ordered the arrest of the prophet in order to punish him (the king perhaps planned to execute Jeremiah, as he had already done to the other prophet, Uriah, son of Shemaiah from Kiriath- Jearim; see Jer 26:20-23). Similarly, the Wicked Priest pursues the Teacher of Righteousness in order to kill him.

The interesting detail is that the event described in Jer 36 happened on a fast day (Jer 36:9). This point brings us to the third fragment from the Peshar Habakkuk in which the Wicked Priest attacks the Teacher of Righteousness “on the fast-day”.

In actual fact, this parallel is not perfect. In contrast to the Peshar Habakkuk, the fast day mentioned in Jer 36:9 is not the Day of Atonement (*Yom Hakippurim*), but another fast which took place “in the ninth month”³⁹. Nevertheless, there is some symbolic connection between the fast day and the persecution of the prophet. On a day which should have been devoted to God, the wicked leader decides to attack the person chosen by God – the prophet who has dared to criticize the corruption of power⁴⁰. It is worth noting that other examples of the persecution happening on the Day of Atonement can be found in post-biblical traditions. First, according to Jub 34, the fast on the Day of Atonement was established in memory of Jacob’s mourning for Joseph after he had been sold by his brothers. Every year on this day the sons of Israel must beg God’s forgiveness for this sin. Second, according to the Aramaic Targum of Lam 2: 20, the Prophet and High Priest Zechariah, son of Iddo was assassinated in the Temple on the Day of Atonement⁴¹. A more moderate story is found later in m. Rosh Hashanah 2:8-9: Raban Gamaliel decides to punish Rabbi Yehoshua because of the halachic disagreement between them, and says to him: “I order you to appear before me with your staff and your money on the day which, according to your count, should be Yom Hakippurim”. The mishna’s narrative can help us understand the bizarre behavior of the Wicked Priest in the Peshar Habakkuk. If he is a priest (probably the High Priest) serving in the Temple in Jerusalem, what is he doing in the desert on the Day of Atonement? Why is he not serving in the Temple on this holy day? One might suggest that the Day of Atonement mentioned in the fragment from Qumran

³⁸ Compare this description with the postbiblical tradition about King Manasseh who, according to 2 Kgs 21:16. “... shed the blood of an innocent man (דם נקי שפר) that he filled Jerusalem [with blood] from end to end”. Josephus tells that Manasseh slew all the righteous men and did not spare the prophets (*Ant.* 10. 38). The Book of Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah reports that Manasseh pursued Isaiah and put him to death. This tradition appears later also in the Rabbinic literature (see, for example: b. Yebam. 49b).

³⁹ For the discussion about this fast, see: John Skinner, *Prophecy and Religion: Studies in the Life of Jeremiah* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 236-42; John Bright, *Jeremiah: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, AB 21 (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1965), 181-2; Ernest W. Nicholson, *Preaching to the Exiles: A Study of the Prose Tradition in the Book of Jeremiah* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970), 8-9; Ernest W. Nicholson, *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, Chapters 26-52*, CBC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 105-6; William L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, Chapters 26- 52*, Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 254-7; Yair Hoffman, *Jeremiah: Introduction and Commentary, Chapters 26-52* (in Hebrew), A Bible Commentary for Israel (Tel Aviv, Jerusalem: Am Oved Publishers Ltd, The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 2001), 664.

⁴⁰ A similar situation is described in the story about Naboth the Jezreelite who was assassinated by Queen Jezebel (1 Kgs 21). Although Naboth is not a prophet, he is a righteous man, faithful to God. Jezebel the Wicked persecutes and executes him on a fast day faked by her in order to take away his vineyard and give it to King Ahab.

⁴¹ This tradition confuses two different biblical figures: Zechariah, son of Jehoiada, who was murdered by order of King Joash in the court of the Temple, according to 2 Chr 24:21-22, and the prophet Zechariah, son of Berechiah, son of Iddo, from the book of Zechariah (cf. also Ezra 5:1).

is not the same as the holy day at the Temple in Jerusalem because of different calendars⁴². In any case, it seems possible that variations of a similar motif can be found in all these stories: the persecution of a righteous or innocent man by the people's (family's) leader(s) on the Day of Atonement. In two such narratives (Zechariah from the Targum, and the Teacher of Righteousness) the persecuted person is both a priest and a prophet, and this detail strengthens the similarity between them and Jeremiah. Therefore, Jeremiah's narrative might have contributed to the development of the motif and influenced later writers who intensified the persecution theme by substituting the Day of Atonement (the holiest day in the Jewish religious tradition) for the unknown fast day mentioned in Jer 36⁴³.

The last piece of the "puzzle" can be found: in the Peshar Ps 37 it is written that "... the Wicked [Priest]... *wa[tche]s the Righteous [One and seeks] to slay him []* and the Law which he sent to him (התורה אשר שלח) (4Q171 [4QpPsa] 3-10 IV 8-9). Assuming that the reconstruction of the text is correct, one can conclude that the Teacher of Righteousness was persecuted by the Wicked Priest because of the Teacher's writings. On the one hand, the mentioning of the Law (התורה) can connect the Teacher with figure of Moses⁴⁴. But on the other hand, this description creates an additional parallel to Jeremiah's story: King Jehoiakim also pursues Jeremiah in Jer 36 because of his writings (the scroll of his prophecies). Moreover, just as God saved (literally: hid) Jeremiah from persecution (Jer 36:26, according to the Masoretic Text⁴⁵), God also "will not ab[andon him] (the Teacher of Righteousness) and will not [condemn him when] he is judged (4Q171 [4QpPs] 3- 10 IV 9)⁴⁶.

We can infer from our discussion that the description of the Teacher's persecution by the Wicked Priest rests upon the biblical stories of Jeremiah's persecution, and the figure of the Wicked Priest depends on the images of the priests (the narrative pattern "the priest against the prophet") and the king ("the king against the prophet") from Jeremiah's narrative.

3. Who were "The wicked of Ephraim and Manasseh"?

In the Peshar Ps 37, mention is made of "the wicked ones of Ephraim and Manasseh (אפרים ומנשה) who will seek to put forth a hand against the Priest and the men of his council" (4Q171 [4QpPs] 1-2 II 17-18). It is reasonable that this report bears witness to the enmity between the Qumran sect and other groups which existed among the people during that time. Scholars suggest that the sobriquets "Ephraim" and "Manasseh" in the Qumran Scrolls imply the Pharisees and the Sadducees⁴⁷. In the Bible, Ephraim and Manasseh are the names of the tribes of Israel who originated from Joseph's sons and

⁴² Shemaryahu Talmon, "Yom Hakippurim in the Habakkuk Scroll", *Biblica* 32 (1951): 549-63; Nitzan, *Peshar Habakkuk*, 190-1.

⁴³ One can also point to the similarity between Joseph in Gen 37 and Jeremiah in Jer 38: both of them were cast into the pit by their own relatives / people (Joseph's brothers, the officials in the story about Jeremiah), and the pit was devoid of water. Both almost died, but were ultimately saved by strangers (the Midianite traders, Ebed-melech the Ethiopian). This similarity is not coincidental: apparently Jeremiah's story depends on Joseph's. It is possible, then, that the author of Jubilees was conscious of this connection, and tried to strengthen it by relating Joseph's sale to the fast day, since a similar detail exists in Jer 36.

⁴⁴ Some scholars identify "the Law which he sent to him" (התורה אשר שלח אליו) with *Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah* Scroll. According to their opinion, the Teacher of Righteousness wrote this composition and sent it to the Wicked Priest (Qimron and Strugnell, *Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah*, 120).

⁴⁵ The Septuagint reads here: *kai katekrubhsan* "they were hidden [by themselves]".

⁴⁶ At the same time, one can align the Teacher's message to the Wicked Priest with the letter which Jeremiah sent from Jerusalem to the elders, the priests, the prophets and all the people of the exile (Jer 29:1). In the letter Jeremiah explains how the exiled people have to live in Babylon. In response to this letter, Shemaiah the Nehelamite, who was one of the exile leaders, demanded from Jerusalem priests to silence and arrest Jeremiah (ibid, 24-28). It is an interesting detail that the directions are opposite in the two cases: Jeremiah sends his letter from Jerusalem to the Babylon exile, while the Teacher of Righteousness sends "the Law" apparently from the desert ("the exile") to Jerusalem. I will return to the clash between Jeremiah and Shemaiah the Nehelamite later.

⁴⁷ See, for example, David Flusser, "Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes in the Commentary on Nahum" (in Hebrew), in *Essays in Jewish History and Philology, in Memory of Gedaliahu Alon*, ed. Menahem Dorman, Shmuel Safrai, Menahem Stern (Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 1970), 133-68; Eshel, "The History of Qumran Community", 86-9; Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Qumran and Jerusalem: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Judaism* (Grand Rapids, Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2010), 321-52.

became the biggest and most significant tribes in the Northern Kingdom (the Kingdom of Israel) which separated from the Southern Kingdom (the Kingdom of Judah). At the same time, the Qumran scrolls use the name "Judah" as the sobriquet for the sect's members (1QpHab VIII 1: 4Q 169 [4QpNah] 3-4 III 4: 4Q266 (4QD^a) 3 I 5 [CD^a IV 11])⁴⁸.

The split of the kingdom and the enmity between Judah and Ephraim/Manasseh (cf. Isa 9:20: "Manasseh [devoured] Ephraim, and Ephraim Manasseh, and together they were against Judah") may have symbolized their own situation to the Qumran sect: the split between the righteous people of "Judah" (the members of the sect) and "the wicked ones of Ephraim and Manasseh" (the Pharisees and the Sadducees)⁴⁹. According to the above fragment from the Peshar Ps 37, these two groups attacked the Teacher of Righteousness. Similarly, Jeremiah was persecuted by different groups of people, such as priests, prophets and some officials. Is it possible to reveal parallels between these groups of Jeremiah's persecutors and "the wicked of Ephraim and Manasseh"?

Let us start with "the wicked of Ephraim". In the Peshar Nahum this group is described in great detail as "the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things (דורשי החלקות) at the end of days, who in "lies" and falsehood[s] conduct themselves (יִתְהַלְכוּ אֲשֶׁר בִּכְחָשׁ) (4Q169 [4QpNah] 3-4 II 2), "who, by their false teaching and their lying tongue and lip of deceit, will lead many astray (אֲשֶׁר בְּתִלְמִיד שִׁקְרָם וּלְשׁוֹן (כֹּזֵבִים וּשְׁפָת מִרְמָה יִתְּנוּ רַבִּים (ibid, 8). Very similar expressions relating to enemies appear in the Thanksgiving Hymns (1QHa X 16, 18, 33, 36 [II 14, 16, 31, 34]); XII 11 [IV 10]). In addition, some scrolls mention another leading figure, "the Man of the Lie" (אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב) (1QpHab II 1-2; V 11; 4Q171 [4QpPsa] 1-2 I 18-19; CDb XX 15) or "the Spreader of the Lie" (מְשִׁיב הַכֹּזֵב) (1QpHab XX 9; CDa VIII 13). This individual belongs to "the trai[tors to the] new [covenant]", who "did not [believe the words of] the Teacher of Righteousness" (1QpHab II 1-3). He "had rejected the Law in the presence of their entire company" (ibid, V 11-12), "deceived many (הִתְעָה רַבִּים), building a worthless city by bloodshed and forming a community by lies (בְּשִׁקְרָה) for his own glory, making many toil at useless labour, teaching them to do false d[ee]ds (בְּמַעֲשֵׂי שִׁקְרָה). Their toil will be for nothing" (ibid, X 9-13; cf. 4Q171 [4QpPs^a] 1-2 I 18-19). Both the Man of the Lie and the "wicked of Ephraim" spread lies and mislead of many people. From this, we may conclude that the Man of the Lie might be the leader of "the wicked of Ephraim".

In addition, the Damascus Document tells us about

"the Man of Mock[ery] (אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן)... [who poured upon Israel waters of falsehood] and led them astray in a trackless chaos (וַיִּתְּעַם בְּתוֹךְ וְלֹא אֶשֶׁר דֶּרֶךְ הַטִּיף לְיִשְׂרָאֵל מִיָּמֵי כֹזֵב)... [and departing from the paths of righteousness]... For they sought smooth things and chose [delusions...] and justified [the evil man and condemned the righteous man, and caused the covenant to be broken and the law to be violated]" (4Q266 (4QD^a) 2 I 18-23 [CD^a I 14-20]; cf. CD^b XX 11-12).

One can infer from the similarity between the Man of the Lie and the Man of Mockery that they seem to describe the same person. Moreover, the above fragment from the Damascus Document describes the community of the Man of Mockery as the people who "sought smooth things (בְּחִלְקוֹת) דְּרִישׁוֹ", precisely like the "wicked of Ephraim" from the Peshar Nahum. And, like "the wicked of Ephraim" from the Peshar Ps. 37 who "will seek to put forth a hand against the Priest and the men of his council" (4Q171 [4QpPs^a] 1-2 II 17-18), the group of the Man of Mockery "ganged up on [those of righteous soul, and all those who walk with integrity] their souls [despised,] [and they persecuted them with sword and incited dissension amidst the people]" (4Q266 (4QD^a) 2 I 23-25 [CD^a I 20-21]).

These symbolic names, therefore, seem to designate the same group of Qumran community enemies. This group of liars and misleaders is similar to the biblical prophets who prophesied falsehood and lead the people of Israel astray. Indeed, some of the images used by the Qumran scribes in order to

⁴⁸ But cf. the appellation "The House of Judah" in 4Q171 [4QpPs^a] 1-2 II 13-14 where it designates the enemies of the sect.

⁴⁹ See Flusser, "Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes", 141.

describe their enemies are borrowed from biblical texts which condemn and deride prophets of this kind. For example, the Damascus Document describes those who joined the Spreader of the Lie as “the builders of the barrier and the whitewash daubers (התפל בתי החץ ושחי) (CDa VIII 12-13; cf. 6Q15 (6QDa) 1, 1 [CDa IV 19-20])⁵⁰. This appellation is inspired by Ezek 13:10, in which Ezekiel condemns the prophets who prophesy falsehood, comparing them to the daubers who plaster the flimsy wall which has been built by the people (והגם טחים אותו יען תפל וביען הטעו את-עמי לאמר שלום ואין שלום והוא בנה חץ) (הגם טחים אותו יען תפל וביען הטעו את-עמי לאמר שלום ואין שלום והוא בנה חץ). Just as whitewash daubing will not save the wall from collapse, the false prophecy will not save Jerusalem from destruction. In addition, the title “the Spreader of the Lie” (משיף הכזב) itself appears to be influenced by the fragment from Mic 2:11 in which the prophet blames the man who preaches (משיף) to the people walking in the wind and uttering falsehood (איש כזב הלך רוח ושקר). This verse is quoted explicitly in CDb XIX 25 (cf. also 6Q15 (6QDa) 1, 1 [CDa IV 19-20] and Mic 2:6). Also the titles “the Man of Mockery” and “the People of Mockery” (איש הלצון, אנשי הלצון) relate to the biblical prophecy; this time, to Isa 28:14-15. Here the leaders of the people are called by this name, since they “have made lies (כזב)” their “refuge” and “in falsehood (בשקר)... have taken shelter”. Among these leaders there are priests and prophets (ibid, 7). Finally, such expressions as “led (many) astray (התעה)” (see examples above) or “prophesied lies (נבא שקר)” (cf. for example 4Q 266 (4QDa) 3 II 9 [CDa VI 1]; 4Q 267 (4QDb) 2, 6 [CDa VI 6]), which describe the notorious behavior of the community enemies, have its parallels in the biblical texts devoted to the false prophets (Isa 9:14-15; Mic 3:5; Jer 5, 31; 14:14-15; 20:6; 23:13, 25-26, 32; 27:10, 14-16; 29:9, 21).

Even from this partial list of references, one can infer that the book of Jeremiah engages in the issue of the false prophets more than other prophetic books. As Davis expresses it: “An overarching theme within the book of Jeremiah is his relationship as a prophet to rival prophets in Jerusalem... Large sections of the composition are occupied with accounts of Jeremiah’s oppression at the hand of others from the prophetic schools, and with diatribes issued against these opposing prophets... This presentation of a contentious Jeremiah not surprisingly resonates in those compositions from the Qumran literature where drawing sharp distinctions with their own contemporaries is a primary feature”⁵¹. Indeed, in the book of Jeremiah alone we find stories about clashes between Jeremiah and those who “prophesy lies (נבא שקר)” or “promise lies to the people (על מבטיחים שקר את העם הזה)”: Hananiah, son of Azzur, from Gibeon (Jer 28) and Shemaiah the Nehelamite (ibid, 29:24-32)⁵². Hananiah rebuffs Jeremiah’s words and humiliates Jeremiah in the presence of all the people (Jer 28:10-11), while Shemaiah (as I have mentioned above) attacks Jeremiah “from the distance”: he sends a letter to Jerusalem and demands to stop Jeremiah from prophesying (ibid, 29:24-28). Similarly, the Man of the Lie together with his people assaults the Teacher of Righteousness and rejects his words:

[“Look, o nations (בגוים)⁵³, and see,] [and be shocked, for the Lord is doing something in your time that you would not believe it if] were it told” (Hab 1:5). [This passage refers to] the traitors (הבוגדים) together with the Man of the Lie, because they did not [believe the words of] the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of God (כי לוא [האמינו בדברין] מורה צדקה מפיא אל). It also refers to the traitors to the new [covenant] (ועל הבוגדים בברית החדשה), because they did not believe in God’s covenant [and desecrated] his holy name... (1QpHab I 16 – 2:4).

“How can you look on silently, you traitors, when the wicked destroys one more righteous than he” (Hab 1:13b). This refers to the family of Absalom and the members of their party, who kept quiet when Teacher of Righteousness was rebuked (בתוכחת מורה הצדק), and they did not help him

⁵⁰ The translation of this fragment is quoted according to Charlesworth et al., *Damascus Document*, 28-9.

⁵¹ Davis, *The Cave 4 Apocryphon of Jeremiah and the Qumran Jeremianic Traditions*, 267-8.

⁵² The indirect evidence of the importance of the false prophets from the book of Jeremiah for Qumran community can be found in the List of False Prophets (4Q 339). This composition includes at least three names which relate to the figures from the book of Jeremiah: Ahab, son of Kolaiah, Zedekiah, son of Maaseiah, and Shemaiah the Nehelamite (cf. Jer 29:21-32). Some scholars also reconstruct the reference to Hananiah, son of Azzur, in the end of the list. See Davis, *The Cave 4 Apocryphon of Jeremiah and the Qumran Jeremianic Traditions*, 268 and footnote 98.

⁵³ The Septuagint reads here οἱ καταφρονῆται “the despisers, traitors”. Probably, this version reflects the Hebrew word בוגדים

against the Man of the Lie, who had rejected the Law in the presence of their entire company (מאס את התורה בתוך כל עדתם אשר (1QpHab V 8-12).

As it has been already noted, the role of the Law (התורה) herald turns the Teacher of Righteousness to the new Moses. But at the same time, both mentioning of the new covenant and the motif of rebuke, contempt and rejection of the words, which the protagonist receives from "the mouth of God", connects the Teacher with Jeremiah. So, the Man of the Lie, like Hananiah, son of Azzur, and Shemaiah the Nehelamite, despises the prophet's message⁵⁴.

Concerning the family of Absalom, mentioned in the quoted fragment from the Pesher Habakkuk, we don't have any specific information, but there is no doubt that this is a symbolic appellation for those whom the Qumran community saw as traitors (בוגדים) (such as Absalom, David's son, who betrayed and rebelled against his father; see 2 Sam 15). One can find here an additional linkage between the Teacher of Righteousness and Jeremiah: Jeremiah is described as a having been betrayed by those whom he used to trust: "For even your kinsmen and your father's house, even they are treacherous toward you (המה בגדו בך כי גם-אחיך ובית-אביך גם, (בגדו בך כי גם-אחיך ובית-אביך גם, they cry after you as a mob. Do not believe them when they speak cordially to you" (Jer 12:6).

Finally, let's pay attention to the fact that the prophets were the active participants of Jeremiah's trial and together with the priests demanded to bring Jeremiah to death (Jer 26:7-11), like the Man of Mockery and the community, who "sought smooth things (דרשו בחלקות)" and "condemned the righteous man" (cf. 4Q266 (4QDa) 2 I 18-23 [CDa I 14-20]; cf. CDb XX 11-12).

To sum up: "the wicked of Ephraim", who persecuted the Teacher of Righteousness and his community, can be compared with the biblical prophets who prophesied falsehood and lead the people of Israel astray, mainly from the book of Jeremiah. Some of them attack Jeremiah trying to silence him or refute his words, while another group participates in Jeremiah's trial and demands to execute him.

But what about the second group mentioned in the Pesher Ps 37, "the wicked of Manasseh"? The identity of this group is less clear than "the wicked of Ephraim". The only thing we know about "the wicked of Manasseh" is their respected and prominent position and even close relations with the kingdom: "... the nobles Manasseh, the honoured ones..." (4Q169 [4QpNah] 3-4 III 9); "Its interpretation concerns Manasseh at the end of the age when his rule over Is[rael] will fall..." (ibid. 3-4 IV 3). If "the wicked of Manasseh" are correctly identified with the Sadducees, their high standing may correspond with the priestly position of the Sadducees. In addition, the Sadducees indeed had close relations with some rulers from the Hasmonean Dynasty, especially with Alexander Jannaeus. So, from a typological point of view there are some parallels between the Jerusalem priests who persecuted Jeremiah, and "the wicked of Manasseh" who attacked the Teacher of Righteousness. Let's repeat: in the story of Jeremiah's trial (Jer 26), both the priests and the prophets join together in order to condemn Jeremiah to death. In the same way, in the Pesher Ps 37, "the wicked of Ephraim and Manasseh" act together and attack the Teacher of Righteousness. If our comparison is correct, however, why do the Teacher's enemies appear in the opposite order: first, the prophets ("the wicked of Ephraim"), followed by the priests ("the wicked of Manasseh"), while in Jer 26 the order is "the priests and prophets"? It seems that this order follows the story of the blessing of Joseph's sons, Ephraim and Manasseh, in which Jacob-Israel crosses his hands in order to bless Ephraim first, even though Manasseh is the first-born (Gen 48:14). According to the Bible, Ephraim is the central and the most important northern tribe, and this name often designates metonymically the whole Northern kingdom (see for example, Is 7:5).

We can conclude that the double typology of the tribes' names existed in Qumran compositions: an explicit one which created a parallel between the split of Jewish kingdom after Solomon's death and

⁵⁴ On the other hand, there is some parallel between the Man of the Lie, who "did not [believe the words of] the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of God", and King Zedekiah, who "did not humble himself before the prophet Jeremiah who spoke from the mouth of the Lord" (2 Chr 36:12).

the religious and social schism among the Jewish people in the Second Temple period. But alongside with this explicit typology, an implicit one may be posited: the persecutors of the Teacher of Righteousness – “the wicked of Ephraim and Manasseh” – function in the Qumran scrolls as the prophets and the priests in Jeremiah’s narrative.

Conclusions: Why Jeremiah?

Our observations lead us to the conclusion that the Teacher of Righteousness was described as the persecuted prophet even though we have scant data about his life. We have tried to check to what extent the stories about Jeremiah influenced the shaping of the prophetic “biography” of the Teacher of Righteousness. On the one hand, no explicit comparison exists between the Teacher and Jeremiah in the Qumran literature, and so far, no Peshier Jeremiah has been found where we might have expected to find such a comparison⁵⁵. But, on the other hand, in other Peshier works, which characteristically don’t mention Jeremiah, we have discovered implicit references to Jeremiah’s stories. In my opinion, the Qumran authors deliberately created an analogy between these two figures. Here, therefore, Jeremiah turns into the prototype of the persecuted prophet. The description of the Teacher of Righteousness as the persecuted prophet, like Jeremiah (the “second” or the “new” Jeremiah), provided the sect with clear proof as to their verity: anybody who persecutes God’s messenger rebels against the sender, and belongs to the camp of wickedness. Punishment for these people is inevitable (cf. 2 Chr 36:11-21).

But why was the connection between the Teacher of Righteousness and Jeremiah specifically so important in the eyes of the Qumran? First of all, as mentioned above, the persecution motif is the central element in Jeremiah’s “biography” in the Bible, and it is also prominent in the extra-biblical traditions concerning this prophet⁵⁶. The really significant aspect of our discussion, however, is the fact that, already in the Bible, Jeremiah became a kind of symbolic example of the persecuted, and rejected prophet. It is written in 2 Chr 36:12: “He (Zedekiah) did not humble himself before the prophet Jeremiah who spoke from the mouth of the Lord”. Several verses later, the author explains what caused God’s wrath and the destruction of Jerusalem: “... they (the people) kept mocking the messengers of God, despising his words, and scoffing at his prophets...” (ibid, 16). One can infer from this proximity that the case of Jeremiah was the “last straw” before God’s patience ran out⁵⁷. So, among all the other biblical prophets, Jeremiah was indeed the most suitable candidate to become the prototype of the persecuted prophet and to presage the appearance of the Teacher of Righteousness.

Second, the concept of the New Covenant, which appears once in the Peshier Habakkuk, and several times in the Damascus Document, is, as is well-known, also rooted in the book of Jeremiah. In Jer 31:30-33, a prophecy about the “new covenant” which God will make with Israel is described:

It will not be like the covenant that I made with their ancestors when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt – a covenant that they broke... But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days... I will put my law within them, and I will write it on their hearts.

This symbolic description comes to establish the absolute adherence of the people of Israel to God in the future.

It seems that the Qumran community interpreted this prophecy according to the Peshier method and claimed that the prophecy relates exclusively to their members: they made the new covenant in Damascus. Only they are faithful and adhere to God, while the other people of Israel have broken their father’s covenant. Even though the connection between Jeremiah’s prophecy and the new covenant in the

⁵⁵ See a detailed discussion on this issue by Davis, *The Cave 4 Apocryphon of Jeremiah and the Qumran Jeremianic Traditions*, 1-9.

⁵⁶ For more about these traditions, see Christian Wolff, *Jeremia im Frühjudentum und Urchristentum*, TUGAL 118 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1976), 6-98; anonymous reference.

⁵⁷ About Jeremiah as the prototype of a persecuted prophet in the book of Chronicles, see anonymous reference.

land of Damascus is not expressed explicitly (there is no citation of the biblical text and the stereotypic introductory sentence "interpreted, this concerns..."), this connection is very plausible, because the concept of the new covenant does not appear in any other place, except the book of Jeremiah. Moreover: one of the fragments from the Damascus Document mentions Jeremiah when it tells about those who betrayed the new covenant: "This is the word which Jeremiah said to Baruch, son of Neriah... All the men who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus" (CD^a VIII 20-21)⁵⁸. It is difficult to know what, exactly, the author meant in this sentence and how the words of Jeremiah to Baruch are connected with the new covenant in the land of Damascus, but the fact that the name of the prophet and the expression borrowed from his prophecy appear one next to another cannot be accidental⁵⁹. We can conclude that the Teacher of Righteousness who brought his community into the new covenant, fulfilled the prophecy of Jeremiah. Actually the Teacher is the second Jeremiah, and therefore also "inherited" the prophet's lot of being persecuted.

Third, the figure of Baruch, Jeremiah's personal scribe, may contribute to the connection between Jeremiah and the Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran Peshier literature. According to Jer 36:4, 32 Baruch recorded all of Jeremiah's prophecies in the scroll. The Qumran scribes, who also recorded in the scrolls the acts and words of the Teacher, could identify in Baruch a founder of the scribes' institution which they related to. In addition, according to Jer 32:11-14 Jeremiah gives Baruch "the sealed deed of purchase, containing the terms and conditions, and the open copy", in order to put them into an earthen jar, "...that they may last for a long time". Even though these documents are the bill of sale (the redemption of the family holding according to the law in Lev 25:25-28), they also have a symbolic meaning: the redemption of the land by Jeremiah symbolizes the future redemption of Israel, and "the deed of purchase" is the token, or guarantee. So, Baruch is the keeper of the redemption pledge. The Qumran scribes also placed their scrolls in earthen jars, and many of these texts contained the eschatological message. From this point of view, Baruch again seems to be the example for the sect scribes. Finally, Baruch, like Jeremiah, was persecuted by King Jehoiakim (Jer 36:26) and accompanied him when the Judean refugees went to Egypt, taking Jeremiah with them (Jer 43:6-7). In the same way, the sect members were persecuted together with their teacher and accompanied him to the desert (and perhaps, to the land of Damascus). Baruch could be perceived by these people as the typological figure who refers to all the community, which stays true to the persecuted prophet and preserves his heritage⁶⁰.

⁵⁸ The translation of this fragment is quoted according to Charlesworth et al., *Damascus Document*, 28-9.

⁵⁹ For a detailed discussion of this issue, see Wolff, *Jeremia im Frühjudentum und Urchristentum*, 124-30; Davis, *The Cave 4 Apocryphon of Jeremiah and the Qumran Jeremianic Traditions*, 269-73.

⁶⁰ It is worth noting that, at the end of the Second Temple period and following its destruction, Baruch evolves from a secondary figure to a character of significance, and appears as a successor of Jeremiah in some Jewish writings: the book of Baruch; 2 Baruch (Syriac Apocalypse); 3 Baruch (Greek Apocalypse); 4 Baruch (Paraleipomena Jeremioi). Even though most of these compositions were written after the destruction of the Temple and could not be included in the Qumran library, the traditions about the central role of Baruch in Jeremiah's life probably began to develop before it, and the Qumran authors could have been familiar with some of them. Concerning the traditions surrounding the figure of Baruch, see J. Edward Wright, "Baruch: His Evolution from Scribe to Apocalyptic Seer", in *Biblical Figures outside the Bible*, ed. Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998), 264-89.