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<td>4QpNah</td>
<td>Pesher Nahum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QpPs</td>
<td>Pesher Psalm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Damascus Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSS</td>
<td>Dead Sea Scrolls</td>
</tr>
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Abstract

The Dead Sea Scrolls corpus presents a leadership figure presiding over the Qumran movement known only by the sobriquet “Teacher of Righteousness.” This shadowy character has garnered a significant amount of scholarly attention due to its extraordinary role in the formation and maintenance of Qumran’s sectarian identity. Despite exhaustive efforts to better understand the group’s figurehead, the Teacher of Righteousness has remained an obscurity with the only general consensus being that it represented an historical figure in the Second Temple period. This thesis seeks to problematize this consensus and argue for an imagined leadership figure produced in order to legitimize the sectarian movement. The argument is presented through the purview of collective memory theory in order to read the historical recordings in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the experiential narratives of the Teacher as a tradition rather than objective reality. Furthermore, this thesis looks to display substantial continuity between the scrolls’ presentation of the Teacher of Righteousness and biblical heroes abound the memory of the Qumran sectarians. In arguing for a fictitious Teacher figure in the Dead Sea Scrolls, this thesis seeks to discourage further research into the figure’s historical persona and rather encourage future inquiry to focus on the influence of its narratives on the Qumran members.
Chapter One

The leadership figure in the Qumran movement known as מורה הצדק, the Teacher of Righteousness, constitutes the most mysterious and consequential character in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The title appears in some form in at least seventeen occurrences throughout the Qumran corpus.¹ Scribes display their leader in several variant ways which include: מורה צדק; מורה; מורה הצדקה; יורה הצדק; and the aforementioned definitive form מורה הצדק.² The person behind the title is portrayed in several different lights throughout the scrolls including, but not limited to, taking on the role of prophet, priest, and founder. Due to the high volume of appearances by מורה הצדק throughout the writings of the scrolls, the position he is portrayed to have employed, and the influence a leader may have had on a community of his exilic followers, there has been an abundance of research done on the subject. He has, in fact, almost unanimously been considered the single most important character in the Dead Sea Scrolls corpus.³ Inquiry has normally revolved around three major issues: (1) what person known through other Second Temple writings is behind the epithet? (2) What can be reconstructed about the Teacher’s life and how does this relate to the origins of the Qumran community? And (3) which documents from the Dead Sea Scrolls, if any, were authored by the Teacher of Righteousness?⁴

¹ Stuckenbruck (2010: 26-27) relays the following passages as specifically mentioning the Teacher of Righteousness: 1QpHab 1:13; 2:2; 5:10; 7:4; 8:3; 9:9-10; 11:5; 1QpMic (1Q14) 10:6; 4QpPs⁵ 4Q171 1-10 3:15, 19; 4:8, 27; 4QpPs⁵ (4Q173) 1 4, 2 2; an unidentified pesher fragment (4Q172 7:1); CD A 1:11; 6:11. The use of this sobriquet in the variant forms provided appear in six further texts: CD B 20:1, 14; 4QpPs⁵ 1-10 1:27; CD B 20:28; 4Qplsa⁶ (4Q163) 21:6; and depending on its restoration, 4Qplsa⁶ (4Q165) 1-2 3⁶. Based on the context there is no reason to believe that the different titles refer to separate people but rather one individual or office. Rabinowitz (1958: 392-393) even notes that in one case a scribe seems to have crossed out the first three letters of יורה and proceeds to fill in the word מורה. He concludes that the author regarded the masculine singular participles qal and hiph'il from the root ירה as synonyms.

³ Stuckenbruck 2007: 78
⁴ Stuckenbruck 2007: 75-76
Despite exhaustive efforts to understand this shadowy character, scholarship has remained conflicted with theories ranging from the possible to the absurd.

One of the more curious aspects involved in the study of the Teacher of Righteousness is the fact that he was discovered in the Cairo Geniza well before the rest of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Solomon Schechter first published the work which has come to be known as the Damascus Document under the headline “Fragments of a Zadokite Work” in 1910. It is not known how the document made its way to Cairo or what bearing that has on the Qumran movement but the important point for this study is Schechter’s early work on the Teacher of Righteousness. Beyond simply stating that the Teacher was an historical character, he further developed his theory to envelop the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel into the personage of the Teacher of Righteousness and he ascribed the community’s founding to this person.\(^5\) Some modern scholars who study the figure of the Teacher of Righteousness have expressed questions about what the field would be like had scholarship not previously been aware of the Teacher’s existence. Since Schechter first proposed the likelihood that the Teacher of Righteousness in the Damascus Document was an historical character, most of scholarship has continued with this theme and looked to explore the identity of the Teacher. In fact, scholars often refer to his historical validity as the only consensus about the figure.\(^6\) The Teacher’s historicity has been accepted almost as a truism in Qumran scholarship and the few studies which have demurred this position have failed to sway the field.

\(^5\) Schechter 1910: 44-45  
\(^6\) Wacholder 1999: 28
The purpose of the current project is two-fold. The history of scholarly discourse concerning the Teacher’s role and historical character will be presented in order to demonstrate the widespread disagreement regarding the leader of the Qumran sect. Despite the fact that most consider him to be certainly an historical character the evidence, or lack thereof, has left conclusions varied and asserted. When considering the historicity of the Teacher of Righteousness and his historical counterpart it is simply the case that the evidence is lacking in the Dead Sea Scrolls to find any definitive conclusions. Moreover, the continuation of historical investigation into the nature of Qumran’s leader may obfuscate the social significance of the Teacher’s narrative. While discussing the Teacher Hymns Hypothesis in the Hodayot, Newsom claims that the emphasis on the historical Teacher’s connection with the text has deleterious effects toward the greater understanding of the influence that the scroll had on the community: “What tends to get left to one side,” Newsom writes, “is how these Hodayot functioned over time, as they were continually read or recited, to shape the ethos of the community and to address perennial questions of sectarian life.” Similarly, I posit that the continued historical inquiry into the Teacher of Righteousness fails to acknowledge how the narratives about him shaped the cosmological worldview of the community and raised the value of what it meant to be a member in the Qumran movement.

After presenting the ongoing discourse about the historical Teacher of Righteousness and the complications involved, this work will attempt to problematize the one consensus that has been reached concerning the Qumranic figurehead. It is the thesis

---

7 Wise 2003: 87
8 The Teacher Hymns Hypothesis constitutes the proposed reading of portions of the Hodayot, particularly columns X-XVII, as having been authored by the historical Teacher of Righteousness. For more about this theory and its rebuttal, see pg. 4 n. 10.
9 Newsom 2004: 288
of this project that the mysterious appearance and death of the Teacher in the Damascus Document, the lack of his direct authorship of Qumran texts, and his absence from historical descriptions of the Essene community recounted by Josephus and others can be explained if one views this figure as a literary character formed by the community to serve social purposes from a memory of biblical leaders. In raising this point I hope to discourage the study of the Teacher of Righteousness’s historical personage and rather encourage future research to examine the impact the figure’s narrative had on the community of his followers.

It is unreasonable, however, for this study or any other to suggest that the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls invented the Teacher of Righteousness out of thin air to serve an unheralded position or function. Such a stance will not be taken in the argument of this paper. The Teacher employs a position well recognized in offshoot groups for a very long time. He takes up the place of charismatic leadership described by Max Weber. Weber claims that in communal organizations there seems to be one person who is regarded by his followers as endowed with charismatic authority and who takes a position of leadership. Charisma, as defined by Weber, is “a certain quality of an individual

\[10\] I will be operating under the recently advanced theory that the Teacher of Righteousness did not author the famously known “Teacher Hymns” in the Hodayot. The theory that proposes the first-person account found in the Hodayot as expressed by the historical Teacher of Righteousness is widely known as the Teacher Hymns Hypothesis and is credited to the German Heidelberg School from the 1960’s. Their work sought to prove the long-held assumption proposed initially by Eleazar Sukenik (1955). However, Harkins has recently revisited this hypothesis and concluded that it relies on false and romantic ideas about authorship and ignorance of manuscript evidence. She writes, “Scholars who were impressed by the strong and distinctive literary style, which I will refer to as the strong ‘I’ of the TH, went on to draw conclusions that, in my view, the texts do not warrant by claiming that the hodayot in X-XVII give evidence of an actual historical person’s experiences of distress and deliverance.” (Harkins 2012: 20) Newsom (2004: 288) similarly expresses doubt about the Teacher Hymns Hypothesis. She proposes that the “I” in the Hodayot may refer to the Mebaqker or function as a way to articulate a leadership myth that was appropriated by the current Qumran leader. Other studies which question this theory include Michael O. Wise, The First Messiah: Investigating the Savior before Jesus (New York: Harper Collins, 1999) and Israel Knohl, The Messiah Before Jesus: The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls (trans. David Maisel; Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).
personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities.”

The endowed qualities of the Teacher of Righteousness display striking similarities to other exemplary biblical leaders such as Moses. Based on the presence of biblical documents among the Qumran scrolls it is easily deduced that the community is well aware of the Hebrew Bible and its narratives of righteous groups of the past. The structure and roles of characters such as Moses and Ezra would have been deeply ingrained in the minds of exilic people on the path to living justly in the eyes of their supreme God. That being said, this paper will present the positions of biblical figures as both leaders and prophets and hold them in direct comparison to the portrayal of the Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran writings. By highlighting a significant number of similarities between the Teacher and the authors’ memory of biblical heroes it will be argued that the Teacher of Righteousness was constructed based on the position he was projected to fulfill.

The proposition of a false Teacher in the Dead Sea Scrolls comes on the heels of other scholarly inquiry into the historicity of prophetic figures such as Malachi. Many scholars suspect that the prophet never really existed and was used either as an epithet or

---

11 Weber 1947: 358
12 The problem of using the terms Hebrew Bible and canon for Second Temple times has long been recognized. For an overview of the Bible’s progression and authority in the time of the Qumran community see Jonathan G. Campbell, “‘Rewritten Bible’ and ‘Parabiblical Texts’: A Terminological and Ideological Critique” in New Directions in Qumran Studies (ed. by Jonathan G. Campbell, William John Lyons & Lloyd K. Pietersen; London: T & T Clark International, 2005); Shani Tzoref, “Qumran Pesharim and the Pentateuch: Explicit Citation, Overt Typologies, and Implicit Interpretive Traditions” in Dead Sea Discoveries 16 (2009), 192. In order to avoid being pedantic in this work I will refer to the presently recognized biblical texts and the primary texts cited in the pesharim (Habakkuk, Psalms, and Micah) as Hebrew Bible on the basis of the community’s recognition of these writings as authoritative, as evident by their insistence on assimilating the scriptures into their community.
merely constituted the title of the book.\textsuperscript{13} Scholarship has found it impossible to definitively prove anything concerning the prophet Malachi. The name does not appear elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible as a proper noun and literally translates to “my messenger.” According to Redditt, many have deemed such a name inappropriate for a parent to possibly give to a child. They conclude, then, that the name was a shorter form of something like Malachijah which would result in either the blasphemous translation “God is my messenger” or “Messenger of God.” Redditt finds this argument difficult in its assertion and concludes Malachi to be a title taken from Mal. 3:1 where the word is once again used.\textsuperscript{14} Moreover, there is absolutely no historical information provided about the prophet in the book of Malachi or elsewhere. He seems to only appear for the purpose of authoring this work and then proceeds to vanish from the record books. Whatever the case may be, the historical personage of the prophet Malachi has garnered a substantial amount of doubt in biblical scholarship.

The scholarly investigations and suspicions regarding the historicity of the prophet Malachi for these reasons provide significant parallels with the proposed study on the Teacher of Righteousness. If what many scholars assume is correct and Malachi functions as a title rather than a proper name then there is an obvious comparison to the Teacher in the scrolls. It has long been the purpose of Qumran scholarship to discern the historical name of the Teacher of Righteousness. This title is seen nowhere else so prominently other than in the Dead Sea Scrolls writings and is not mentioned by any Second Temple historians such as Josephus. The Qumran leader figure is presented only

\textsuperscript{13} Sweeney 2005: 207 \& Lundbom 2010: 134
\textsuperscript{14} Redditt 2008: 151
by his sobriquet which is clearly meant to perpetuate a position on high.\textsuperscript{15} This is an almost identical situation to what was discussed regarding Malachi. Furthermore, like with the prophet Malachi, there is no direct reference to the Teacher’s historical life such as a genealogy or hometown. In fact, even his appearance into the community (CD 1:9-11) and his abrupt death (CD 20:1) depicted in the Damascus Document are clouded in allusions.

As I have noted above, there has been a tremendous amount of work on the figure of the Teacher of Righteousness in the scrolls. So why is it important for there to be another study on the figure and, more specifically, why is it important to have this particular project on the Teacher? The result of a prophet-like leader for the Qumran sect is paramount to their communal identity and their members’ ability to avoid cognitive dissonance regarding their new metaphysical beliefs in tension with their perception of the corrupt social landscape of Second Temple Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{16} The narratives about the Teacher of Righteousness depicted in the Dead Sea Scrolls that project him as sent by God (CD 1:10-11), a divine recipient of revelation (1QpHab 7:4-5), and the founder of a chosen community (4QpPs\textsuperscript{a} 3:15-16) functioned not only to create an appropriate leader reminiscent of Moses but to inculcate the Qumran members with the belief that they are God’s righteous elect. Stories people read and tell to each other are the driving force that creates and sustains communal identity and worldviews.\textsuperscript{17} A set understanding which involved a prophet-like messenger sent by God for the purpose of raising you, a righteous

\textsuperscript{15} Jokiranta (2013: 178) writes that “the teacher’s title claims that he was sent by God, to give the people a fresh start, and to assist it in its search for justice.”

\textsuperscript{16} My categorization of the Qumran community as a sectarian movement is informed by Jokiranta’s (2013: 17-76) discussion on the matter. Jokiranta (2013: 50) concludes that the Qumran movement should be dubbed sectarian by using Stark and Bainbridge’s definition which claims one to be “a deviant religious organization with traditional beliefs and practices.”

\textsuperscript{17} Smith 2003: 63-94
community, would have resulted in great reassurance for the group of exiles who left their worlds behind in Jerusalem. Therefore, what is crucial for the development of Qumran life is the narrative about the Teacher of Righteousness as presiding over the community and not so much the actual historical figure. The Teacher, in this case, constitutes a figure of memory which contains the community’s identity, validation, and authority to construct new laws and interpretations.\textsuperscript{18} Scholarship’s assertion that the Teacher of Righteousness must be an historical person and their focus on characters from the time period is remiss of the real influence of the figurehead in the Qumran sectarian’s life. For the community to have believed in a prophetic leader as having at some time reigned over their movement is as substantial as there ever having been an actual historical actor.

\textbf{The Dead Sea Scrolls and Collective Memory Theory}

Before delving into the study of the Teacher of Righteousness there must be some consideration for the methodology to be utilized in this project. It would be impossible to argue for a fictitious Teacher in the scrolls if one takes the content of the Qumran writings to be literal. Therefore, this paper is inclined to read the Dead Sea Scrolls as not the storage of facts \textit{per se} but the passing down of a memory that would inscribe the individual members who make up the collective whole with a belief that they are the righteous of God and enjoy a superior status to their cultural counterparts. It has long been recognized that the Babylonian exile of 587/586 BCE had a lasting influence on the

\textsuperscript{18} Figures of memory are defined by Assman (1995:129) as “fateful events of the past, whose memory is maintained through cultural formation (texts, rites, monuments) and institutional communication (recitation, practice, observance).”
writings of the prophets. Authors struggled to present a world in which YHWH reigned supreme and just amidst a reality in which those considered to be righteous had been attacked. The Qumran community similarly believed itself also to have gone through an exile. Brooke writes,

The movement that the Teacher brings into focus rewrites the notion of exile present in the Deuteronomistic History by insisting that the Sin-Exile-Return model is to be applied to Israel’s experiences in a way rather different than the reformed returnees of the late sixth and fifth centuries B.C.E. might have supposed.20

The Qumran authors clearly felt that Jerusalem and its people had gone astray and it proceeded to live separated from Jerusalem because of this.21 Similar to the post-exilic prophetic authors, the scribes of the Dead Sea Scrolls would have grappled with the need to present a justification for their exile and assure God’s steadfast remainder with them.22 Just as the prophetic writings were meant to instill a certain behavior and worldview into its readers, so to the Dead Sea Scrolls were meant to reassure the group members of their place in God’s plan and their correctness to have left their world behind.

The issue of memory and its dependability to recount an accurate portrayal of an experiential past has become a problematic matter in recent social inquiry. Memory itself has been recognized to constitute a highly fallible phenomenon which is embedded in and influenced by many of the reminiscing party’s social circumstances. The production of

---

19 Sweeney 2005: 15. Sweeney states that the prophetic writings of the Hebrew Bible provide some of the most profound theological questions about evil vs. righteousness as they try to come to grips with the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple as well as the concept of restoration after the experience of the exile.
20 Brooke 2010: 51
21 VanderKam 2002: 275-292. VanderKam reviews the way in which several groups from the Second Temple period (Pharisees, Sadducees, etc.) are referred to in the Qumran scrolls. These labels, such as the “seekers of smooth things/easy interpretations,” often carry a pejorative connotation.
22 Collins (2011: 306), for example, writes that the “pesharim are written to assure the faithful that their vindication is guaranteed by prophecy, and that prophecy is being fulfilled in their time.”
history is at its core merely the recollection and subsequent codification of a memory – either personal or collective – concerning past events. This process of recollection, however, can no longer be considered an innocent nor objective practice. Instead, recent developments in the field of memory have come to recognize the many complex factors that influence and shape the presentation of past experiences. That is to say that the production and perpetuation of a memory is seen as a strategic maneuver with expected repercussions in the present era. The transmission of a particular perception of the past works in a cyclical fashion in that it is both produced with an eye to serve the present and the present similarly – and often times subconsciously – shapes one’s memory of the past.

The transmutation of memories is largely a function of its own self-interest. In other words, particular presentations of the past with specific rhetoric, events, and connotations, are advanced in order to push one’s agenda. Memories thus remain malleable in order so that they may be recalled, reinterpreted, and revised to suit evolving

23 Allison 2010: 1; Burke 1989: 98
24 The proposition that several factors revolving the time of the composition of a memory inevitably alter the structure of a given memory is regularly referred to as ‘memory distortion.’ For instance, the time elapsed between the historical event and its recording will undoubtedly cause the memory of the aforementioned event to become rather vague and specific details may be forgotten only to be replaced by newly developed scenarios or interpretations (Schudson 1995: 348-360). As Allison (2010: 2) states, “To recollect is not to play back a tape. Memory, at least long-term memory, is reconstructive as well as reproductive and so involves imagination.” Also, the specific reason for sharing a memory as well as the audience for which it is presented will significantly alter the proposal of a single past event. In this case, Engel (1999: 12) provides a wonderful description of how these social factors contribute to the formation of a past memory: “Think back to some charged event in your own life. Perhaps the first fight you had with your spouse. Now imagine telling that story to your mate, many years later at the celebration of your twenty-fifth wedding anniversary, telling it to the divorce lawyer, telling it to your children now that they are grown up, writing it in a humorous memoir of your now famous life, or telling it to your therapist. In each case the person you are telling it to, and the reasons you are telling it, will have a formative effect on the memory itself.”
25 The re-presentation and transmission of memories are a part of “our continued efforts to make coherence of our own lives, to synthesize past and present so as to face the future.” (Rose 1998: 429-454)
demands. This is true at both the individual and the collective level. In this respect, memory undoes itself from the stigma of objectivity and instead must be viewed as a more strategic means of projecting history. As Megill elaborates,

On the one hand, ‘history’ appears as a pseudo-objective discourse that rides roughshod over particular memories and identities, which claim to have an experiential reality and authenticity that history lacks. On the other hand, memory appears as an unmeasured discourse that, in the service of desire, makes claims for its own validity that cannot be justified.

In similar fashion Assman proclaims,

Seen as an individual and as a social capacity, memory is not simply the storage of past “facts” but the ongoing work of reconstructive imagination. In other words, the past cannot be stored but always has to be “processed” and mediated. This mediation depends on the semantic frames and needs of a given individual or society within a given present.

The declaration of a particular memory as representative of an individual or community is invariably selective. A community perpetuates a specific memory of the past because it is what proves most conducive to the desired results for the needs of the present. At the same time, however, other memories and representations are pushed into darkness and subsequently forgotten.

Inquiry into the dynamics of memory in the collective sphere is a subject that has gained steam in biblical and historical discourse over the past twenty years. The

---

26 Olick & Robbins 1998: 128
27 Megill 1998: 38
28 Assman 1997: 14
29 Schudson 1995: 348
30 Olick & Robbins reference Schwartz (1996) as identifying three related aspects of 1960s-1970s intellectual culture that contributed to the emergence of interest in the social construction of the past. He writes, “First, multiculturalists identify historiography as a source of cultural domination and challenge dominant historical narratives in the name of repressed groups. Second, post-modernists attack the conceptual underpinnings of linear historicity, truth, and power. Finally, hegemony theorists provide a
systematic theory of collective memory\(^{31}\) is normally credited to have been introduced into the social sciences first by the French scholar Maurice Halbwachs in his seminal work *The Social Frameworks of Memory (Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire).*\(^{32}\) For Halbwachs, memory is determined by an already well-established collective or individual identity. He claims that a meaningful identity, which has already been assumed by a community, goes about creating itself a past which is congruent with itself. However, this position has shifted in recent sociological inquiry. “In contrast,” Megill writes in regards to Halbwachs’ theory above, “the most characteristic feature of the contemporary scene is a lack of fixity at the level of identity, leading to the project of constructing memory with a view to constructing identity itself.”\(^{33}\) A common collective memory is thus the pivotal factor in defining what makes a group unique and distinct from outsiders.\(^{34}\) Olick and Robbins have decisively identified memory as the central medium through which collective identities are constituted.\(^{35}\)

The discourse concerning memory production and its inherent ties with subservience to the present demands raises the significant question of our ability to rely on memory as fact. For Halbwachs, history is dead memory: “a way of preserving pasts

---

\(^{31}\) The term I will be using during the course of this examination is “collective memory.” However, this theory has often been taken as synonymous with “social memory” and “cultural memory,” which has led to the three being used interchangeably by many scholars. The three have slightly different nuances: On the one hand, Halbwachs used the label *sociaux* in order to show the ways in which group ideologies inform individual memories. On the other hand, collective memory connotes the memories shared and passed down by groups. More recently, cultural memory has entered the discussion as a term that simply broadens the scope of collective memory. As Le Donne (2007: 165 n. 6) explains, though, these nuances vary depending on the author employing these terms and can regularly be viewed as synonymous unless explained.

\(^{32}\) There is at this time no full translation of Halbwachs’ *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire* (1925) in English. However, Lewis Coser has provided the most complete edition of Halbwachs’ work in *On Collective Memory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).

\(^{33}\) Megill 1998: 44

\(^{34}\) Assman 1995: 130

\(^{35}\) Olick & Robbins 1998: 133
to which we know longer have an ‘organic’ experiential relation.” Assman has theorized that memory is in fact incapable of preserving the past as it was because it is inevitably caught up in a contemporary frame of reference which can only relate its knowledge to an actual and contemporary situation. He further states that the significance of memory is not in any attempt to present a concrete objective representation of experiential reality but the construction of events’ meaning and significance. Therefore, in response to the question of memory’s capability to portray the past as fact, a qualified answer is no. As has been seen, memory is the constant work of imagination, structure, and re-presentation. However, another answer to this query may be that you’re asking the wrong question. Memory serves a number of social functions for those who subscribe to it. It is capable of shaping the ethos of a community from humanizing functions to molding the docile body. It is able to construct its own past reality irrespective of any experiential reality and implement for its collective body a memory which is very real and very impactful on all aspects of current life.

However, for the purpose of this thesis, it is important to note that while the collective memory was perceived as experiential by the group who subscribed to it, the narratives produced from this memory are likely to have been dramatically altered to serve a specific purpose and thus cannot and should not be read as a reliable recollection.

---

36 This quote comes from Olick & Robbins’ explanation of Halbwachs’ work. They go on to say that Halbwachs’ solution negates the image of historiography as the more appropriate attitude towards the past. “History’s epistemological claim,” they write, “is devalued in favor of memory’s meaningfulness. At a deeper level, however, the distinction is the same that traditional historians would draw between history and memory: Only the former is engaged in a search for truth.” (Olick & Robbins 1998: 110)
37 Assman 1995: 130
38 Assman 1995: 126
39 Assman (1995: 132) writes, “The binding character of the knowledge preserved in cultural memory has two aspects, the formative one in its educative, civilizing, and humanizing functions and the normative one in its function of providing rules of conduct.”
of historical fact. Therefore, in turning our attention to the Qumran scrolls it should be acknowledged that the portrayal of the community’s past is likely not entirely true in the sense that it can be taken credibly to reconstruct a history of the movement. There is ample evidence to support the theory that the contents of the Dead Sea Scrolls are not the storage of factual history but rather narratives to construct a common memory. One of the earliest and perhaps most enticing historical features in the scrolls is the author’s dating of the community’s formation in the Damascus Document. CD 1: 5-8 reads:

ובקץ חרון שנים שלוש מאות ותשעים לתיתו בהם ביד נבוכדנאצר מלך בבל פקדם ויצמח מישראל ומאחר שנות מטעת לירוש את ארצו ומנベース את אדמתו

And at the period of wrath, three hundred and ninety years after having delivered them up into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, he visited them and caused to sprout from Israel and from Aaron a shoot of the planting, in order to possess his land and to become fat with the good things of his soil. 41

For quite some time this passage has been referenced to date the manifestation of the Qumran group. However, as the methodology of this paper has noted, the writings in the Dead Sea Scrolls, even those as straightforward as this, cannot be taken as objective facts of history. On the contrary, the scrolls present an image of the community which would resonate in the memory of its members to instill some sort of value in being a part of the Qumran movement. Scholars have noted the fact that the number presented in the passage above for the rise of the righteous shoot is exactly the same as the number provided in Ezekiel for how long Israel is to bear punishment before God’s intervention (Ezekiel 4:5). 42 Unless one is susceptible to believe in outstanding coincidences, the author of the Damascus Document seems to have created a past which depicts the community as being raised up as the righteous shoot just as the time of wrath is said to end in the book of

40 Davies 2010: 32-33
41 Unless otherwise specified, all Hebrew texts and translations will be provided by Florentino Garcia Martinez & Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition (Leiden: Brill, 1997).
42 VanderKam 1994: 100
Ezekiel. This would serve to further support the community’s claim to be the sons of righteousness sent by God. They viewed themselves as the shoot of planting which rose from the chaos abound in Second Temple Jerusalem.

Definitive conclusions concerning the history of the Qumran sect have been scarce. Efforts have been made to construct their history through the writings of Josephus and the Dead Sea Scrolls themselves with little to be gained. The benefit of applying collective memory theory to the scrolls is that they can be read not as ‘what really happened’ but as Qumran’s interaction with its own conception of its place in history.\(^{43}\)

Several passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls can be read with an eye to sustaining a group identity based on shared memories regarding their place in biblical history. Many of the scrolls which were before read for their historicity can, under the lens of collective memory theory, be read instead for their sociological influences on their recipients. Researchers will be more able to discern Qumran’s self-conception and understanding of the world by setting aside the scrolls’ historicity for an approach into studying memory.

Recent Qumran scholars have largely turned their attention to utilizing collective memory theory in studying the Dead Sea Scrolls because of the benefits it offers. As discussed above, the hope to ascertain any solid historical value from the texts which are littered with sobriquets, allusions, and nuances has been almost entirely abandoned. By shifting focus away from historical investigation in the scrolls, one is more able to present a thorough analysis of what the Qumran community envisioned of itself and how members may have thought of themselves as righteous exiles. In her methodological study of the Damascus Document Grossman states, “My own suggestion is that our

\(^{43}\) Grossman 2002: 209

15
historical approach to the Dead Sea Scrolls needs to move away from a view of the scrolls only as ‘historical evidence’ and toward a recognition that they are, themselves, literary texts presenting ideological constructions of history and not simple statements of fact.\textsuperscript{44} Outside of the confines of the Damascus Document, John Collins writes that the \textit{pesharim} are written not as historical documentation but as a means to assure community members that their vindication is guaranteed by biblical prophecy which is being fulfilled in their time.\textsuperscript{45} Davies goes on to further emphasize a reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls as the product of a shared collective memory and regards it as a “typical component part of the ideological repertoire that supports a sectarian mentality.”\textsuperscript{46} That being said, the methodology that I propose in this work is not unusual for studying the contents of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

This section has attempted to cast the methodological underpinnings that will be utilized in examining the writings of the Dead Sea Scrolls throughout this project. However, this work will be more closely focused on the character and role of the Teacher of Righteousness not only as a part of the greater swath of Qumran writings but as a narrative of his own. Therefore, there will be further discussion about collective memory theory and how it specifically relates to the character of the Teacher in chapter 3. The work above has been essential in that it is necessary to understand the writings of the Dead Sea Scrolls not as the storage of factual history but more so as literary works used to construct their history from memory and promote a new communal identity centered on the library found at Qumran.

\textsuperscript{44} Grossman 2002: x
\textsuperscript{45} Collins 2011: 306
\textsuperscript{46} Davies 2010: 34
Historical Context

The present study argues for a fictitious Teacher of Righteousness produced by the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls as a prototype member for their cause resulting in legitimacy and authority for the sect’s biblical and halakhic interpretations. The contents of the Qumran writings portray the Teacher as a founder, priest, and prophet. It may be worthwhile for this investigation to peruse the social historical context of the Dead Sea Scrolls to ascertain a reason for needing such a figure in leadership.

Dating the scrolls has been a matter of much interest ever since their discovery. As mentioned above, the Damascus Document places the floruit of the Qumran movement 390 years after Nebuchadnezzar sacked Jerusalem in 587/586 BCE. This would mean the Qumranites embarked on their exile in 197/196 BCE and the Teacher of Righteousness, who is said to come 20 years later (CD 1:9-10), around 177/176 BCE. However, it has been seen, as discussed above, that these figures are factually unreliable and may hint towards greater theological concerns of the community.\(^{47}\) Apart from reading the scrolls themselves, there have been significant developments in methods for discerning the date of the Dead Sea Scrolls’ conception over the last 50 years. For the most part, studies have found the Qumran exile to have taken place at some time during the mid-second century BCE.\(^{48}\)

Without exhausting the issue, this section will situate the Dead Sea Scrolls and the rise of the Teacher of Righteousness in its historical context to evaluate any possible

\(^{47}\) VanderKam 1994: 100
\(^{48}\) Wise 2003: 53
motives the authors of the scrolls may have had for fabricating a priestly figure as reigning over the Qumran movement. As stated above, much of scholarship has concluded that the scrolls originated at some point during the second century BCE. This has been achieved primarily through four methods of interpretation: (1) archaeology of Khirbet Qumran; (2) internal dating in the scrolls; (3) paleography; and (4) radiocarbon methods.\textsuperscript{49} In order to identify the historical whereabouts of the Teacher of Righteousness, this study turns to examine the central sectarian writings from Qumran where the epithet appears.\textsuperscript{50} According to the Dictionary of Classical Hebrew, the title מורה הצדק (and its variant spellings) is attested in 1QpHab, 1QpMic, 4QpPs\textsuperscript{a+b}, and CD.\textsuperscript{51} Therefore, by dating the scrolls and specifically the sectarian manuscripts found at Qumran one can better discern the social landscape of the community and, more importantly, when the Teacher began to gain significant importance in the authors’ minds.

Early scholarship on the dating of the Qumran movement developed what came to be known as the “Essene Hypothesis,” first purported by Eleazar Sukenik.\textsuperscript{52} This theory has been widely supported throughout the years and holds that during the reign of either Jonathan or Simon Maccabee (approximately 161-135 BCE) a dissident group of Jews left Jerusalem to live in the wilderness. This group which is equated to both the Qumran community and the Essenes departed in protest of the current high priest and came to be

\textsuperscript{49} Flint 2013: 28-35
\textsuperscript{50} My classification for “central sectarian writings” is informed by Wise’s (2003: 60-61) definition of them as those scrolls “that both exhibit the requisite features as noted and testify to their own importance by their preservation in multiple copies. The works that qualify are the Rule of the Community, the Damascus Document, the Thanksgiving Hymns, the pesharim, 4QMMT, the War Scroll, and the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.”
\textsuperscript{51} Clines 1998: 292
\textsuperscript{52} Sukenik 1948: 16
led by the figure known as מורה הצדק. Murphy-O’Connor references the many works which identify the Teacher’s contemporary, the Wicked Priest, with Jonathan Maccabeus or his brother Simon. In doing so he argues that the Teacher of Righteousness, who is said to have had encounters with the Wicked Priest in passages such as 1QpHab 11:4-6 in which the Priest tries to kill the Teacher, must have lived around the same time as Jonathan and/or Simon in the mid-second century BCE. Wise, however, recently presented a thorough study on dating not just the Dead Sea Scrolls but the Teacher of Righteousness himself where he concludes the floruit of the community to have been closer to the late second century BCE or early first century. As mentioned above, the goal of this section is not to land on one specific date but to recognize the milieu of the Qumran scrolls. Whether mid second century BCE or later, most studies agree that the Dead Sea Scrolls are being written after the rise of the Hasmonean dynasty.

Further evidence for reading the scrolls as post-Maccabean revolt comes from one of the most important sectarian scrolls for analyzing internal dating. 4QpNah 1:2-4 reads:

פשת על דמיטרוס מלך יון אשר בקש לבוא ירושלים בעצת דורשי החלקות ולוא בוא כי לוא נתן אל את ירושלים בד מלכי יון מאנתיכוס עד עמוד מושלי כתיים.

Its interpretation concerns Demetrius, king of Yavan, who wanted to enter Jerusalem on the advice of the those looking for easy interpretations, but he did not enter, for God had not given Jerusalem into the hand of the kings of Yavan from Antiochus up to the appearance of the chiefs of the Kittim.

Flint reads the lion as Demetruis III, those who seek easy interpretations as the Pharisees, Antiochus as Antiochus IV Epiphanes, and the Kittim as the Romans. He further goes on to identify a figure known as the Lion of Wrath later in the manuscript as Alexander

53 Wise 2003: 53
54 Theories arguing for Jonathan include: Jeremias 1963: 36-78 and Stegemann 1971: 202-207. The argument that the Wicked Priest should be identified as Simon Maccabeus is led by Schürer 1987 3/1: 435 n. 6, 438.
55 Murphy-O’Connor 1992: 340
56 Wise 2003: 53-87
Jannaeus.\textsuperscript{57} Regardless of a correct classification on the Lion of Wrath, we know from Josephus that Demetrius III was operating around 88 BCE during the time of Jannaeus. Jannaeus was a leadership figure for the Hasmonean dynasty who ruled as king and high priest from about 103 to 76 BCE.\textsuperscript{58} Judging from this passage, scholars can conclude that the Qumran community is writing after the rise of the Hasmonean dynasty and revolt of the Maccabees.

Evidence that supplies the hypothesis that the Qumran community was established after the rise of the Hasmonean dynasty is beneficial to this study’s understanding of the Teacher of Righteousness. The Teacher displays prominent high priestly characteristics in several parts of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In fact, three passages (4QpPs\textsuperscript{a} 3:15; 4QpPs\textsuperscript{a} 2:19; and 1QpHab 2:8) seem to refer to him simply as “The Priest.”\textsuperscript{59} This short epithet הכהן used to describe the Teacher in these instances is a title also regularly used to describe the high priest in the postexilic era.\textsuperscript{60} A handful of scholars have used this evidence to even argue that the historical teacher must have served at some time as the High Priest of Jerusalem, likely before the rule of Jonathan.\textsuperscript{61} Furthermore, the Teacher of Righteousness is presented in direct opposition to another mysterious character revealed as the Wicked Priest. This dualistic opposition between wickedness and righteousness is most prevalent in the Pesher Psalms where, as Jokiranta states, the teacher is “almost always together with his opponent, either the ‘liar,’ or the

\textsuperscript{57} Flint 2013: 29
\textsuperscript{58} Flint 2013: 29
\textsuperscript{59} Wise (1990: 587 n. 3) observes this claim made by Stegemann (1971) and contends that the passage in 1QpHab 2:8 does not explicitly link the priest with the Teacher of Righteousness and 4QpPs\textsuperscript{a} 2:19 presents a figure by the epithet “the priest” but never mentions the Teacher of Righteousness at all. However, the final case, although damaged, can be read confidently to identify the priest with the Teacher.
\textsuperscript{60} de Vaux 1965: 397-398
\textsuperscript{61} Stegemann 1971: 102, 210-220; Schürer 1987, 1: 605-606; VanderKam 1994: 101-102
‘wicked priest.’”62 This priest figure is thought to be a play on words to depict the illegitimate high priest at the time of the Qumran movement. According to VanderKam, “Scholars have long suspected that the epithet is a Hebrew wordplay on the title ‘the high priest’ (ha-kohen ha-ro’sh = high priest; ha-kohen ha-rasha’ = wicked priest).”63 Due to the assumption that the wicked priest is actually the High Priest and the Teacher’s constant dichotomous relation with this figure, many scholars have concluded that the Teacher of Righteousness is the legitimate High Priest in the eyes of the Qumran sect.

Our investigation on the culmination and active production of Qumran texts has left us in some time after the rise of the Hasmonean dynasty. The major question which remains to be answered is as follows: what bearing does this hold on an argument which proposes a fictitious leader created by the Qumran scribes? The community abandoned Jerusalem for many reasons. Scholars have recognized that the most crucial of these reasons may have concerned disagreement regarding the liturgical calendar and purity laws.64 However, the community’s distaste for the political landscape of Jerusalem is prevalent in their presentation of the Wicked Priest who is described by 1QpHab 8:8-13 as follows65:

The Wicked Priest, who was called loyal at the start of his office. However, when he ruled over Israel his heart became proud, he deserted God and betrayed the laws for the sake of riches. And he robbed and hoarded wealthy from the

---

62 Jokiranta 2013: 178
64 Collins 1998: 149
65 VanderKam (1994: 103-104) and others have argued that this political dispute was the driving force for the Qumran community’s exile out of Jerusalem. However, more recent scholarship has refused to accept this proposal and turn to view disputes about calendar and purity as main reasons for the community’s abandoning of Jerusalem, as shown above.
violent men who had rebelled against God. And he seized public money, incurring additional serious sin. And he performed repulsive acts by every type of defiling impurity.

There is a clear and resounding antagonism displayed throughout the scrolls in regards to the present-day High Priest as well as his followers. This is likely to have been the fault of the new Hasmonean dynasty that filled the position of high priesthood alongside that of the kingship with their family members; people who did not belong to the traditional lineage of Zadok.

Scholars have noticed that the writings from the Qumran caves seem to present all the members of the movement as priests. However, it seems very unlikely that all of the Qumran sectarians were actually priests in the Second Temple world but instead incurred priest-like qualities in their conjoining with the Qumran movement. If the authors of the scrolls envisioned themselves as priests, it would be most fitting that they employ a leader who displays High Priest-like qualities and connotations. Considering the community’s clear disappointment with the Second Temple political establishment and their highly dualistic mentality – which is prevalent throughout all aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls – it seems only natural that the communal memory developed in the Qumran writings would include a legitimate priestly figure who could lead them in their quest for perfection opposed to the Wicked Priest. The Qumran movement’s aversion for the Wicked Priest and their claims to the correct calendar system and purity laws culminated in the production of a leader with high priestly qualities who could lend the authority necessary to back-up the new halakhah proposed by the exiles. The Dead Sea Scrolls’ scribes’ motives for manufacturing the Teacher of Righteousness is brought to light when considering the Second Temple milieu from which they arise.

66 Charlesworth proposes this reading when he argues against Stegemann’s claim that the title הכהן must refer to the high priest. Charlesworth (1980: 222) writes that the title “does not necessarily denote only the high priest, it may merely describe the priest who is head of a group of priests.”
The Title מורה הצדק

There has been some dispute among scholarship concerning the correct rendition of the title מורה הצדק and its several variant forms. Throughout the course of this thesis the title will be translated as ‘Teacher of Righteousness.’ This has been the most common interpretation of the Hebrew epithet since Solomon Schechter first encountered it in 1910.\(^{67}\) However, language is inherently a product of interpretation and there is often some ambiguity regarding possibilities for translation. This section will briefly present the discourse that has taken place in early Qumran scholarship concerning the correct translation of the title and simultaneously provide an argument for why the most appropriate translation is ‘Teacher of Righteousness.’

The contention for a new reading of the title מורה הצדק carries significant implications for the ongoing reconstruction and study of the Teacher’s role in the Qumran community. Rabinowitz has proposed an argument against the ‘Teacher of Righteousness’ translation that presents a reading of מורה הצדק that would instead produce the title ‘guide of righteousness.’ Such an interpretation, Rabinowitz argues, would give Qumran scholarship no reason to believe that the guide was either primarily an exegete or a teacher.\(^{68}\) Similarly, Weingreen proposes a reading of מורה הצדק that shifts attention on the Teacher away from moral duty and more towards a judicial position to be obeyed by the community.\(^{69}\) Both authors propose their interpretations with

\(^{67}\) Schechter (1910: 63 n. 16) produces this result in his translation of the “Zadokite Fragments.”

\(^{68}\) Rabinowitz 1958: 397

\(^{69}\) Though Weingreen does not blatantly introduce a new translation, his argument seems to hint at his understanding of the title מורה הצדק as “true leader.”
the support of outside works such as the book of Enoch and Karaite or Midrashic texts. These connections seem rather farfetched and the new interpretive frames that Rabinowitz and Weingreen provide do not accurately depict the many roles of the figure of the Teacher beyond its judicial capacity.

The Sheffield Dictionary of Classical Hebrew translates the initial word of this Hebrew phrase, מורה, as teacher.\(^{70}\) Despite this normative translation of the Hebrew word, Rabinowitz takes it instead to refer to a guide. In so doing, he writes, “The word מורה or יורה, translated ‘guide’ in this expression, means ‘leader’, one who has authority to put law into effect and to issue commands in the expectations that he will be obeyed.”\(^{71}\) Weingreen, on the other hand, does not provide a different meaning for the Hebrew word but relays an understanding of its connotation to refer more directly to someone of high judicial authority. He contends that “the word Moreh designates one who has the authority of putting his decisions into effect. In other words, “he is not merely a recognized expounder or interpreter of the Tora, but its judicial authority empowered to implement his legal decisions and rulings.”\(^{72}\) In this respect, the proposition of Weingreen runs parallel to the argument of Rabinowitz in that the word מורה is taken to refer to someone of high political and authoritative standing.

Both of the arguments presented above contend that the Teacher employs a position in which he expects to be obeyed and his word is passed as law. However, even in cases in which the Teacher is said to be “obeyed” in the Damascus Document and Pesher Habakkuk, the Hebrew seems to instead understand this authority as the product

---

\(^{70}\) Clines 2001 v.5: 188  
\(^{71}\) Rabinowitz 1958: 394  
\(^{72}\) Weingreen 1961: 164
of loyalty or faithfulness. With this connotation, one could read this phrase as pertaining to loyalty not solely because of the position of the מורה הצדק but because his word is inspired by God, as will be shown in chapter two. The faithfulness of the community towards the מורה הצדק is in order to structure a communal identity under the Teacher because of his divinely inspired interpretation. As Fröhlich states, “the righteous are characterized by the authentic interpretation of the Law, in a special way.” Also, CD 6:10-11 describes a figure often equated with the Teacher of Righteousness when it mentions “the one who teaches righteousness.” As Murphy-O’Connor writes, “this is the simplest explanation of his title, Teacher of Righteousness.” With the evidence presented and supplanted by the description of the Teacher’s role in the community, it seems that מורה cannot simply refer exclusively to an authoritative figure and must carry a role of edification.

Moreover, the word צדק, regularly translated as righteousness, is significantly altered in these arguments. Rabinowitz seeks an understanding of this word as not referring only to righteousness as a quality of being but rather a collective body of righteous people. If this were the case, though, one must wonder why the scrolls never present the teacher as reigning over the צדיקים or why the phrase the community uses for themselves, “sons of righteousness,” (1QS 9:14) isn’t attested in the title for the Teacher.

---

73 Rabinowitz (1958: 394) argues his claim on the grounds that the Damascus Document and Pesher Habakkuk both make reference to obeying the מורה הצדק. However, in the case of Pesher Habakkuk (col. 8), this seems to be an overstatement of the commonly used term מאמין meaning loyalty/faithfulness. Horgan (1979: 40) comments on this particular word and finds appropriate translations to be “trust,” “fidelity,” or “trustworthy agreement.” He cites passages from the Hebrew Bible which utilize this word such as Nehemiah 10:1 as well as Mishnaic Hebrew which translates the word in question as “trust” or “fidelity.” The usage of this word in the Pesher Habakkuk, Horgan claims, is an allusion to Hab. 2:4b which reads “by his faithfulness.” There is no reference whatsoever to the word indicating obedience to a strictly authoritative figure.

74 Jokiranta 2013: 115
75 Fröhlich 2011: 853
76 Murphy-O’Connor 1992: 341
It seems to be a forced reading asserted by Rabinowitz rather than a sound interpretation based on the evidence provided in the scrolls. Weingreen, on the other hand, takes the word צדק as an adjective conveying legitimacy onto the leader. He claims that the word regularly understood as ‘righteousness’ must be substituted for ‘true’ or ‘right’ because the leader would deal with more than just theological issues from the Torah.\(^\text{77}\) This, Weingreen argues, would ascribe legitimacy to the position of the leader among the Qumran exiles.\(^\text{78}\) However, this contention fails to recognize the edifying role of the Teacher and will be negated by Hebrew syntax rules demonstrated in the following paragraph.

Finally, there has been an ongoing discussion about whether the title should be rendered as the traditional “Teacher of Righteousness” or “Righteous Teacher.” The latter case is argued because of Hebrew syntax which allows the word צדק in the attributive position to be read as an adjective. As mentioned above, the title for the Qumran leader appears in the Dead Sea Scrolls in many variant ways as מורה צדק, מורה, מורה הצדקה, יורה, מורה הצדק, and מורה יורה. In the case of situations like מורה צדק which appears early in the Damascus Document, the adjectival rendition is appropriate. According to Hebrew syntax an adjective in the attributive position must agree with the noun it is modifying in number, gender, and definiteness. The term definiteness means that if the noun has the definite ה attached to it then the adjective must as well. Similarly, if the noun is not definite then the adjective also must not have the definite marker.\(^\text{79}\) For this reason the phrase מורה צדק can appropriately be rendered as Righteous Teacher. However, in the case of the very

\(^{77}\) Weingreen 1961: 167
\(^{78}\) Weingreen 1961: 169
\(^{79}\) Garrett & DeRouchie 2009: 100
familiar Hebrew title מורה הצדק this rule of adjective is broken. The initial noun מורה does not take the definite article while the latter הצדק does. This same problem is seen also in other presentations of the Teacher as יורה הצדק and מורה הצדקה. Also, the Teacher is never portrayed by the title מורה הצדק with the double definite המורה הצדק as the Wicked Priest (כהן הרשע) is often depicted. This, coupled with the role of the Teacher which will be further discussed in chapters two and three, leads me to use the traditional understanding of the title מורה הצדק and all its variant forms as Teacher of Righteousness.

Conclusion

The purpose of this opening chapter has been to set the stage for the rest of the work to be done in the course of this thesis. The Teacher of Righteousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls constitutes the most influential and provocative character in the entire Qumran corpus. His position as a divinely appointed leader, prophet, and priest functioned to give the community its authority for proposing new halakhic and prophetic interpretations as well as project legitimacy and reassurance to its exilic members. It is the position of this project that scholarship’s constant attention to the Teacher of Righteousness’s historical character is remiss of the effect the narrative of this leader had on the exilic members in Qumran. In an attempt to obviate the historical study of the Teacher, this work will present the argument for a fabricated leader in the Dead Sea Scrolls constructed on the basis of former biblical leaders. This will be done by examining the content of the scrolls through the purview of cultural memory theory. By utilizing this methodology the question of historicity is one which can be discarded for a
look into the manuscripts’ influence on creating a common identity of uprightness for the community. In the following chapter the role of the Teacher in the Dead Sea Scrolls will be presented alongside scholarship’s ongoing discourse concerning the figure’s historical persona.
Chapter Two

Understanding the Teacher of Righteousness’s position in the formation of the Qumran community has been a matter of the utmost importance ever since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The manuscripts available which detail the personality of the Teacher seem to depict him as one who takes on several variant roles. Brooke has noticed that he seems to exemplify positions as a priest, a new Moses and lawgiver, prophetic commentator, a poet and a sage.\(^{80}\) As the leader of the self-proclaimed sons of light in the eschatological age, it seems plausible to think of the community having envisioned the Teacher as embodying a collective group of positive leadership traits that are normally scarce. Schechter’s work on the Teacher of Righteousness, which he became aware of through his discovery of the Damascus Document in the Cairo Geniza, is the seminal starting point to any investigation into the Qumran figurehead. His understanding of this figure is well summarized by Philip Davies as follows:

Schechter’s reconstruction of the community’s history was as follows: at the end of a ‘period of wrath’ which followed the destruction by Nebuchadnezzar, Israel was blindly groping its way under the erroneous teaching of a ‘man of scoffing.’ But God raised a ‘bud’ who became recognized as the ‘Teacher of Righteousness,’ also known as the ‘Interpreter of the Law’ and the ‘Only Teacher.’ He was one of the group who ‘went out of the land of Judah.’ This group was said to have walked in his precepts during the period after his death but before his second coming, an expectation which Schechter inferred from the phrase in VI, 11: ‘until one comes who will teach righteousness at the end of days.’ This Teacher is also the Messiah of Israel and Aaron, rejected by the majority of the nation.\(^{81}\)

---

\(^{80}\) Brooke 2010: 50

\(^{81}\) Davies 1982: 6
Schechter, of course, was working solely on the basis of the Damascus Document and, despite not having a developed description of the Teacher and his following, picked up on many complex characteristics which laid the foundation for future discourse. The subsequent discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls presented scholarship with a fuller description of the Teacher of Righteousness through the *pesharim* and a sectarian context in which to situate him.

The purpose of this chapter will be to show how scholarship has gone about ascertaining the several lights in which the Teacher of Righteousness is cast throughout the Dead Sea Scrolls corpus. It is not to say that the Teacher, if he were an historical figure, really held these attributes or claimed them for himself, but rather that the authors of the scrolls chose to remember him in this way and pass down his memory in such fashion. George Brooke has argued that the historical leader of the Qumran group did not even wish to bear the name Teacher of Righteousness and that this was a title applied to him only later during the codification of the Qumran manuscripts.\(^2\) By remembering him through this title, which we have already discussed as perpetuating a righteous position of leadership,\(^3\) the community goes about establishing for itself an identity as those who follow a divinely inspired frontrunner. Similarly, I posit that the characteristics which will be seen in this section need not have pertained to a physical human being but may have instead been conjured by the authors of the scrolls with a mind to creating the ideal leader for the community to follow. In so doing, the scrolls functioned to codify a


\(^3\) VanderKam (2002: 282) writes that “The title Teacher of Righteousness (*moreh hassadeq*) may emphasize the content of what the Teacher gives to his students – he teaches them the right lessons – or it may express primarily his authenticity as a teacher – he is the right or legitimate teacher.” Jokiranta (2013: 178) also states that “The teacher’s title claims that he was sent by God, to give the people a fresh start, and to assist it in its search for justice.”
memory that placed the Qumran community as followers of a leader not only like those portrayed in the narratives of the Hebrew Bible, but better. The Teacher of Righteousness encompassed all that was expected in the perfect figurehead for a group yearning to follow the history laid down in the Hebrew Bible: prophet, priest, founder, suffering servant, and more.

Following this review of the Teacher’s role in the Dead Sea Scrolls, which will inevitably cite most – if not all – passages in which the figure is directly mentioned, this section will present scholarship’s attempts to identify the mysterious character. As discussed in the previous chapter, most of scholarship has accepted the Teacher of Righteousness’s historicity as a truism and in analyzing his role they go about studying how this can bring us closer to understanding who he was in cross-reference with other Second Temple historical documents. It makes for an interesting conundrum in the field of Qumran studies because while everyone is reviewing identical evidence – being a small sample size at that – scholarship has commenced to formulate wildly different conclusions on the historical persona of the Teacher. This point, I believe, gives credence to the proposal of this work that examining the historical Teacher is remiss of the larger purpose of his narrative and, furthermore, that the Teacher of Righteousness did not have to be a real historical person known through other documents.

**Teacher as Prophet**

The prophetic nature of the Teacher of Righteousness is perhaps the aspect to his character which has garnered the most attention in Qumran scholarship. The implications
of a prophetic leader found in the Qumran writings branch out into the community’s apocalyptic views, its own self-conception as those perfectly following the law, its ideas about authoritative scripture, and more. It would take a much larger investigation than what is available in the scope of this section to thoroughly paint the portrait of scholarship’s attempt to pin down the Teacher’s relation to prophecy. However, in what follows I will look to portray accurately the connection displayed between the ways the Teacher of Righteousness is presented in the Dead Sea Scrolls, particularly pesher Habakkuk, in the context of Second Temple conceptions about prophecy.

In responding to the question “was the Teacher of Righteousness considered to be a prophet,” Brooke has answered with an equally qualified yes and no. Much of the discussion concerning the Teacher’s position as prophet is inevitably filtered through the discourse concerning prophecy in Second Temple/post-biblical Judaism. Research has long considered prophecy an unquestionably dormant institution during this time period. However, recent developments have noticed a somewhat nuanced understanding of what constitutes prophecy in post-biblical times. David Petersen presents a six-fold typology for defining a prophet in the classical sense. These include: (1) an intense experience of the deity; (2) the prophet speaks or writes in a distinctive way; (3) the prophet acts in a particular social setting; (4) the prophet possesses distinct personal

---

84 Brooke (2009: 77-98) briefly reviews the evidence provided in the Dead Sea Scrolls on reviewing whether or not the community viewed their leader as a prophet. However, most of his time is spent in the Hodayot and he reads this document as indicative of the Teacher’s personality whether it was authored by him or not. As mentioned previously, Brooke argues that the historical Teacher of Righteousness probably did not wish to assume this title nor the position of prophet in order to better appeal to his exilic followers, despite projecting several prophetic characteristics in the scrolls. Therefore, Brooke concludes that one could answer the question of “was the Teacher of Righteousness considered to be a prophet” with a qualified no, on the basis that he was never labeled with the Hebrew title נביא, and a qualified yes, on the basis that he is described as “promulgating the Law like Moses and in being understood and portrayed as offering inspired interpretation of the mysteries of the Prophets.”

85 Jassen 2008: 299
qualities such as charisma; (5) the prophet is an intermediary; and (6) the prophet has a distinctive message. Kugel further develops this definition and writes that prophets were also considered holy men and women. They often performed miraculous deeds or were required to intercede with God on Israel’s behalf. Prophets were normally noted by the Hebrew noun נביא. Scholars notice the lack of classical prophetic rhetoric and prophetic figures in Second Temple Judaism and thus have deemed it to be inactive.

Prophecy, like most things, cannot be understood as a static institution with concrete characteristics that pervade different times and cultures. Recent work on prophecy has attempted to situate the concept into the context of its Second Temple milieu. This has been done by adapting the definition of a prophet and prophecy more towards the simple definition provided by Kugel which states that a prophet might be “a messenger sent by God to speak on his behalf.” Similarly, Petersen, who discusses all the ways in which prophecy has been defined, draws on recent developments from the wider Ancient Near East to emphasize the intermediary characteristic of a prophet. He claims that the major advantage of adopting this definition is that it allows for one to identify different kinds of intermediaries between times and cultures. Nissinen writes,

Rather than charismatic qualities, distinct social roles, the use of specific literary forms, or characteristic features of proclamation (for instance, prediction or social criticism), such a definition today assumes the essential feature of prophecy to be the transmission of divine messages to human recipients by a person who in this capacity is called a prophet.

---
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In regards to the lack of prophetic rhetoric in the Second Temple period, Jassen claims that it is not absent but rather hidden in nuanced language to better fit the recent disposition. “Individuals who mediate the divine word,” Jassen writes, “are rarely identified with classical biblical prophetic epithets. The ‘assumed’ distinction can be found in the numerous ancient witnesses to the transformed character of postbiblical prophecy.”

Furthermore, it is clear that the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls not only acknowledged the prospect of Second Temple prophets but are actively concerned with identifying them. 4Q375, 11Q19 61, and 4Q339 are scrolls that rework legislation concerning false prophets found in Deuteronomy and provide the sectarians with a way of distinguishing true prophecy from false. As Brooke writes, this “would have been futile activity if there was a general consensus with Palestinian Judaism in the few centuries before the fall of the temple in 70 CE that prophecy had ceased a long time before.”

Perhaps the most revealing passage in the Dead Sea Scrolls regarding the Teacher of Righteousness and his place as a prophet in the Qumran community is found in 1QpHab 7:4-5:

פשת על מורה הצדק אשר他说ו אל את כל רבי דברי עבדיו הנביאים

Its interpretation concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God has made known all the mysteries of the words of his servants, the prophets.

The author of the pesher Habakkuk here explicitly states that the Teacher of Righteousness is one who has received divine revelation concerning prophetic oracles. In fact, the Teacher knows the true interpretation of words first uttered by the prophets –

---

91 Jassen 2008: 303
92 Brooke 2006: 158-160
interpretations that even they did not know.\textsuperscript{93} Concerning this passage, Brooke states that the author comes as close as possible to calling the Teacher a prophet without actually doing so.\textsuperscript{94} Nissinen claims that this should not matter for the modern scholar. He exclaims that the Teacher of Righteousness “clearly acts as an intermediary whose utterances are actually words of God. He is also the one who receives a new revelation that, without invalidating the words of the prophets of old, reveals their true meaning for the final generation.”\textsuperscript{95} The form of revelation that seems to take place with the Teacher of Righteousness is not one of direct contact with God. Instead it seems that the Teacher has been allotted with what Jassen has come to call “revelatory exegesis.” This term conceptualizes the reading, interpretation, and reconfiguration of ancient scripture as prophetic experience.\textsuperscript{96} A similar correlation between the Teacher and revelatory exegesis arises in the text of the Damascus Document where heeding “the voice of the Teacher” (CD 20:28, 32) corresponds to behaving in accordance with the Torah.\textsuperscript{97}

The Qumran community judged people as rightly following the path laid by God as those who believed in the words of the Teacher of Righteousness. This is prevalent throughout the scrolls (CD 20:28, 32; 1QpHab 2:2-3) and provides further evidence to conclude that the Teacher of Righteousness was regarded to hold a prophetic position in the mind of the sectarians. The Qumranites viewed the words of the past prophets, most

\textsuperscript{93} Bowley 1998: 364  
\textsuperscript{94} Brooke 2009: 92  
\textsuperscript{95} Nissinen 2008: 529  
\textsuperscript{96} Jassen 2008: 318-319. Jassen argues that revelatory exegesis is not so uncommon and is meriting of prophetic status. He connects this phenomenon specifically to Daniel’s reading of Jeremiah’s seventy weeks prophecy in Daniel 9. This chapter presents Daniel’s reinterpretation of Jeremiah’s prophecy regarding Jerusalem and is ultimately done with the assistance of the angel Gabriel. The exegetical assistance by the angel provides an understanding of revelatory exegesis and “indicate that the reading and interpretation of Jeremiah’s older prophetic word was considered commensurate with the other revelatory means employed throughout the book of Daniel.” He further speculates that there is an allusion to such revelation when Ezekiel swallows a scroll at Ezekiel 3:1-3.  
\textsuperscript{97} Stuckenbruck 2007: 83
of all Moses, as the very words of God. Jassen states that there is ample evidence to deduce that the Teacher was bestowed with a sort of divine discernment and contends,

> The understanding of the prophetic word is actualized through a process of reading, here strengthened by divine guidance – the divine bestowal of ‘discernment’ identified in column 2. This divinely directed process is reserved exclusively for the Teacher of Righteousness, who is the ‘reader’ assumed in the biblical passage.

Collins further states:

> With the arrival of the Teacher of Righteousness, the sect had no need to rely on the authority of legendary heroes such as Enoch. The authority accorded to the contemporary figure of the Teacher is probably a major reason why the sectarians dispensed with the literary form of the apocalypse… The sect… found a new medium of revelation in the inspired exegesis of the Teacher and did not rely on visions or ascents in the name of an ancient seer.

Using the methodological underpinnings proposed in this section on Second Temple prophecy, the Teacher of Righteousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls clearly functions as a prophetic figure. Schiffman further states that the Teacher of Righteousness’s God-given ability of interpretation is the main reason for his position of leadership in the Qumran group. As a prophet, the Teacher lends authority to the claims of the Qumran group and functions to raise significantly the value of being a part of the movement.

**Teacher as High Priest**

---
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The speculation concerning the Teacher of Righteousness’s relation to the high priesthood was briefly reviewed in Chapter One. The figure is in a handful of passages referred to simply as “the priest.” (4QpPsᵃ 3:15; 4QpPsᵃ 2:19; and 1QpHab 2:8) Hartmut Stegemann is often cited for championing this theory in his 1971 book Die Enstehung der Qumrangemeinde. Much of this argument’s credibility relies on the position that the Hebrew definitive noun הכהן is reserved exclusively for the High Priest of Jerusalem. Stegemann maintains this position in his methodology and claims its roots to be dug well into the Hebrew Bible with both pre-exilic and post-exilic works. His stance concerning the titular use of the title הכהן has, however, been met with much disagreement from a large portion of scholarship. Charlesworth has argued that the title does not necessarily need to refer to a High Priest but might merely describe a priest who is head of a larger group of priests. Similarly, Callaway agrees for the possibility that this may be what the title represents but is not swayed by Stegemann’s contention to make it a hard and fast rule. He observes that in all the cases mentioned by Stegemann the phrase הכהן is followed by a proper name, unlike in the content of the Dead Sea Scrolls writings. Most recently, Michael Wise has emphatically trumped Stegemann’s argument by reviewing biblical, numismatic, and inscriptional evidence and concludes by stating:

102 Stegemann 1971: 102, 210-220, n. 328-329
103 Wise (1990: 589) reviews Stegemann’s argument for the titular usage of הכהן and relays the following: “The expression originated in the First Temple period, when together with a man’s name it designated the chief priest of a particular sanctuary. For this usage Stegemann was able to provide many examples, such as Eli in 1 Sam 19. Stemming from this earlier convention, in the postexilic period the titular use of the term came to designate the Aaronide high priest at Jerusalem. Here Stegemann found ten examples: nine passages from Ezra-Nehemiah and one from Sir. The well-known titles found elsewhere for the Aaronide high priest such as הכהן הגדול and הכהן הראש were only subsequently added as modifiers to the already established title of הכהן. The common locution from Tannaitic Hebrew, (H)KHN (H)GDL, was a secondary usage, known but not ordinarily used in literature of the Second Temple – and not used at all, according to Stegemann, in the DSS.”
104 Charlesworth 1980: 222
105 Callaway 1988: 153-154
The great mass of evidence – from the usage for known early postexilic high priests to the Hasmonean coins and the ossuary inscriptions – points to the conclusion that the way to say ‘high priest’ was HKHN HGDL. The conclusion has to be that the references to the T of R as HKHN do not intend to suggest that he was ever a functioning – or nonfunctioning – high priest.\(^\text{106}\)

It is important to remember that the purpose of this investigation is not to prove that the Teacher of Righteousness was once a functioning High Priest in Jerusalem but to show that he *could have been*. In other words, this section argues that the Teacher of Righteousness was portrayed as endowed with High Priest-like qualities that made him a suitable candidate to fit such a position. The presentation of the Teacher as “the priest,” as displayed above, may not point directly to a High Priesthood position but certainly amplifies the priestly nature of the Qumran figurehead. Even if the Dead Sea Scrolls never mention the Teacher of Righteousness by the title of the High Priest, it is still worth noting that he is held in direct opposition to the Wicked Priest. Throughout the pesher Habakkuk the Teacher and the Wicked Priest are presented as the antithesis of good vs. evil, truth vs. deceit, and legitimacy vs. dubiousness. Some of the more pithy examples include:

\[\text{(1QpHab 1:13)}\]

הרשע הוא הכוהן הרשע והצדיק הוא מורה הצדק

The evildoer is the Wicked Priest and the upright man is the Teacher of Righteousness.

\[\text{(1QpHab 9:9-12)}\]

פᵍʳᵃ פ酢 על הכוהן הרשע אשר בعون מורה הצדק ואמ 쉬 עוץ וננו אל יד

און י_WATERLESS.facebookounter לגלל במרור, נפש בנה ודרר את הרשעה על ברכה

Its interpretation concerns the Wicked Priest, whom, for the wickedness against the Teacher of Righteousness and the members of his council, God delivered into the hands of his enemies to disgrace him with a punishment, to destroy him with bitterness of soul for having acted wickedly against his elect.

\[\text{(1QpHab 11:4-6)}\]

פ酢 על הכוהן הרשע אשר דרכו אחר מורה הצדק לבלע בכעס חמתי

אבית גלות

\(^{106}\) Wise 1990: 602
Its interpretation concerns the Wicked Priest who pursued the Teacher of Righteousness to consume him with the heat of his anger in the place of his banishment.

These passages are coupled with larger sections in which the pesher Habakkuk presents short diatribes against the Wicked Priest only to be followed by praise for the Teacher of Righteousness. If one is to take the Wicked Priest to be the current High Priest in Jerusalem, as is suggested in Chapter One, then the scrolls demonstrate significant animosity towards the individual who holds this office. With the Teacher being displayed as the counterpart to this figure, one should suspect that the community envisioned the Teacher of Righteousness as someone better suited to fit the position currently employed by the Wicked Priest.

Furthermore, 4QpPs\(^a\) 3:15-16 reads:

Its interpretation concerns the Priest, the Teacher of Righteousness, whom God chose to stand.

In commenting on this passage, Stuckenbruck writes that the author’s interpretation highlights the Teacher’s priestly role. He claims that

This evidence holds, regardless of whether לעמוד is taken as a verb la’amod (thus alluding to the performance of priestly duties) or as a noun la’amud (metaphorically alluding to a supporting column in the Temple structure). Implied is that the Teacher’s priestly function underpins the community’s cultic understanding of itself.\(^{107}\)

Schiffman also notes this passage as evidence to show that the Teacher was a priest. This would, according to him, facilitate the historical reconstruction which claims that the Teacher was the High Priest before Jonathan.\(^{108}\) VanderKam also acknowledges that the

\(^{107}\) Stuckenbruck 2007: 79

\(^{108}\) Schiffman 1994: 120
Teacher of Righteousness may have been a High Priest and contends that the Teacher’s priestly character was a fact when he writes:

The facts that the Teacher was a priest, that astonishing claims were made for his legal and interpretive authority, and that he drew the attention of the Wicked Priest have given rise to the theory that the Teacher was himself a high priest or, perhaps more plausibly, that he acted as high priest in the years 159-152 BCE when, according to the received list, there was no high priest in Jerusalem.¹⁰⁹

Once more, I reiterate the fact that this section has not argued for a reading of the Teacher of Righteousness as having employed the position of High Priest at any time. On the contrary, this paper argues for the literary fabrication of a leadership figure who demonstrates the capacity to do so. “Priests have two principal and explicit roles,” Brooke states, “as those who offer sacrifice within the cultic system on behalf of individuals and the community as a whole, and as those who interpret the tradition, especially the Law.” Brooke further goes on to elaborate on this and writes that because of the community’s withdrawal from the Temple in Jerusalem, their idea of priesthood would have naturally shifted to the Teacher’s role as interpreter.¹¹⁰ This interpretative role dovetails nicely with passages we have already examined in the section above concerning prophecy.

It seems that the priestly characteristics of the Teacher cannot be refuted. Even Michael Wise, who adamantly rebuked Stegemann’s claim above, concludes that after cross-reviewing the Temple Scroll and 1-2 Maccabees, the Teacher of Righteousness certainly displays priest-like qualities and could have indeed functioned as the High Priest during the intersacerdotum (the seven year period before Jonathan’s position as

¹⁰⁹ VanderKam 2002: 284-285
¹¹⁰ Brooke 2010: 46-47
High Priest during which time there is no record of an acting High Priest). The Teacher of Righteousness may thus be read as a literary response to the illegitimate High Priest of Jerusalem, the Wicked Priest, at the time of the Qumran community.

**Teacher as Founder**

The Teacher of Righteousness as founder of the Qumran movement was perhaps the first theory that came into scholarship concerning the figure back in 1910 through the mind of Solomon Schechter. We have already reviewed the beginning portion to one of the most influential verses for pegging the Teacher as founder over the community.

4QpPs⁹ 3:15-17 reads:

_execute a translation of the Hebrew text here_

Its interpretation concerns the Priest, the Teacher of Righteousness, whom God chose to stand … he installed him to found the congregation of his chosen ones of the truth for him, and straightened out his path, in truth.

In this passage one finds what seems to be a blatant attempt by the author to situate the Teacher of Righteousness at the founding of the Qumran community. However, what is found in another passage – which is perhaps the most famous passage about the Teacher in the Dead Sea Scrolls – seems to contradict this memory of the past. CD 1:10-11 states:

_execute a translation of the Hebrew text here_

And God appraised their deeds, because they sought him with an undivided heart, and raised up for them a Teacher of Righteousness, in order to direct them in the path of his heart.

This passage comes after a historical review of the movement’s formation presented in the Damascus Document in which the community has already spent twenty years

---

111 Wise 1990: 613
‘groping for a path.’ In this case, the Teacher is raised by God to join the community and lead them in the ways of righteousness. While subtle, there is a significant difference between the two examples which choose to portray the Teacher of Righteousness as founder in some capacity; the former as founder of the community and the latter as leader to the righteous way.

The founding quality of the Teacher has long been the subject of scholarly discourse and, for quite some time, was the dominant theory in Qumran scholarship. Wacholder examines the Damascus Document through the passage presented above and his summary is exemplary of the position which the Teacher of Righteousness is projected to fulfill, at least through the eyes of early scholarship.

The treatise emphasizes the place of the Moreh Sedeq by using a number of sobriquets to designate his paramount role:

2:12 – anointed one, holy spirit, and seer of truth
2:13 – his name
3:19 – sure house
6:4 – staff
6:6 – searcher of the Law and the staff
6:11 – Teacher of Righteousness
7:18 – star and searcher of the Law
7:19 – scepter
7:20 – prince of all the congregation, shepherd and friend
7:21 – anointed one of Aaron and Israel

If our interpretation is correct, these references reveal the significant role of the Teacher of Righteousness in the foundation of the sect. The threefold preface is used to emphasize the one who was to be regarded as the father of the movement. He is an Aaronide, the interpreter of the Law; he is the one whom the prophets predicted of old; he is the Moreh Sedeq, the one who will lead the group.112

---
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Wacholder’s reasoning is riddled with misinformation for which proper identifications had not yet become available. However, it demonstrates the way the Teacher’s role as founder was pushed to the forefront of early scholarship.\footnote{In a later study by Wacholder (1999) he changed his thinking regarding the Teacher of Righteousness to identifying him as an eschatological figure yet to come to the community. This will be further investigated later in this chapter.}

Recently, however, it has become a scholarly consensus that the Teacher of Righteousness never inhabited the Qumran settlement where the Dead Sea Scrolls were authored.\footnote{Brooke 2010: 45} Instead, the Teacher has been examined as a founding figure for the larger Essene movement from which the Qumran community emerged. Stuckenbruck agrees with this theory, which he cites to Philip Davies,\footnote{Philip R. Davies, “The Teacher of Righteousness and the ‘End of Days,’” in \textit{Sects and Scrolls. Essays on Qumran and Related Topics} (ed. by Philip R. Davies, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), pp. 89-94.} and states that the Teacher of Righteousness is clearly said to inherit the movement in the Damascus Document which is pre-Qumranic. This proves problematic for understanding the passage in 4QpPs\textsuperscript{a} 3:15-17 which seems to depict the Teacher as founder of the ‘congregation of his chosen ones.’

It seems, though, that an appropriate response to this conundrum comes in the commentary of Stuckenbruck who writes that “in remembering the Teacher as the community’s founder, the pesharist of 4QpPs\textsuperscript{a} was selecting the advent of the Teacher as the essential beginning point, rather than reflecting on or recalling the community’s earlier origins.”\footnote{Stuckenbruck 2007: 84} This sense of selective remembering, placing the Teacher at the forefront of the community’s identity despite never having been with the historical figure, ties in significantly with the proposal of this project which aims to read a fabricated Teacher within the Qumran writings. More on that will be presented in the following
chapters. For the purpose of this section, it is valuable to recognize the Teacher’s founding character for the Qumran movement.

Teacher as Eschatological Figure

Thus far during our investigation into the makeup of the Teacher of Righteousness we have discussed the figure as a prophet, priest, and founder in the minds of the Qumran members. All of these have been enveloped in a figure represented in the past. Another wrinkle to the character of the Teacher is one which has received substantial scrutiny by much of scholarship. CD 20: 13-15 presents what seems to be a reflection on the death of the Teacher:¹¹⁷

וימים האסף יורהו היחיד עד תם כל אנשי המלחמה אשר שבו עם איש הכזב כשנים ארבעים
And from the day of the gathering in of the unique teacher, until the end of all the men of war who turned back with the man of lies, there shall be about forty years.

This event is echoed in CD 19:35. The reign of the Teacher of Righteousness had come to an end and the community envisioned the ‘end of days’ taking place 40 years after his gathering. Knibb writes that this passage “indicates that at the time at which it was written the community was demoralized, and there was a serious risk of a wholesale defection of members to a rival group under the leadership of ‘the liar.’”¹¹⁸

With this considered, some scholars have taken a passage found elsewhere in the Damascus Document to imply an expected return of the Teacher in the final days. CD 6: 8-11 reads:

¹¹⁷ The Hebrew title given here is יורהו היחיד (the unique teacher) but is normally regarded as identical to המורה הצדק. (Knibb 1990: 51)
¹¹⁸ Knibb 1990: 52
This passage presents to the reader the expectation of a future figure who will appear to “teach righteousness” at the end of days and lead the Qumran community into its eternal glory. In this case, unlike what has been seen before, the one who will teach righteousness is a future figure. Davies reads this passage and equates the one “who will teach righteousness” with the Teacher of Righteousness seen in the pesharim. He writes that in the Damascus Document, the founder of the Qumran community who is discussed in the past is rather the דורשי התורה while the expected figure, the Teacher of Righteousness, is the יורה הצדק who is identical to the מורה הצדק in the pesharim and CD 1:10-11. The fact that the Teacher is discussed in the perfect tense in the pesharim, Davies argues, indicates that someone who was considered to fulfill this position had indeed arrived to the sect. By considering the Teacher of Righteousness in CD 6 as an eschatological figure, Davies concludes that the figure’s primary function is to usher in the end of days. “The ‘end of days’ might signify the arrival of the ‘Teacher’: more pertinently, *the arrival of the Teacher would signify the ‘end of days.’”

One of the main proponents of this theory is Jerome Murphy O’Connor. Not only does he agree with Davies that the Teacher of Righteousness is a future eschatological

---

119 Davies (1996: 90-91) argues for this distinction based on the fact that CD 1:10-11 places the Teacher of Righteousness in the community after it having already been established. On the other hand, the Interpreter of the Law is placed at the very conception of the movement in CD 6:7. Therefore, he argues, the latter is a past figure that helped found the Qumran movement while the former is one who will join after its establishment.

120 Davies 1996: 91-92; original emphasis.
figure, but he expounds upon this to incorporate other sobriquets of expected figures into this character as well. He writes,

Not only does [Philip Davies’s] interpretation furnish an explanation of why the ex-High Priest became known to his followers as the Teacher of Righteousness, but it also provides a more adequate rationale for his proposal that the Essenes should move to the desert. I had suggested that this was essentially a pragmatic solution to the problems posed by a hostile environment, but the ex-High Priest’s claim to be the expected Teacher of Righteousness is certainly a more adequate motive. Equally, the reaction of the Man of Lies should no longer be seen in terms of envy, but as the repudiation of an eschatological claim that exhibited no solid guarantees…

If, as seems high probable, this personage assumed the title of Teacher of Righteousness on the basis of CD 6.11, it is likely that he also appropriated the title Prince of all the Congregation from 7.20. Both are seen as the eschatological counterpart of the Interpreter of the Law, the founder of the community in Babylon, and both occur in documents which antedate the conversion of the ex-High Priest.121

Wacholder has reached a similar conclusion on the eschatological nature of the Teacher of Righteousness and writes that “in fact, all references to the Teacher of Righteousness point to the End of Days.”122 He even goes on to argue that the passage in CD 20 that displays the death of the Teacher is misinterpreted. Wacholder claims that the word יָכָה, ingathering, is misrepresented as the death of the Teacher and instead he chooses to understand it as the ingathering of the people preceding the end of days.123

As mentioned at the outset of this section, the theory of an eschatological Teacher of Righteousness has not been received lightly in Qumran scholarship. Knibb provides an appropriate reaction to this theory when he writes that it is unlikely due in large part to

---
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three major reasons: (1) there is no reflection of messianic contact in the scrolls; (2) the title יורה הצדק does not necessarily relate to the מורה הצדק as it comes from Hos 10:12’s description of a messiah and there is other evidence in the scrolls of identical sobriquets being used for past and future figures; and (3) it is not clear that the דורשי התורה is set at the beginning of the formation of the Qumran movement, as Davies argues. However, there is clearly the expectation of an eschatological figure who will teach righteousness at the end of days, per CD 6. It is also clear that whether or not this figure is identical with the Teacher of Righteousness found in the rest of the Dead Sea Scrolls is highly debatable. For the purpose of this project, though, it is worth considering the possibility of this characteristic pertaining to our subject in question. The present discussion about the Teacher’s eschatological possibility raises pertinent questions for his historicity in a past sense. The discourse about this facet of the Teacher further demonstrates Qumran scholarship’s conflicted analysis on the Teacher of Righteousness.

### Teacher as Suffering Servant

A further and final facet to the Teacher’s multilayered personality which we will investigate is that which projects him to fit the role of a suffering servant. This is an aspect to the Teacher’s composition which has only recently begun to gain attention amidst the many disputes between he and his foes. The encounter between the Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest recounted in 1QpHab 11:4-6 in which the Priest pursues the Teacher with deadly intent has been mentioned above. In our earlier

\[124\] Knibb 1990: 59-60
discussion it served to demonstrate the opposition between the Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest while it now demonstrates one example of the Teacher’s persecution under his enemies. Schiffman notes that in this passage the Priest approaches the sect to attack the Teacher on their holy day. This is demonstrative of the dispute between the sectarians and larger Jerusalem over the calendar, as the sectarians in this instance are clearly celebrating the Day of Atonement while the Wicked Priest is not.¹²⁵ Stuckenbruck contends, “The association between the Wicked Priest’s persecution of the Teacher and the Day of Atonement thus not only means that the pesharist retells a past event, but also stresses its timing, that is, at a festival no doubt being observed by the pesharist’s own community which could not mark the event without recalling what happened to the Teacher.”¹²⁶

Leaving this well-known altercation between the Teacher and the Priest, I turn my attention to present other instances in which the Teacher of Righteousness plays the role of suffering servant for the Qumran community. 1QpHab 5:9-12 states:

Its interpretation concerns the House of Absalom and the members of their council, who kept silent when the Teacher of Righteousness was rebuked, and did not help him against the Man of Lie, who rejected the Law in the midst of their whole council.

The text depicts an instance in which the Teacher of Righteousness was verbally abused and rejected regarding his teachings. A group called the “House of Absalom” stood by and allowed this to take place before their entire council. It seems that this group’s name derives from the biblical story of Absalom’s rebellion against his father, David (2 Samuel

¹²⁵ Schiffman 1994: 119-120
¹²⁶ Stuckenbruck 2007: 88
The Man of Lie in this passage encompasses another point of opposition to the Teacher of Righteousness, beside the Wicked Priest. Stuckenbruck speculates that the depth of disappointment implied by the terms “lie” and “unfaithful” point to the Man of Lie having been a person with whom the Teacher once held counsel and is the devious leader of the Seekers of Smooth Things in pesher Nahum. The Teacher is at this moment not only rejected but decisively scorned.

The Teacher of Righteousness is not one who rises to popularity immediately and is widely acclaimed for his divinely inspired interpretation of the law. On the contrary, the Teacher endures significant persecution by all the traitors (Jerusalem included) who, according to the Damascus Document, banded together against his life (CD 1:20).

According to 4QpPs\(^a\) 4:8-9, the Teacher of Righteousness is under constant surveillance by the Wicked Priest who, according to the text, wishes to kill him “and the law which he sent him.” Moreover, it has been rightly recognized that the authors’ portrayal of the Teacher as subject to persecution is analogous with the persecuted community members. In fact, according to 1QpHab 8:1-3 those who observe the law proposed in the House of Judah (the sect) will be saved from punishment because of their toil and faith in the Teacher of Righteousness. Thus, the struggle alongside the Teacher of Righteousness represented salvation for the Qumran group in the ‘end of days.’ The purpose for representing the Teacher in this way through the writings of the Dead Sea

\(^{127}\) Schiffman 1994: 119
\(^{128}\) Stuckenbruck 2007: 84-86
\(^{129}\) The Hebrew text here reads that the Wicked Priest spies on הָצִידָק (the righteous one/the just man). There is not, in this case, a direct mention to the Teacher of Righteousness. However, scholars have typically gone about reading this passage as further explanation concerning the incident between the Wicked Priest and the Teacher of Righteousness described in pesher Habakkuk. In reading it this way, it has almost unanimously been the case that הָצִידָק here is taken to refer to the Teacher of Righteousness (Jokiranta 2013: 176 n. 216; VanderKam 2002: 284).
\(^{130}\) Jokiranta 2013: 177-178
Scrolls was meant to represent the community: persecuted, correct in its interpretations, and promised vindication. As Stuckenbruck points out,

The Teacher and his group, however, are said to have been pursued in the ‘house of exile’, that is, away from Jerusalem. Therefore, the memory of the event, in which the Teacher was unjustly pursued by the Wicked Priest, would have functioned to reinforce the community’s claim that its observance of the Torah – *away from the Jerusalem cult* where an erring calendrical system remained in use – was legitimate.\(^{131}\)

**Identifying the Teacher of Righteousness**

The Teacher of Righteousness certainly constitutes the most complex figure in the Dead Sea Scrolls corpus. He is featured prominently in the Damascus Document and the pesharim as the culmination of several righteous characteristics. These particularities have been adopted in scholarship’s attempt to reconstruct a historical persona behind the Qumran epithet. However, due to the lack of any historical information about the Teacher – such as a genealogy or hometown – identifications have been highly conflicted. Despite the general consensus that the Teacher must have been an historical individual there seems to be absolutely no agreement after that point. The following will display several of the identifications proposed for the Teacher of Righteousness and demonstrate the way multiple scholars use the same evidence to arrive at very different conclusions. A thorough analysis of this topic is well beyond the scope of this section, but by the end of

\(^{131}\) Stuckenbruck 2007: 88
our endeavor the futile attempt to match the Teacher of Righteousness with a person known through other historical documents should become clear.\textsuperscript{132}

Prior to the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls the Teacher of Righteousness was known through the Zadokite work (Damascus Document) found by Solomon Schechter and his team in the Cairo Geniza. Even at this time, interest in the historical persona behind the Teacher was very high with many scholars attempting to best reconstruct an historical scenario for this figure. However, without the supplementary works of the \textit{pesharim} to better situate the scroll’s composition, these theories fell on a very large spectrum of history. For example, on the one hand Margoliouth (1911) offered the suggestion that the community that authored the scroll was a group of Sadducean Christians and the Teacher of Righteousness was Jesus Christ. This required a very late dating of the scroll in question. On the other hand, Ginzberg (1976 [1922]) contended that the Teacher of Righteousness was the high priest Hilkiah who served under the rule of King Josiah. This suggested a very early date for the Teacher. Finally, Büchler (1913) concludes that the Teacher of Righteousness is the first century Jewish scholar Shammai.\textsuperscript{133} These conclusions are all contingent on the characteristics demonstrated regarding the Teacher in the Damascus Document, namely those which portray him as a divinely raised, eschatological, and priestly. This conflicted analysis similarly demonstrates the way scholarship is able to cherry-pick from the many complexities of the Teacher in order to make them fit several different historical persons.


\textsuperscript{133} The above arguments are summarized by Philip R. Davies, \textit{The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the Damascus Document} (England: JSOT Press, 1982), 5-14.
Following the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, scholarship revamped its efforts to identify the historical Teacher of Righteousness. New evidence from the *pesharim* and about the community which authored these scrolls was expected to better equip researchers in their attempt to reconstruct the historical Teacher. However, while the historical milieu from which these persons are being presented has become much more compact, there yet remains to be any sort of agreement on who the Teacher of Righteousness may have been. Theories have been both possible and wildly absurd with no general consensus in sight.134 One particular theory for identifying the Teacher of Righteousness – at least to some degree – has already been presented above. There are those, such as Stegemann, who claim the Teacher of Righteousness to have been the High Priest for whom we have no historical evidence during the time of the intersacerdotum.135 This position is further argued by Murphy O’Connor using evidence available through the letters of Demetrius in 1 Maccabees.136 In what follows, though, we will review some of the historical individuals who have been equated with the Teacher of Righteousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Some preliminary identifications that can be discarded on the basis of paleographic evidence include those which claim the Teacher should be identified with

134 Perhaps the most unusual theory in recent memory concerning the identity of the Teacher comes from Australian theologian Barbara Thiering. She constructs an early Christian pseudo-history in which she ultimately argues that the Wicked Priest was Jesus Christ and the Teacher of Righteousness was John the Baptist (Thiering 1992). This has been met with adamant disagreement in the scholarly community. Vermes, for example, has stated, "Professor Barbara Thiering's reinterpretation of the New Testament, in which the married, divorced, and remarried Jesus, father of four, becomes the "Wicked Priest" of the Dead Sea Scrolls, has made no impact on learned opinion. Scroll scholars and New Testament experts alike have found the basis of the new theory, Thiering's use of the so-called "pesher technique", without substance." (The New York Review of Books: 1994) Due to its lack of impact on Qumran scholarship this project will not spend time reviewing it.
135 Hartmut Stegemann, *Die Entstehung Der Qumrangemeinde* (Bonn, 1971).
136 Murphy O’Connor 1976: 400-420
John the Baptist, Jesus, or James the Just. Another proposal for the identity of the Teacher of Righteousness which seems to come from a period too late for Qumran comes from Roth who equates the figure with Menahem, the son of Judah the Galilean. Roth argues his position by examining specifically the passage in pesher Habakkuk in which the Wicked Priest approaches the sect to kill the Teacher of Righteousness. Josephus described the character of Menahem with the word σοφιστῆς which indicates someone who was learned in Jewish law. Menahem is said to have seized Masada in 66 CE and subsequently marched on Jerusalem where he and his followers dislodged the priestly authorities. Menahem was eventually killed and his followers returned to Masada. For Roth, the role of exegete and teacher shared by Menahem and the Teacher of Righteousness coupled with the passage of the Teacher’s death are enough to create the connection. He states, “The Teacher of Righteousness then was necessarily Menahem ben Judah, the Zealot leader, who was done to death by Eleazar ben Hananiah the Priest, Captain of the Temple, in the early autumn of A.D. 66; or the nephew who shared his experience but escaped.” Driver has been one of the main proponents of Roth’s theory and agrees with his identification for the Teacher of Righteousness. Driver shows his hand in reading the Dead Sea Scrolls to be much later compositions when early in his

138 Gothenburg 1992
141 VanderKam 1998: 519
142 Roth 1958: 18
work he states that since 1950 he had “expressed distrust of any pre-Christian date, although I went too far in suggesting one long after 200 A.D.”

Beyond this, Wacholder introduced a theory that proposed a reading of the Teacher of Righteousness as Zadok. He does this considering the historical rise of the Teacher and his community to have been sometime early in the second century BCE and reads the Teacher’s opposition to include Simon the Just II and Onias III. The historical Zadok flourished around 200 BCE and was a pupil of Antigonus from Socho (known from *m. Avot* 1.3). This theory does well in proposing a more literal understanding of the community’s self-identification as the “sons of Zadok.” It also stresses the priestly and interpretive ability of the Teacher of Righteousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In direct opposition to this proposal, Fisdel has argued that the origin of the Essene movement firmly resides within the Maccabean period and he identifies the Teacher of Righteousness as Onias III. This argument is similarly proposed by Rowley and Michel. The identification of Onias III fits the profile if one considers the Teacher to have been a dispossessed High Priest, as discussed previously. The priestly and suffering servant characteristics of the Teacher of Righteousness are here brought to the forefront in proposing for a disgruntled ex-High Priest. Onias III was deposed of the High Priest position by his brother Jason and had to flee from Jerusalem in

---

143 Driver 1965: ix
144 Wacholder 1983: 135-140
145 Wacholder 1983: 181-184
146 Ulfgard 1998: 335
175 BCE only to be killed five years later. In this case Fisdel regards someone who Wacholder considers the enemy of the Teacher to be the Teacher himself.

Vermes may be most correct when he writes that in his opinion he feels that the Teacher of Righteousness is likely to remain anonymous. Some of the other classifications for the historical Teacher include:

the early Pharisee Yose ben Yoezer or Eleazar, the critic of John Hyrcanus, Judas the Essene, a prophet known to have been active towards the end of the second century BCE, or even Jesus ben Sira. Later identifications are Eleazar the Pharisee, a well-known critic of John Hyrcanus, or the Essene prophet Judas, both of whom were living towards the end of the second century BCE.

There have been variant understandings of the historical Teacher as well. For example, there is a strand of scholarship that proposes the argument that the Teacher of Righteousness is a position of authority passed down to subsequent individuals rather than one historical persona. To the best of my understanding, Isaac Rabinowitz was the first to propose the possibility of the Teacher of Righteousness constituting an office to be held by many. He writes,

We are thus left with the hypothesis that the contemporary guides of the Peshers and of the Fragments are none other than Mattathias and Judas. As we have seen, the designation “guide of righteousness” applies to more than one person, whereas the designation “guide of the regathering (of Israel)” applies to only one… What we are told about Mattathias and Judas in the Books of Maccabees and by Josephus seems to me to indicate that the allusions to the guide in the Peshers and the Fragments should be divided between them.

---

150 Ulfgard 1998: 335
151 Vermes 1977: 160
153 As discussed in chapter one, Rabinowitz translates the title מורה הצדק as “guide of righteousness.”
154 Rabinowitz 1958: 402-403
Rabinowitz goes on to also include the prophetic figure of Nehemiah into the position of Teacher of Righteousness at Qumran.\textsuperscript{155} Buchanan promotes this understanding of the Teacher and concludes his study by claiming that “the rabbinic reference to the priestly teacher of righteousness as a position rather than a description of a specific individual makes good sense when applied to the passages that mention the teacher of righteousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls.”\textsuperscript{156}

Identifying the Teacher of Righteousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls has always been an arduous matter for Qumran scholarship. Identifications have been widely varied and often times contradictory. It is simply the case that when attempting to reconstruct the historical person of the Teacher of Righteousness the evidence is unavailable. Due to this fact some scholars have even questioned the position of the Teacher as an individual figure, as seen above. This theory which proposes a string of teachers has failed to sway the field but functions to further demonstrate the perplexity involved with identifying the Qumran leader.

\textbf{Conclusion}

The aim of this chapter has first and foremost been to present the complexities inherent in scholarship’s attempt to understand the Teacher of Righteousness. The Qumran figurehead encompasses several exemplary characteristics throughout the scrolls. As demonstrated, many of these are rather oblique and have garnered significant dispute among scholarship. This has led to conflicted analysis on the identity of the Teacher of

\textsuperscript{156} Buchanan 1969: 553-558
Righteousness. It is the position of this paper that the Teacher can be viewed not as a historical person but rather one created to embody a perfect leadership figure that is similar in qualities with leaders in the Hebrew Bible and encompasses all that makes the community unique. As Brooke writes, “the Teacher can be seen as a notable multi-tasker, appealing to the various elements in the movement through a complex combination of strategies, literary and otherwise.”\textsuperscript{157} These elements to the character of the Teacher appeal to the identity construction of the Qumran community by passing down the memory of a founder figure who grants legitimacy to the movement’s halakhic claims and interpretations, their rightful position of residing over and above a corrupted Jerusalem, and their promise of vindication after suffering alongside God’s elect. Jokiranta best summarizes the nature of the Teacher when she writes that “the teacher of the pesharim represents an ideal community member, who captures some essential characteristics of the group’s identity.”\textsuperscript{158} She later expounds upon this point and claims that “The teacher is portrayed in such a way that it captures the essence of what makes the group distinct from other groups.”\textsuperscript{159} The proposal of this project is quite similar but in some way reversed. The Teacher is not portrayed as reflective of the community’s identity but rather pivotal in creating and maintaining it.

The convoluted nature of the Teacher of Righteousness has left identifying him with an historical persona a lost cause. An abundant amount of research has been dedicated to reading the descriptions of the Teacher with an eye to discerning an historical reconstruction which is simply unavailable in the scrolls. Proposals have fallen

\textsuperscript{157} Brooke 2010: 46
\textsuperscript{158} Jokiranta 2010: 254
\textsuperscript{159} Jokiranta 2013: 177
on all points of the spectrum with no decisive goal in mind. Rather than continuing to wager bets regarding the Teacher’s persona, scholarship would be better suited to read the narratives of the Teacher of Righteousness for what they are. The narratives of the Teacher read through the purview of collective memory theory and identity construction helps to more fully develop our understanding of the way the Teacher of Righteousness contributed to the formation of the Qumran community despite never being a part of them. The Teacher’s narrative will be further expounded upon in comparison to the memory of other biblical heroes in the following chapter. Thus far it seems that despite the exhaustive efforts of Qumran scholarship to understand and identify the Teacher, the Qumran leader remains a shadowy figure.
Chapter Three

Thus far in our investigation we have perused the direct mentions of the Teacher of Righteousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls with a goal to enumerate the different qualities projected onto this figure and display the conflicted analysis of the figure’s historical character. There has been one crucial element involved in the study of the Teacher and his narrative in the Qumran scrolls that has remained implicit throughout the discourse provided. This scholarly assumption is that the narratives about the Teacher must have been historically accurate and, consequently, the Teacher of Righteousness must have himself been an historical figure. Such an assumption has contributed to the large swath of Qumran scholarship’s attempt to match the narratives and characteristics of the Teacher with an elsewhere known historical character from the Second Temple period. However, as demonstrated, the large body of features concerning the Teacher in the scrolls is difficult to apply to one single personage. This has led to a vast array of identifications divergent to one another and conclusions claiming for more than a single figure. It seems that the historical inquiry into the Teacher of Righteousness has continuously proven to be a fruitless endeavor.\textsuperscript{160}

As a result to this difficulty, the current project looks to propose a new reading of the Teacher of Righteousness. This reading considers the Teacher described in the Dead Sea Scrolls not to have been an historical person or, less radically, not a person who

\textsuperscript{160} Stuckenbruck (2010: 23-24) has noted that scholarly inquiry into the historical character of the Teacher has been “anything but straightforward.” He credits the difficulty to the indirectness and remoteness between primary texts and the historical Teacher. Due to the scrolls’ fragmentary nature, he views the reconstruction of the Teacher to be one fitted together by scholarship and not based on clear decisive evidence. Furthermore, he points out that there are no sources apart from the scrolls which mention the Teacher.
demonstrated all the qualities – or any – portrayed onto the figure. That is to say that the Teacher we read in the content of the Damascus Document and the pesharim has been constructed by its authors with an intent to legitimize the Qumran community by creating a past involving a perfect figurehead similar to other legends of the Hebrew Bible. The phenomenon of manipulating the past with a goal to somehow impact the present is one well attested under the purview of collective memory theory.

The Teacher of Righteousness, as argued by this paper, represents an invented figure of memory from which the community draws its identity; a figure whose memory has undergone significant distortion and narrativization in order to better fit the community’s self-identification as the perfect biblical group. In other words, studying the qualities present in the Dead Sea Scrolls with an attempt to discern the historical Teacher is a futile task. This is so because, as will be argued, the Teacher of Righteousness demonstrates qualities inherently embedded in leadership figures from the past. Due to this fact, scholarship has been able to ascertain several features to the Teacher’s persona and link them to a vast quantity of identifications for the historical figure, making the possibility of pinning down a decisive conclusion unlikely. The Teacher may not have been a real persona or otherwise not one who fits the character molded in the Qumran writings. On the contrary, this thesis argues that the Teacher was a figure produced from the mold of upright biblical heroes considered to be a part of the righteous past of the Qumran sect.

Memory Distortion and Narrativization
There has long been an understanding of the relation between history and memory that accounted for memory as reflective of what actually happened and history reflective of memory. However, this traditional belief has become more problematic with developments in the field of sociology and collective memory theory. As Burke states, “remembering the past and writing about it no longer seem the innocent activities they were once taken to be. Neither memories nor histories seem objective any longer. In both cases we are learning to take account of conscious and unconscious selection, interpretation and distortion.” In other words, recordings of the past cannot be viewed as an objective portrayal of experiential reality but instead must be recognized to encompass a group’s interpretation, manipulation, and representation of the past to serve a purpose in the present. As was discussed in chapter one, by viewing records of history through the purview of memory theory one is not concerned with discerning ‘what really happened’ but rather how the authors’ choice to portray the past in such a way demonstrates their current concerns and present objectives. Gedi and Elam helpfully provide a quote by Nora who sums up the relations between memory and history as follows:

Memory is life… It remains in permanent evolution… History, on the other hand, is the reconstruction, always problematic and incomplete, of what is no longer. Memory is a perpetually actual phenomenon… history is a representation of the past… Memory, insofar as it is affective and magical, only accommodates those facts that suit it… History… calls for analysis and criticism… memory is by nature multiple and yet specific; collective, plural, and yet individual. History, on the other hand, belongs to everyone and to no one, whence its claim to universal authority… Memory is absolute, while history can only conceive the relative.

161 Burke 1989: 98
Memory theory thus provides the perfect lens through which to view the Dead Sea Scrolls for the purpose of this project.

The recollection of historical narratives in the Dead Sea Scrolls and beyond cannot therefore be read as objective historical data. Memory instead serves the needs of the current group recalling upon an historical perspective. For this to be true, memories of the past must remain malleable. That is to say that memory – and the subsequent codification of it in monuments, texts, and so on – is susceptible to manipulation or, better said, distortion. Schudson emphatically argues,

> Memory is distortion since memory is invariably and inevitably selective. A way of seeing is a way of not seeing, a way of remembering is a way of forgetting, too. If memory were only a kind of registration, a “true” memory might be possible. But memory is a process of encoding information, storing information, and strategically retrieving information, and there are social, psychological, and historical influences at each point.\(^{164}\)

Assman further argues for the correlation between memory and distortion when he writes:

> It is a well-known fact that there is no absolute and objective truth in memory. Remembering is always transformation and reconstruction… whatever advantages symbolic codification might provide over individual memory, they are more than balanced by the fact that writings and other forms of objectivization and codification are open to censorship, manipulation, and even annihilation. In a way, every memory is “distorted” memory, just as every tradition is an “invented tradition.”\(^{165}\)

---


\(^{164}\) Schudson 1995: 348

\(^{165}\) Assman 1995: 365-366
Memories of the past and their recordings are inevitably distorted by the biases, interpretations, and needs of the people who recall them. Schudson suggests four means of distortion as (1) distanciation, (2) instrumentalization, (3) narrativization, and (4) cognitivization and conventionalization.\textsuperscript{166} Le Donne aptly describes these processes as (1) the tendency for memories to become vague or for details to be forgotten, (2) the tendency for memories to be reinterpreted to serve the present better, (3) the tendency for memories to conform to socio-typical experiences, and (4) the tendency for memories to be conventionalized through the constraints of storytelling. He also goes on to add a fifth, which he calls “articulation: the tendency for memories to conform to language conventions.”\textsuperscript{167}

The memories of the past, which have already been significantly distorted in favor of the current needs, are formed and passed on through the process of narrativization. In order to pass on a version of the past to others it must be enveloped into a sort of cultural form. This is generally a narrative. As Schudson explains, “Narrativization is an effort not only to report the past but to make it interesting. Narratives simplify.”\textsuperscript{168} Through narrative the proposed historical past takes shape in a given community and molds into the collective memory of that particular group. Historical facts are “timeless and discontinuous” until they are formed together through the means of a narrative.\textsuperscript{169} Thus it is in story-telling where one finds the meaning and significance of a formed memory.\textsuperscript{170} However, a story will not be successful if it is simply manufactured without a well-known and acknowledged structure or template, if you will. Articulating memories,

\textsuperscript{166} Schudson 1995: 348-360
\textsuperscript{167} Le Donne 2007: 168
\textsuperscript{168} Schudson 1995: 355
\textsuperscript{169} Lowenthal 1985: 220
\textsuperscript{170} Le Donne 2007: 169
which inevitably relies on the use of language, must conform, often times unconsciously, to patterns of rhetoric familiar to the present group.\textsuperscript{171} This process of narrativization further lends credence to the distortion of a narrative. Gedi and Elam provide a wonderful example of this when they present Rostov’s recounting of his heroic battle of Schoen Graben:

He [Rostov] described the Schoen Graben affair exactly as men who have taken part in battles always describe them – that is, as they would like them to have been, as they have heard them described by others, and as sounds well, but not in the least as they really had been. Rostov was a truthful young man and would never have told a deliberate lie. He began his story with the intention of telling everything exactly as it happened, but imperceptibly, unconsciously and inevitably he passed into falsehood… His listeners expected to hear how, forgetful of himself and all on fire with excitement, he had rushed down like a hurricane on the enemy’s square, hacked his way in, slashing the French right and left; how his sabre had tasted flesh, and he had fallen exhausted, and so on. And that was what he told them.\textsuperscript{172}

Rostov was strongly and unconsciously influenced by the frame of discourse from his current time and community. It severely shaped the structure and content of his story as it went on to say exactly what was expected. What can be taken from this example is that in order for a memory to be successfully transmitted it must adopt socially accepted rhetoric and coalesce with other narratives familiar to a present community.\textsuperscript{173} This is true even if it is at the expense of the memory’s ‘truthfulness.’

This is the methodology to be applied to our reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls and specifically the narratives about the Teacher of Righteousness. What is in the content of the writings found in the Judean desert near the Dead Sea is not the storage of facts.

\textsuperscript{171} Assman 1995: 126-127
\textsuperscript{172} Gedi & Elam 1996: 45
\textsuperscript{173} Schudson 1995: 359
Instead, they constitute the community’s memory and perception of its own collective past. The memories are articulated in the form of narrative throughout the content of the Qumran writings and adopt a much larger metanarrative about heroes, leaders, and history from the Hebrew Bible. It is important to remember that the records we have seen in the scrolls are not innocent acts to portray history but attempts to persuade and shape the memory of others.\textsuperscript{174} The experiential narratives about the Teacher of Righteousness – what I will come to call the ‘Teacher tradition’ – are not the recollection of historical events but an invention and narrativization proposed to push the Qumran community’s sectarian agenda. In order for this to be successful, the presentation of the Teacher would have needed to significantly parallel qualities found in righteous leaders of chosen communities in the stories of the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Judaism.

The proposition of this project contends that the Teacher tradition in the Dead Sea Scrolls constitutes an invented memory shaped by narratives in the Hebrew Bible for the purpose of influencing the Qumran community into believing itself to be the rightful elect of God. Viewing the mentions of the Teacher of Righteousness diachronically one finds that with the passage of time there seems to have been a substantial amount of distortion and narrativization regarding the figure. As demonstrated in previous chapters, the Teacher appears in a couple of verses in the Damascus Document and in a much larger capacity throughout the \textit{pesharim}. The former is regularly dated at some time in the second century BCE or earlier\textsuperscript{175} while the latter is often attributed to the first century

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{174} Burke 1989: 101  
\textsuperscript{175} Davies (1982) for example argues that the Damascus Document has Babylonian roots.}
BCE or first century CE. The *pesharim* display a much richer and more developed narrative concerning the Teacher of Righteousness than what is found in the Damascus Document. On the one hand, CD presents the Teacher as being raised by God to lead the community and heeding his voice is equated with following the Torah. On the other hand, the *pesharim* present stories of the Teacher’s historical encounters with dramatic opposition, namely the Wicked Priest (a figure which holds prominent interest in the *pesharim* but is unattested in the Damascus Document). In the *pesharim* the Teacher takes on many roles that seem to parallel the community’s idea of its own identity, as demonstrated in chapter two. As time went on it seems that the memory of the Teacher of Righteousness expanded and was codified in much grander narratives. The Teacher goes on to represent his own tradition among the Qumran group. However, unlike the theory of memory distortion presented above, it seems unlikely for a genuine historical memory to have become so distorted and aggrandized so rapidly. Instead, I posit that the Teacher of Righteousness was an imagined character whose narrative was invented and shaped to better suit the needs of an evolving sectarian community.

The Qumran community chose to recast itself a history in which it was led by a divinely appointed prophetic priest in order to legitimize itself as God’s chosen group. Zerubavel addresses pertinent reasoning regarding the reconstruction of the past when he states:

> When a society undergoes rapid developments that shatter its social and political order, its need to restructure the past is as great as its desire to set its future agenda. As Hobbswam and Ranger observed, such periods often stimulate the creation of new cultural forms that replace the weakening

---

176 Lim (2002: 21-22) dates the scrolls in question as follows: 1QpMic, just before the first century BCE; 1QpHab, written by two scribes of the Herodian period, c. 30-1 BCE; 4QpPs*, c. 20-70 CE.
older traditions. These “invented traditions” are particularly significant for the legitimation of the emergent social and political order, and their success depends, to a large measure, on their ability to reconstruct an acceptable view of the past.\textsuperscript{177}

The impact of metanarratives and archetypes on a group’s perception of itself and the world around them is of paramount importance. As Le Donne rightly exclaims, “The climactic moments of our lives are measured against, and interpreted by, the climactic moments of great stories and indeed history itself.”\textsuperscript{178} Therefore, the presence of the Teacher of Righteousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls functioned greatly to inculcate the Qumran members with a self-belief as a righteous group but did so only insofar as it was able to fit the grander metanarratives of the Hebrew Bible, through which the sectarians saw their history unfolding.

As an example of “invented tradition” I turn our attention to Zerubavel’s discussion of the Trumpeldor legend. According to Zerubavel, the historical Trumpeldor was an ex-officer of the czarist army and a Zionist activist. On March 1, 1920 a battle ensued with Arab forces assembled near Tel Hai in which eight settlers died. There was an outpour of literature on this event which projected Trumpeldor to encompass a legendary figure who was himself now larger than life. Ultimately, Trumpeldor was killed in battle and is said to have uttered his final words, “it is good to die for our country.” This narrative about the hero Trumpeldor was produced in order to “symbolize the emergence of a new type of Jew, tough, strong, and resourceful, who stands up to his enemies, a Jew who assumes charge of his own history and fate rather than depends on

\textsuperscript{177} Zerubavel 1994: 105-106
\textsuperscript{178} Le Donne 2007: 171; original emphasis.
others’ will to provide him with security.”\textsuperscript{179} There was throughout the discourse about Trumpeldor an implicit link between he and the famous Jewish heroes of antiquity. As Zerubavel writes, “Trumpeldor’s presentation as the modern reincarnation of the ancient heroes elevated him beyond the immediate historical situation and assured him an honorable position in the pantheon of Jewish heroes.”\textsuperscript{180} In so doing, the new tradition being invented through the narrative of Trumpeldor was tasked with significantly linking with older traditions and language.\textsuperscript{181} As Le Donne comments on this example, “The successful invention of tradition requires a close proximity to the older tradition so that its reception into the society is a smooth one. If an invention is too radical it will be largely rejected.” Furthermore, Le Donne goes on to expound upon the Trumpeldor legend and notices:

In addition to Zerubavel’s comments, it should also be pointed out that the typological appeal to Bar Kokhba \textit{et al.} reinforced a heroic memory into Israel’s contemporary consciousness. And inversely, the memory of Trumpeldor was localized into the more established collective memory of Israel’s heroes.\textsuperscript{182}

The aggrandizement of the Trumpeldor narrative in synchronicity with other well-known Jewish heroes and narratives is directly pertinent to the current discussion about the Teacher of Righteousness. That is not to say that the two are identical. In the case of Trumpeldor, the legend stems from an historical person and an historical event. On the contrary, in the case of the Teacher of Righteousness, this paper argues that the need for leadership coherent with its biblical memory demanded the creation of this figure. In any case, it is important to note that in order for the legend of Trumpeldor to be accepted and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{179} Zerubavel 1994: 108
\item \textsuperscript{180} Zerubavel 1994: 109
\item \textsuperscript{181} Zerubavel 1994: 110
\item \textsuperscript{182} Le Donne 2007: 173
\end{itemize}
internalized it had to mirror the already well-established legends that came before it. Similarly, in order for the Teacher tradition to hold any validity and influence on the sectarian community, its narratives had to fit with the greater memory of righteous leaders in the Hebrew Bible. The Teacher of Righteousness thus provides a mnemonic device for sectarians to recall past biblical figures and their respective communities. The members reading these stories would subsequently subconsciously equate the Teacher with the past hero and themselves with the upright groups these heroes once led.

The Teacher Tradition and Biblical Leaders

The Teacher tradition, as I define it, constitutes the experiential narratives that form the Teacher of Righteousness into the community-encompassing character that he is portrayed to embody. The term tradition in this case is beneficial for the purposes of this project in that it helps to promote further inquiry on the Teacher to focus on the figure’s narrative being passed down through the scrolls. In so doing, understanding the Qumran figurehead as a tradition may discourage scholarship’s insistence on identifying the historical persona of the Teacher of Righteousness. Research on the Teacher of Righteousness may be better suited to extrapolate the influences the narratives of the Teacher had on the community of exiles at Qumran. This sets aside the need to read into this character’s historicity. After all, the members living at Qumran were not likely to have ever interacted with the Teacher of Righteousness – had he actually been an historical person – and only knew about him through the narratives provided in the Dead
Sea Scrolls. Like the legend of Trumpeldor, the Teacher tradition was constructed by a community with needs to create a new ethos. While the Israeli community of the 20th century sought to shape its group into strong, independent Jews, the Qumran exiles sought rather to legitimize its movement over and against the rest of its cultural surroundings through the memory of a perfect biblical leader.

The figure of the Teacher of Righteousness and his tradition were created by the Qumran community in order to serve as a mnemonic device for biblical stories around which the exiles constructed their history. In order for this tradition to be both effective and received it had to conform to Second Temple rhetoric and Qumranic conceptions about biblical heroes. It is the argument of this project that for the Qumran community to apply to itself an identity as the righteous group of God, it recognized the need for a priestly, prophetic leader to deliver and legitimate the halakhic and purity laws proposed in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Qumran community believed that divine law was delivered to people in successive periods. Moses received the first, one-time revelation at Sinai. Subsequently, the prophets were each tasked with passing on law and instruction to their respective communities. The Qumran group saw itself as the most recent and final group to receive this instruction to walk in the perfect path. The chosen people prior to the sectarians were each led by a forerunner with certain instructional and prophetic qualities. The recognition of this social position and hierarchy remained in the minds of the

---

183 Brooke (2010: 45) states that there is no evidence to put the Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran settlement. This is based on recent consideration of the archaeological evidence showing that Khirbet Qumran was not inhabited until the first quarter of the first century BCE and the Teacher is likely to have been a product from the mid-second century BCE. Brooke, of course, is assuming, as most do, that the Teacher of Righteousness was an historical figure in the second century BCE. In any case it seems clear that the Qumran community that authored the pesharim, which largely discuss and expand the narratives of the Teacher, never held any contact with this figure.

184 Jassen 2008b: 307-308
Qumran authors who were in need of a similar leader to validate their movement. The remainder of this chapter will argue for a direct correlation between the description of the Teacher of Righteousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the memory of biblical leaders. It is argued that the Qumran authors constructed the Teacher tradition based on their recognition of various past prophets and these various qualities culminated in an archetypal leader for the community.

It is necessary to recognize at the outset of this section that the prophetic books and figures represented in the Hebrew Bible are not set in a vacuum. In other words, the Qumran community’s interpretation of biblical heroes as well as the broader memory of such personas in Second Temple Judaism is the matter to be dealt with in this work. That being said, the Qumran conceptions presented in the scrolls about prophethood and the specific functions of past characters are already largely reflective of the thought pattern pervading most of Second Temple Judaism. The authors of the scrolls manufactured the figure of the Teacher of Righteousness by the template of upright qualities they perceived as being pertinent to biblical leaders. The interpretation of crucial aspects of the prophetic role to its respective community varies slightly in Qumranic understanding as opposed to classical renditions. Understanding this juxtaposition may shed some light on the character of the Teacher in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Perhaps the major divergence between Qumran interpretations and classic biblical leadership lies in the role of prophets as lawgivers. It is largely acknowledged that the Pentateuch presents Moses as the prophetic lawgiver par excellence. This is evident through the revelation of the law on Sinai and Moses’ continuous interaction with
YHWH in order to legislate and adjudicate unclear legal situations. However, the Qumran group seems to have maintained similar roles for the prophets as lawgivers among their respective groups. Jassen concludes the following:

Prophets in the Hebrew Bible rarely appear as lawgivers. Though they often champion the observance of the covenant and its laws, their prophetic capabilities are rarely employed to mediate newly revealed divine law. In contrast, the Qumran texts routinely represent the ancient prophets as mediators of divinely revealed law, sometimes in cooperation with Moses and sometimes independent of Moses. The presentation of the ancient prophets as lawgivers at Qumran therefore suggests a deliberate attempt to assign juridical responsibilities to the ancient prophets.

The prophet’s main function was thus to exhort his community to proper observance of the law and, for Qumran, propose new revelations of law. This new accreditation of lawgiver for the classical prophet and community leader is made clear through several passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls. For instance, 1QS 1:2-3 reads:

לעשונת הטוב והישרلفינו כרש זוהי מושה וביד כל עבדיו הנביאים

In order to do what is good and just in his presence, as he commanded by the hand of Moses and by the hand of all his servants the Prophets.

The passage presented implies that that which is good and just is passed not only through Moses to the prophets but through the prophets themselves. Although there are a

---

185 Jassen 2008b: 311. He further elaborates in n. 8 as follows: “In addition to the revelation at Sinai, Moses is often presented as a prophetic lawgiver. Leviticus 24:10-23 and Num 15:32-36 describe, respectively, incidences in the desert where an individual is accused of blasphemy and gathering sticks on the Sabbath. In both instances, Moses is uncertain how to proceed and the individual is placed in custody until God reveals to Moses the appropriate punitive measures. Likewise, in Num 9:6-13, Moses turns to divine revelation in order to determine the proper procedure regarding individuals who could not offer the Passover sacrifice at the appropriate time (cf. Num 27:1-11). See also the numerous places where Moses receives legislative revelation in the tent of meeting (e.g., Lev 1:1). In Deuteronomy, the relationship between Moses’ lawgiving responsibilities and prophetic capabilities is made even more explicit (e.g., Deut 18:15-22).” It seems that Moses’ position as the prototype prophetic law giver is not a matter for contention.

186 Jassen 2008b: 310-311

187 For a greater array of examples from the Dead Sea Scrolls in which prophets are presented as lawgivers see Alex P. Jassen, “The Presentation of the Ancient Prophets as Lawgivers at Qumran,” in Journal of Biblical Literature 127: 2 (2008), 307-337.
handful of examples from the Hebrew Bible in which prophets mediate new laws, it is not so explicitly and regularly stated as in the Qumran writings.\textsuperscript{188}

Furthermore, the prophets were understood to regularly stand in opposition to forces of evil which often enveloped unexpected sources. Prophetic leaders regularly stood against other prophets (Isa. 28:7; Jer. 8:1-2, 18:18; Ezek. 13:1-16, 22:25, 28; Mic. 3:5-6; Zeph. 3:4), political and judicial leaders (Isa. 5:23; Jer. 8:1-2; Ezek. 22:6-12, 27; Mic. 3:1-4, 9-11; Zeph. 3:3), and sages (Isa. 5:21; Jer. 8:8-9, 18:18). They also regularly denounced Jerusalem (Isa. 1; Ezek. 22:1-5, 23; Amos 2:4-5; Mic. 3:9-12; Zeph. 1:4-6) and Israel, Judah and the people (Isa. 1; Jer. 7:28-33; Amos 2:4-5, 6-16; Hos. 1:2-2:3, 11:1-7; Mic. 1:2-9; Zeph. 2:1-3). As Ben Zvi states,

\begin{quote}
Since the faithful prophets of old were conceived, among others, as those who were a small minority and warned the people of the impending and fully justified destruction, as those who called the people to turn away from their wrong ways and return to YHWH and YHWH’s ways but were unsuccessful, then the prophets had to stand, by necessity, against the corrupt elite and the people of their times, and therefore, against priests, prophets, sages, political leader, and ‘Israel’, ‘Judah’ or ‘Jerusalem’.\textsuperscript{189}
\end{quote}

The prophet was therefore remembered as a leader who stood to edify his community towards the correct path and to stand in direct opposition to all that was wicked. This resulted in the construction of prophets during times of turmoil where the social situation was perceived to have been corrupted. However, Newman notices that there is a further wrinkle to the development of the memory of leadership figures in Qumran. She writes,

\textsuperscript{188} For biblical examples see 2 Kgs. 17:13b; Ezra 9:10-11; Dan. 9:10; 2 Chr. 29:25. Jassen (2008b: 312 n. 11) notes, “The ascription of legislative activity to prophets in these passages is seemingly intended to demonstrate that the process of transmitting divinely revealed law did not cease with Moses.”

\textsuperscript{189} Ben Zvi 2004: 20-21
In the case of the Shirot, the influence of Sinai is seen not in the distinct mention of the wilderness mountain nor of the covenant mediator Moses himself, but more obliquely in the priestly kabod tradition associated with a visual and mobile manifestation of divine glory which threads its way through the Sinai narrative emphasizing the mediating leadership of both prophet Moses and priest Aaron (inter alia Exod 16:7-10, 24:16-17).

Newman emphasizes the donning of the prophetic mantle by priestly leaders and the convergence of both roles into a single figure. There are times when the portrayal of prophets seems to explicitly or implicitly connote a sense of overlap of mental images of prophets and priests. As Ben Zvi explains, “attributes associated with one image are being assigned to the other, or central characters are described as being both prophets and priests, or prophets are described as salient supporters of priests (and temple) and their status in society.”

The production of the Teacher of Righteousness dovetails nicely with the Second Temple and Qumranic understanding of prophetic leaders. Firstly, the Teacher tradition in the Dead Sea Scrolls certainly adopts expectations about promised leaders and prophets of a future time evident in the Hebrew Bible. Roth has recognized that the title of the Teacher seems to be greatly influenced by Hos. 10:12, which encourages the people to seek YHWH so that he might rain righteousness (וַיָּעַם Tzedeq) on them. Roth takes the title as a play on words with this passage to equate the Teacher of Righteousness with God’s promise of deliverance. The Teacher of Righteousness thus constitutes a figure that was expected by Second Temple Jews and, more importantly, the Qumran members.

---
190 Newman 2008: 30-31, n.5; emphasis added.
191 Ben Zvi 2004: 27. He provides examples of characters who exhibit both prophetic and priestly roles in the figures of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Moreover, both Haggai and Zechariah “are associated with temple building, the centrality of the temple, and even with that of the High Priest.”
192 Roth 1963: 91-95. Roth similarly regards the Teacher to be connected with the מורה תדוקה in Joel 2:23. However, this latter theory has not garnered as much attention as the connection between the Teacher and the passage in Hosea.
There is also the continuing expectation of a coming “prophet like Moses” as expressed in Deuteronomy 18. Therefore, the sectarians would have enthusiastically welcomed the appearance of a new prophetic/priestly leader similar to those of the past. Secondly, the Teacher tradition in the Dead Sea Scrolls significantly overlaps with the Qumran community’s interpretation of biblical leaders and prophets in the Hebrew Bible. As seen above, leaders/prophets in the Second Temple period were held to be lawgivers, proponents of the righteous path, and priests. This explains the multi-faceted character of the Teacher as both prophet (recipient of divine revelation and correct interpretation of halakhic matters) and priest. The Teacher follows along with the prophets in that he leads his community on the path to righteousness. This leads to an understandable embellishment of the Teacher of Righteousness as founder of the righteous sect. Thirdly, this discussion also underscores the narratives regarding the opposition between the Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest, among others. As mentioned above, leaders from the Hebrew Bible often stood in stark contention with political and social rulers, Jerusalem, corrupt people, and priests.\textsuperscript{193} These confrontations which hold as staples to the classical leadership narratives are well-attested throughout the Teacher tradition in his role as suffering servant. Ben Zvi states,

\begin{quote}
the ubiquitous, although at times implied, essential opposition between those who are pious and those who are sinful and above all their respective ways led to the creation of ‘functional prophets’, that is, characters who
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{193} The example of priests, not listed above, is provided by Ben Zvi (2004: 23) who writes that in the Persian period one finds cases of prophetic diatribes against priests who failed to rightfully perform their duties (Mal. 2:1-3). However, despite the antagonism towards a select priest, the book as a whole is certainly not anti-priestly. One can certainly draw a correlation with the Teacher tradition that pins the Teacher of Righteousness against the Wicked Priest but maintains a positive affirmation of the priestly lineage and even portrays the Teacher himself as a priest.
are not prophets, but who serve roles similar to those often associated with the prophets.\footnote{Ben Zvi 2004: 22}

As he explains, during a conflict between good and bad there is often times a created ‘functional prophet’ to serve the righteous. This figure is not a prophet in that he does not receive divine word to pass on to his followers but takes the role of a prophet in standing for his community against outsiders who threaten the fabric of their existence. Such a reading shifts a significant amount of emphasis onto the social aspect of a prophetic figure and its influence in the social world. Similarly, I posit that the Qumran community, envisaging an end time in which they are the light in contrast to darkness, created a functioning leadership figure to embody biblical legitimacy for the sake of establishing for itself an identity as the righteous of God and to distinguish itself from outsiders.

The above discussion has aimed to display the boundaries through which the Teacher tradition was manufactured. The narratives about the Teacher of Righteousness all coalesce well with the understanding of past leadership and prophetic understandings. It seems unlikely for a single historical figure to embody so perfectly the many different characteristics and experiential events depicted in the body of the prophetic works presented above. Yet the Teacher tradition displays the Qumran figurehead as living out and exemplifying all the events/qualities discussed. This, I posit, is best explained if the Teacher of Righteousness is read as a literary character and a prototype leadership figure molded together by the history of biblical prophets. Therefore, as demonstrated, the Teacher tradition adequately parallels the current disposition concerning divinely inspired leadership necessary for the efficient transmission of this memory. Moreover, the
fabrication of the Teacher may also hold deeper roots in individual characters of the Hebrew Bible.

The Teacher of Righteousness and the Ezra Model

The figure of the Teacher of Righteousness has regularly drawn comparison to Moses. In fact, the Qumran leader is often portrayed by scholarship to be the presentation of a “new Moses.”195 Allison remarks that there is “no denying a certain resemblance between the Teacher of Righteousness and Moses.”196 This resemblance seems inevitable with the proposal of this project. Due to the fact that the Qumran community envisioned Moses to embody the archetypal lawgiver and leader, it would be only reasonable to incorporate Mosaic features into the Teacher of Righteousness, the “new Moses” of the community. The authors of the scrolls imagined themselves to have taken part of a new exodus, similar to that of the biblical narratives.197 The prior exodus presented in the text of the Pentateuch was, of course, led and, at least to some degree, founded by Moses.198 In that respect, the leader and founder Teacher in the Dead Sea Scrolls was a necessary component to the community if it wished to present itself in the same light as previous biblical groups.

There are a plethora of comparisons to be drawn between the two figures. Brooke has noticed that in 1QH⁴ 12:6-13:6, a poem that is often thought to most closely represent

---

196 Allison 1993: 84 n. 196
197 Horsley 1999: 154
198 Horsley (1999: 154) states that “as leader and founder of the community, the shadowy Righteous Teacher seems to have performed the functions of a new Moses.” His argument conversely acknowledges the Mosaic role of leader and founder.
the understanding of the Teacher of Righteousness,\textsuperscript{199} there is a dramatic thanksgiving which expresses the following: “I thank you O Lord for you have enlightened my face according to your covenant… like a sure dawn, with perfect light, you have shone for me.”\textsuperscript{200} As he notes, Hughes has picked up on this phraseology and considers it a hyperlink to the occasion of the Torah being given to Moses causing his face to radiate.\textsuperscript{201} Brooke proclaims that the Teacher seems to be aligned with Moses through the experience of being a founding figure on Sinai and the poem further established the figure’s role as teacher and/or new lawgiver.\textsuperscript{202} Further comparisons between Moses and the Teacher of Righteousness are presented by Allison as follows:

He was “raised up” (CD 1:6), just as Deut. 18:15, 18 and 4Q175 foretell that God will “raise up” the prophet like Moses (in each case the verb is \emph{qum}). He was in addition known as the “faithful shepherd” (1Q34 bis ii 8), a title the rabbis gave to Moses (\textit{Mek}. On Exod. 14:31, etc.), and he was believed to be a prophet at the end of days, who spoke from “the mouth of God” (1QpHab. II:2-3; cf. Num. 12:6-8; 4Q175 5-6) and who had come to guide a people who were theretofore wandering “in a pathless wilderness” (CD I:13ff.). He had a special understanding, greater than the writing prophets themselves (1QpHab. II:9; VII:3-5). He was an object of faith, as was Moses (1QpHab. II:7-8), and people were to listen to him (1QpHab. II:7-9; CD XX:28-34; cf. Deut. 18:15-18). It may further be observed that

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{199} It has previously been argued in this thesis, through the work of Harkins and Newsom, that the Hodayot are not authored by the Teacher of Righteousness. This has become the dominant theory concerning the authorship of the Hodayot lately. However, as Davies argues, despite modern recognition that the Hodayot were unlikely to be written by the Teacher, it is entirely feasible to assume that the Qumran members who were reading these texts took them to be compositions of the Teacher and reflective of the figure’s thinking. “Hence, they comprised a sort of hagiography; they enshrined what were seen as the most authentic data about the life and experience of the founder of the community that could possibly exist.” (Davies 1987: 89-90) Therefore, the writings could be taken to constitute some sort of pseudepigrapha or biography (albeit about a fake figure, as argued by this thesis) that was presented to reflect the Teacher’s personality. I wish to remain entirely skeptical about this conclusion but, for the purpose of demonstrating coherent and linguistic comparisons to the figure of Moses, will entertain the work of Brooke (2010), Hughes (2006), and later Cherian (2006), who take these passages to be reflective of the Qumran community’s presentation of the Teacher of Righteousness.
\item\textsuperscript{200} Brooke 2010: 48; translation of Dead Sea Scrolls text provided by Brooke’s article.
\item\textsuperscript{201} Hughes 2006: 105
\item\textsuperscript{202} Brooke 2010: 48
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
the Teacher of Righteousness drew to himself the title “vessel,” just as did Moses in the targumim and rabbinic texts.\textsuperscript{203}

Cherian also proposes an argument based on the Hodayot in which he compares the Teacher’s role as nursing-father (1QH 15:19-22a) with that of the nursing-father imagery for Moses in Num. 11:12. This comparison, Cherian argues, further develops the leadership qualities of the Teacher of Righteousness as an equation with the leadership role of Moses.\textsuperscript{204}

There are obvious connections between the character of the Teacher of Righteousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran community’s memory of Moses from biblical narratives. Moses thus provides one of the model figures by which the authors of the Damascus Document and the pesharim constructed the qualities inherent in the Teacher tradition. There are several motivations for the Qumran authors’ conjoining of their leader with that of Moses, not the least of which is that it garners extreme approval from sectarians who consider Moses the biblical protagonist. Brooke argues,

\begin{quote}
Although it is possible to suggest that Moses is not a complete ideal for the members of the movement whose literary character is reflected in the sectarian Scrolls, part of the opportunity of aligning oneself with Moses was the option for offering rewritten Torah, the prophetically inspired exposure of exposition of the nistarot.\textsuperscript{205}
\end{quote}

Thus, even if Moses does not constitute the perfect model for the Qumran community it is without debate that one of the benefits of aligning the Teacher of Righteousness with Moses is the granted authority to propose new sectarian interpretations and halakhah.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{203} Allison 1993: 84 n. 196
\textsuperscript{204} Cherian 2006: 351-362
\textsuperscript{205} Brooke 2010: 48
\end{flushleft}
This benefit, I contend, is the main reason for the production of the Teacher tradition in the sectarian scrolls.

While Moses certainly exhibits exemplary parallels to the Teacher of Righteousness, there is yet another model figure by which the Qumran community may have structured its forerunner. This thesis proposes that the Teacher in the Qumran writings most closely resembles the persona of the post-exilic figure of Ezra and was manufactured around the image of this character. Ulfgard has mentioned in passing that the Interpreter of the Law in the Damascus Document, who is sometimes equated with the Teacher of Righteousness because of his interpretive ability, may be the figure of Ezra.\footnote{Ulfgard 1998: 324} This project now offers a fuller investigation into the role of Ezra in the formation of the Teacher of Righteousness. The depictions of Ezra in the book of Ezra-Nehemiah (II Esdras) and I Esdras display striking similarities to the multi-faceted role of the Teacher at Qumran. The remainder of this chapter will demonstrate the many comparisons between this Persian figure and the Teacher of Righteousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

The name Ezra appears in several works following the rise of Persian rule. These include the biblical books of Ezra-Nehemiah and the apocryphal book of I Esdras, pseudepigraphic work of IV Ezra, and also the Revelation of Ezra, a Christian representation of IV Ezra.\footnote{Myers 1964: LXXII} This figure seems to have been one of vital importance in Second Temple Judaism as well as a well-circulating tradition at the rise of Christianity, as evident by the Christian Revelation of Ezra. While there remains much discussion...
concerning the date of activity for the historical Ezra, Myers has argued for a mission following the time of Nehemiah, sometime after 430 BCE. At this time Judah was operating under Persian rule and had its attention focused on reestablishing the correct law and practice of YHWH in the newly rebuilt Temple. The High Priest became the main native spokesperson and leader of its community. The social milieu’s accent of correct law and conduct significantly contributed to the character and mission of Ezra, as will be shown.

The fact that Ezra occupied a dual position cannot be disputed. The character is presented as both a scribe (Ezra 7:6) and a priest. The genealogy presented in Ezra 7:1-5 provides evidence as to the pure priestly lineage of this figure. In fact, similar to the presentation of the Teacher in the Qumran scrolls, Ezra is often referred to simply by the title “priest” (Ezra 7:11, 12, 21; 10:10, 16; Neh. 8:2, 9; 12:26). Of specific interest in the genealogical lineage of Ezra is the portrayal of this figure as a direct descendant of Zadok (Ezra 7:2). Zadok, of course, is a prominent figure in the Qumran sect as the members often refer to themselves as the “sons of Zadok” to emphasize their priestly character. Again echoing the presentation of the Teacher of Righteousness, Grabbe writes regarding Ezra that “He is never referred to as the high priest, though some of his activities seem to be those of a high priest; indeed, his activities suggest a variety of offices which the narrative does not actually ascribe to him.” This ‘action-based’ portrayal of Ezra’s role is directly relevant to the presentation of the Teacher of

208 Myers 1964b: 95
209 Grabbe 1995: 50
210 Myers 1964b: 96
211 Grabbe 1995: 50
Righteousness. As discussed in chapter two, the Teacher partakes in prophetic activities despite never being labeled נביא and exemplifies High Priestly qualities despite never being referred to by the label כוהן גדול.

Moreover, Ezra’s role is embedded in a much larger concern about law and leadership. As Grabbe states, the figure of Ezra is “credited with bringing a law – whatever it might be – and teaching it, but this seems to be tied up with his scribal office, at least in part (7:6, 10-11).” In fact, the main aspect to Ezra’s office as a scribe seems to relate to his extraordinary acumen concerning the law of God. As the text of Ezra 7:6 reads concerning Ezra, “he was a scribe skilled in the law of Moses which Yahweh God of Israel had given.” One of the primary goals of this figure was to investigate the law thoroughly and teach his findings to his community so that they might properly follow the law of God. Among this community was a contingent of laymen, priests, Levites, temple singers, gatekeepers, and temple servants, among which he was considered the leader. Therefore, Ezra was considered a dynamic leader of his people with the purpose to pass on a law and teach his following to properly conduct itself in the new era of Israel identity amidst the rebuilding of the Jerusalem Temple. According to Myers, “The dual purpose of Ezra’s visit to Jerusalem was to investigate the (religious) situation at Jerusalem and bear the contributions offered for the improvement of conditions there by the government and the Jews still residing at Babylon.” This goal of Ezra to edify Jerusalem, bring his own law, and teach the people about the correct interpretation of Law is directly pertinent to the description of the Teacher in the Dead

213 Grabbe 1995: 51
214 Grabbe 1995: 158
215 Myers 1964: 61
216 Myers 1964b: 96
217 Myers 1964: 62
Sea Scrolls. I propose that the Teacher employs a similar mission with the community identifying itself as a new, metaphorical Temple.²¹⁸

It is no question that the Qumran community was well aware of the Ezra narrative and held the character in high-esteem. There was an abundance of literature produced which promulgated the erudition of Ezra. It is clear by works following the historical life of Ezra leading all the way into the early Christian era demonstrated that people held a very high regard for his character and role.²¹⁹ Some of scholarship has even gone so far as to credit the figure of Ezra with discovering – or at least perpetuating – the importance of exegesis. Assman writes, “At the water gate of Jerusalem, as Nehemiah reports in chapter 8, Ezra not only reads out the entire Torah to the people, he also interprets it section by section. With this… we witness the birth not only of the scripture, but also of exegesis.”²²⁰

Coupled with Ezra’s acumen is his position as a prophet, first projected in 4 Ezra 12:42. According to Stone, this is the first instance in which Ezra is referred to as a prophet and rather than deny the role he openly accepts his new position.²²¹ Ezra’s role as a prophet is largely ascribed to his understanding of esoteric revelation and his interpretive abilities.²²² 4 Ezra 12:9 presents Ezra as responding to a dream given by God with the following: “For thou hast judged me worthy to be shown the end of the times


²¹⁹ For a review of literature see Jacob M. Myers, Ezra-Nehemiah (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1964), LXXII-LXXIII.

²²⁰ Assman 2006: 71

²²¹ Stone 1990: 34

²²² Stone (1990: 35, n. 246) writes that in Visions 5 and 6 of Ezra he is the recipient of dreams and interpretations regarding esoteric revelation about the end of times.
and the last events of the times.” The Teacher of Righteousness, as discussed in chapter two, owes his prophetic capabilities to similar interpretive abilities regarding esoteric language through the writings of the prophets. Not unlike the figure of Ezra, the Teacher of Righteousness is the recipient of understanding concerning these revelations about the end of times in 1QpHab. The Teacher does not embark on an otherworldly journey nor does he receive a detailed description of direct contact with God, though this may be argued. Instead, the one thing that can hardly be contended is the Teacher’s quality of divine exegesis and esoteric understanding. This method of interpretation shows significant continuity with the exegetical performance of Ezra.

Ezra demonstrates qualities that make him a priest, leader, interpreter of the law, and prophet. The character was well-received and highly regarded at the time of the Qumran community and thus would have made an attractive leadership figure for the sect. The many overlapping details between Ezra and the Teacher of Righteousness, both explicit and implicit, provide ample evidence to the argument that the Teacher was fabricated around the narratives of Ezra. This is not to say that the Qumran figurehead does not demonstrate similarities with other biblical heroes. On the contrary, other figures such as Elijah or Samuel, who comprises the role of leader and priest, also strike various resemblances to the Teacher of Righteousness. This fact does not weaken the current argument proposed but instead strengthens the overarching theory which contends for a fictitious Teacher in the Qumran writings constructed on the basis of other biblical heroes. With the evidence provided above, this project proposes for an Ezra model around which the Teacher of Righteousness was produced.

223 Translation taken from Stone 1990: 34.
Conclusion

The embellishment of particular characters and the narratives that arise concerning these figures has been greatly considered to be the product of memory distortion and narrativization. This process is conducted for the purpose of influencing specific social aspects of the current era. In the case of Trumpeldor, his aggrandizement was meant to provide a figure of memory that would mold a new Israel and its individual members into a strong, independent people. On the other hand, the Teacher of Righteousness and his tradition were produced for similar sociological reasons. The Teacher constitutes a figure of memory for the Qumran group which would grant the sect authority to conjure new halakhic laws and legitimize the movement in the eyes of its members. For this to be done, it is argued that neither the Teacher of Righteousness nor his tradition must have had to have been historically accurate. For the narrativization of these figures to prove effective, they were substantially required to follow along the path set by previous memories of similar figures, both in terms of character and rhetoric.

The Teacher tradition was successfully produced by Qumran authors alongside the already well-established narratives and memory of biblical leaders in the past. In order for the new tradition to take hold of its recipients it had to converge with the rhetoric and overall picture of a leader that was in the minds of the Qumran members. It has been demonstrated that the Teacher tradition synchronizes well to the disposition about leadership roles as lawgivers, priests, and proponents of the righteous path in opposition to wickedness. The Teacher tradition, the narratives about the experiences of
the Teacher of Righteousness, thus parallels the expected events to take place in the lifetime of an iconic leadership figure.

Finally, this chapter has sought to argue for an Ezra model by which the figure of the Teacher of Righteousness was imagined by the Qumran community. It is important to recognize that this is not necessarily connected to the Teacher tradition, which constitutes the experiential stories concerning the Qumran figurehead, but rather the overall qualities and position employed by the Teacher of Righteousness among the sectarians. By drawing significant parallels between the characters of Ezra and the Teacher of Righteousness, this project has argued that the invention of the Qumran leader was highly influenced by this well renowned figure from the Persian era. The need for a leadership figure such as Moses, Ezra, Elijah, Samuel, the prophets, and more, drove the Qumran community into conjuring its own forerunner in order to form for itself an identity as a community following the history projected in the Hebrew Bible.
Chapter Four

The Prototypical Teacher

This project has paid a significant amount of attention to the role of the Teacher of Righteousness in chapter two. It was concluded based on the description of the Teacher in the Dead Sea Scrolls that this figure was comprised of a complex multi-layered personality. Some of the qualities discussed portrayed the Qumran figurehead to take on various roles of high-esteem: that of a priest, prophet, founder, suffering servant, and eschatological figure. However, in the following chapter, the emphasis of this project was to deconstruct the figure of the Teacher of Righteousness and propose an invented character who demonstrated these many features because of his being molded around the model of other biblical narratives. Therefore, the question as to the real sociological role of the Teacher remains a question to be answered.

Chapter two concluded with the remark that the Teacher of Righteousness constituted the prototypical member who, as Jokiranta argues, accentuates the distinguishing characteristics of the in-group over and against the out-group.224 This, I agree, is the best understanding for the role of the Teacher and his tradition in the Dead Sea Scrolls, as it provides the lens necessary for discerning an immense contribution in the memory of the figure irrespective historical validity, in my opinion, for its character or stories. According to Jokiranta, a group’s prototype is “the best (theoretical) representative of the group, which maximizes the out-group differences and minimizes the in-group differences with reference to the dimensions which are held to correlate with

224 Jokiranta 2013: 175-177
the group categorization.” The Teacher, as I have argued, is not an historical figure whose persona naturally reflected the Qumran group but rather one who demonstrates many variant qualities because they have been convoluted into his character by the community who viewed themselves as characterized by them.

The Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran scrolls also did more than embody the prototypical Qumran member. His multi-faceted character and the development of the Teacher tradition were an attempt to also manufacture the prototypical Second Temple leader. This leader would be capable of producing and validating new laws under the provision of God; lead a righteous community with a high moral standard as a High Priest would; stand opposed to corrupt leadership and, in fact, Jerusalem itself; and filter the authority of God onto his followers. Recognized and presented by the Qumran movement as this leader par excellence, the authority that the Teacher of Righteousness demonstrated was not exclusive to the figure but rather fell to the entire Qumran group. Garcia Martinez has demonstrated excellently the way the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls conferred onto themselves the authority to introduce their own laws because of the Teacher of Righteousness, even well after the time of his passing.226 As Garcia Martinez notes,

…the “voice of the Teacher” as an authority-conferring strategy is not limited to the activity of the historical Teacher of Righteousness, the one who represented it eminently, but that it was “institutionalized” within the

---

225 Jokiranta 2013: 176
226 Ulfgard (1998: 318) writes that the Qumran authors’ reference to the “voice of the Teacher” is an indication that the author is aware that the Teacher of Righteousness has been dead for some time. The author is also acknowledging that the people to whom he is writing have never had the opportunity to meet the Teacher nor the chance to listen to him personally. At the time of the authorship of the scrolls it is the voice to which the community should direct their allegiance and, I argue, from which they will garner their authority.
groups that took their inspiration from this figure and became the channel of continuous revelation at the end of times.\textsuperscript{227}

The Teacher of Righteousness was thus a figure who not only benefited the group but was needed in order to grant legitimacy to the movement and the authority to propose laws it sought to argue against Jerusalem and its leadership. Brooke has argued,

\begin{quote}
The ability of the Teacher to act in many roles, even simultaneously, may have been how he functioned as a figure who could hold a diversity of people together as for various reasons they came to align themselves with the movement that was emerging as one amongst several responses to the new circumstances of the second century B.C.E.\textsuperscript{228}
\end{quote}

The binding characteristic of the figure of the Teacher of Righteousness coupled with its authority conferring personality and its tradition based on past biblical heroes gives credence to the conclusion that the figure was a necessity for the second century offshoot group to survive and prosper. The prototypical nature of the Teacher was meant to instill into its community a worldview that claimed for the Qumran movement to be a unique group preserved by God with the true covenant. Jokiranta argues, “In the Pesher Psalms and the Pesher Habakkuk, the prototypical image of the teacher in conflict makes a statement from the past: all the leaders of the Jerusalem establishment as well as rival authorities were wicked; a distinct community was needed.”\textsuperscript{229} In sum, the value and meaning group members attach to their community is regularly related to one’s perception of group origins or past history.\textsuperscript{230} The prototypical Teacher of Righteousness and the Teacher tradition significantly improved the value ascribed to being a part of the Qumran movement and the overall validity of the claims made by it. The fabrication of a

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{227} Garcia Martinez 2010: 235
\textsuperscript{228} Brooke 2010: 49
\textsuperscript{229} Jokiranta 2013: 206
\textsuperscript{230} Jokiranta 2013: 205
\end{footnotesize}
past Teacher who was so well aligned with members’ memory of biblical leaders was necessary and successful for keeping together the group that settled at Qumran.

The Imagined Teacher of Righteousness

This final section will directly address the question as to why the Qumran community felt the necessity to imagine the figure of the Teacher of Righteousness and what benefits this had for the sect. One of the more commonly noted aspects to the way the sectarians viewed themselves in the scrolls is that they imagined their group as continuous with Israel and, as Brooke notes, “an Israel with a renewed covenant.” Brooke goes on to further expound upon this point and states, “At another level it seems as if… their self-perception as a cultic community caused them to speak of themselves as the representation of scriptural ideals themselves.”

Scriptural ideals and, in fact, much of identity have a long history of being represented by prototypical figures from the past. Hendel writes, for example, that the memory of Abraham functioned “to articulate Israelite identity, to motivate the remembering agent to take appropriate actions, to give solace, and to activate social, religious, or political ideals.” The Qumran community remembered the impactful and even necessary position that prophets and leaders held among their respective communities represented by the history of the Hebrew Bible. The sectarians required a similar figure in their founding to hold their group together with a common identity, console the group through doubt, and, most importantly, validate their efforts on the path to righteousness. As a community that stood apart from the rest of

231 Brooke 2010: 51
232 Hendel 2005: 31
Second Temple Jerusalem and mainstream Judaism, the Qumran movement required a figurehead not unlike the past biblical models to raise the value of their cause.

Each characteristic of the Teacher described in chapter two holds a significant sociological function for molding the ethos of the Qumran community. Of specific interest for this work is the authority-conferring status of the leadership figure, mentioned also above. Stuckenbruck writes that in composing the *pesharim* and presenting new biblical interpretations, the authors from Qumran were appropriating onto themselves the authority of the Teacher of Righteousness. He goes on to write that “For the community, the appropriate memory of him (the Teacher) is through *mimesis* of the authority which he claimed.” The Teacher never held any direct contact with the group of exiles who settled at Khirbet Qumran. In fact, it is rightly assumed that the members in the community only knew about the Teacher’s existence and position in their earlier movement through the vehicle of narrative, both oral and by what is present in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Yet what is of the utmost importance for the Qumran community is the authority that this figure grants in order to allow for the sectarian to propose new laws, stand apart from Jerusalem, and maintain their title as ‘sons of light’ against the outsider ‘sons of darkness’.

The figure of the Teacher of Righteousness is therefore a necessary medium through which the Qumran members can present themselves as both righteous and valid.

The Teacher’s opposition with the Wicked Priest, regularly identified as the High Priest

---


234 Stuckenbruck 2007: 84
of Jerusalem at the time of the community, lays the foundation for the movement’s rationalization and validation in separating itself from Jerusalem and its laws. Having perceived the situation of their cultural environment to have faltered, the Qumran movement’s remonstration against their surrounding world took form in the Teacher of Righteousness. The Teacher tradition and its character thus provided a tool by which to reproach Second Temple Jerusalem through an authority reminiscent of God’s former prophets and, at the same time, elevate the community’s status and appeal amongst and against its social milieu.

Synopsis

Through the course of this thesis we have deconstructed the figure of the Teacher of Righteousness in the sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls in order to identify its characteristics, present its many scholarly identifications, argue for an invented tradition and ultimately an invented character altogether. This has been done with a goal to problematize the widely held notion that the Teacher must account for an historical person and must be studied as one. This figure, I have argued, is clearly much more complex than previously understood and the narratives constructed in the scrolls concerning the epithet demonstrate many influences from the social world of the Qumran authors and the Hebrew Bible. In this section I will go about summarizing the efforts of this thesis before offering my final conclusion.

To begin, this project has grounded its methodological underpinnings in the theory of collective memory. This has been done in order to view the Dead Sea Scrolls as
a whole not factually accurate but inspired by many socio-cultural and historical factors at the time of their conception. The theory provides a tool conducive to the current argument’s proposal for a fictitious Teacher of Righteousness and fabricated Teacher tradition. This perspective has been similarly applied to other scriptural texts to look to deconstruct other characters such as Jesus. For example, Allison has applied the theory of collective memory to the Gospels in order to read into the person of Jesus and the influence of his narratives on the early Christians. In applying this theory, Allison states that the events depicted in the Gospels are “best classified as ‘possibly authentic’ or, if one prefers, ‘possibly not authentic.’” He similarly opens to debate the historicity of the Jesus narratives and the motivation for their codification in the Gospels. Allison proposes the possibility that “Maybe Matthew and the other evangelists wanted to set forth the foundational stories of the Christians and, to accomplish this end, deliberately imitated the Pentateuch, Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, which preserve the foundational stories of Israel.” Likewise, the argument in this thesis states that the Qumran group wished to lay down its foundational story with a divinely ordained prophetic priest. In so doing, the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls deliberately manufactured their past figurehead around the stories of other biblical heroes through which the Qumran exiles structured their history.

It is important to note, though, that while modern scholars can reflect on these accounts of memory as not having been an accurate portrayal of the community’s experiential reality, one should not impose this reading onto the contemporaries of the movement who subscribed to this collective memory. The effectiveness of memory takes

235 Allison 2010: 436
236 Allison 2010: 443
its place in its being able to conduct itself imperceptibly. The group that shared this collective memory and shaped its identity around it was likely to have believed deeply in the memory produced and perpetuated. Allison again provides information pertinent to our study when he proclaims:

Despite our modern judgments, it is quite possible that the Synoptic evangelists, who knew nothing of modern critical history and little or nothing about Greek historiography, believed most or even all of the spectacular stories that they narrated – just as Augustine, Gregory of Tours, Gregory the Great, and Bede, who did not distinguish between historiography and hagiography, believed the miracle stories they recounted.237

Therefore, the proposition of this paper to read the scrolls as memory and consequently spurious does not apply to the way they were perceived by the members at Qumran who produced, read, and re-read this material.

Scholarship has been largely concerned with the historical reconstruction of the Teacher of Righteousness. This line of study has been significantly occluded by the lack of evidence available in the Dead Sea Scrolls concerning the historical Teacher. There is absolutely no genealogical evidence to suggest an historical understanding of this figure in the Qumran writings. Also, other historians of the Second Temple period such as Josephus make no reference to this character despite his overwhelming prominence in the scrolls community. These peculiarities have left scholarship with the goal of reconstructing an historical Teacher based on the qualities and narratives presented in the scrolls in juxtaposition with other characters from the second century BCE. However, the scrolls cast the Teacher of Righteousness in several lights that have proved difficult to

237 Allison 2010: 457
match to a single persona. Research has thus gone about cherry picking single features of the Teacher and matching them to a plethora of other known individuals. Scholarship has produced a vast array of results for the figure’s identification with no definitive conclusion to be found. It is argued that the continued insistence on reconstructing an historical Teacher of Righteousness is remiss of the greater understanding that the narratives of this figure had on the community irrespective any historical accuracy.

In opposition to this discourse, this project has argued for a new reading of the historical narratives about the Teacher of Righteousness as a Teacher tradition. In doing so, I argue that the experiential stories concerning the Teacher would no longer carry the label of objective reality. This would open further scholarly research to recognize the embellishment of the Teacher of Righteousness and ask a significant sociological question about the figure’s narrative: why did the Qumran community wish to remember this particular story as significant? This project has argued that the Teacher tradition is reflective of the community’s self-understanding and grants the legitimizing power to maintain the sectarian identity at Qumran. Moreover, the Teacher tradition largely represents the way in which one was supposed to talk about a figure of leadership in the Second Temple milieu. Invented traditions have been demonstrated to parallel the structural conventions of their particular epoch. Through our investigation it has been demonstrated that the Teacher tradition held strong continuity with Qumran’s memory of prophetic figures and their narratives.

The Teacher tradition was a necessary product for the community’s refutation of the corrupted people and establishment of Jerusalem. Assman has noted that when a tradition breaks and falters, a community will go about establishing for itself a new
tradition to demarcate itself and develop a positive identity.\textsuperscript{238} It has been demonstrated and is widely acknowledged that the Qumran movement envisioned Jerusalem to have gone astray and chose to live in the wilderness in order to ‘walk in perfection.’ The movement was then challenged with the task of creating itself a tradition and, remembering that past biblical groups were largely led by a prophetic forerunner, this need culminated in the production of the Teacher tradition. Ulfgard comments on the community’s emphasis on establishing the Teacher’s role with the following: “His role for the community is emphasized by recounting events in which he was involved and by describing important characteristics of his personality. All this serves to highlight his authority and legitimacy as God’s instrument.”\textsuperscript{239} The Teacher tradition thus develops the divine position of the Teacher of Righteousness and conversely accentuates the Qumran movement as not just legitimate, but the only correct path.

According to Jokiranta, “a group that bases its teaching on new revelation is vulnerable: it needs to create continuity with the past as well as to argue for the relevance of the new teachings.”\textsuperscript{240} The community authoring the Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran did so by developing a leadership figure identical in many respects to past authoritative figures such as Moses and Ezra. The figure of the Teacher of Righteousness credited its legitimacy to its striking resemblance to well-renowned figures already established in the memory of Second Temple Jews. The Teacher and his tradition were therefore efficient in their transmission because they provided a mnemonic device that spurred the memories of past biblical groups and leaders.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{238} Assman 2006: 68-70
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\end{itemize}
Conclusion

In concluding, our argument brings us full circle to the assumption that launched this current investigation. The historicity of the Teacher of Righteousness has been held among scholarship as a truism with no prominent contention. It is even referred to as the one consensus that has been reached among Qumran scholarship concerning this mysterious figure. In fact, Jokiranta, who provides a collective memory reading of the scrolls and the Teacher of Righteousness, identifies four types of theoretical approaches to the Qumran figurehead: (1) there was a unique Teacher at the beginning of the movement; (2) there was a unique Teacher late/later in the history of the movement; (3) there was an early individual who was seen as a unique Teacher later in the history of the movement; and (4) there was no one unique Teacher in the movement but a host of Teachers.\textsuperscript{241} Jokiranta even goes on to offer a fifth theoretical scenario in which the community idolized and applied to itself an external person’s teachings.\textsuperscript{242} In this situation the community conferred to itself the teachings of an external figure with whom they have never had contact nor history. However, even in Jokiranta’s attempt to offer all theoretical possibilities, the idea of an imagined Teacher is unfathomed. It is the argument of this thesis that the general consensus which contends for an historical Teacher of Righteousness is remiss the greater appreciation of the narratives concerning this character and detrimental to understanding the light in which the Qumran community wished to cast itself.

\textsuperscript{241} Jokiranta 2013: 194-213
\textsuperscript{242} Jokiranta 2013: 201-202
Historiography has been seen to inhabit a complex range of ideas in the ancient world and in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Articulating and scripting history, understood in this work as memory, is a product of interpretation, imagination, and re-presentation. Lapin hints that much of the history displayed in the Qumran scrolls must be read carefully to account for invention. He argues:

Groups create histories for themselves and in doing so can cobble together into a single tradition elements of a more fragmented and disparate past, or in fact invent a past altogether. … with the Qumran sectarians, we must allow for the possibility that the group created an identity for itself by placing itself in relationship to the myth of terrestrial corruption of 1 Enoch and Jubilees.243 Davila refers to this recounting of history which might have happened but did not as “alternate” or “counterfactual” history.244 It has been a growing consensus in the field of Qumran studies that much of the history one finds in the corpus of the Dead Sea Scrolls is in fact fake memory. However, an investigation into the figure of the Teacher of Righteousness as a part of the community’s fake history remains lacking in the field.

This study has attempted to problematize the historicity of the figure of the Teacher of Righteousness. Furthermore, this thesis has sought to propose an understanding of this character as a means for legitimizing the movement and granting the authority necessary to propose new interpretations of biblical texts. This figure “represents the idea of particularism that the group needed and needs to stand for: that God has preserved his covenant in this group (or these groups) only.”245 This function, I

243 Lapin 2010: 124
245 Jokiranta 2013: 206
posit, is a necessity for the Qumran sect that wishes to thrive over and against the rest of Jerusalem and the Wicked Priest. The Teacher of Righteousness and the Teacher tradition pervasive throughout the Damascus Document and the *pesharim* display a figure who exemplifies the qualities inherent in a perfect biblical leader and function to encapsulate the Qumran movement while also both creating and maintaining a common group identity and memory.
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