

James the Just as Righteous Teacher

To analyse whether James the Just, "the just one" as he was called, can possibly be considered in the role of righteous teacher, we must first analyse some questions surrounding the Qumran community as a whole and how they conceived of themselves. It is perhaps safe to say that since the appearance of the scrolls some thirty years ago, scholarly research has confused many of the most difficult issues and not clarified them. To be convinced of this one has only to look at some of the research done on Solomon Schechter's original find of the Damascus Document in the Cairo Geniza some seventy-five years ago. Perhaps a clearer analysis of that document was done then by Charles and others than one can find now.¹ The old adage that too many cooks spoil the broth, or perhaps muddy up its waters, is perhaps appropriate here. This may well apply to the writer's own efforts; but with this in mind, let us proceed.

Much misunderstanding has developed around the meaning of the term, "Zadok". What does it apply to? Is it a proper noun? Is it a title? Who are the Zadokites, the proverbial "sons of Zadok"? In the innumerable solutions proposed to this problem, the original relationship of the term to Sadducee or Zadduki has all but dropped out.² This was not the case in the early period of the Christian church and among some Talmudic writings, where it is not at all clear when Sadducee is being used, whether what is being referred to is an upper-class Jerusalem hierarchy of the sort described by Josephus and the New Testament, or an apocalyptic fringe group outside the ruling establishment altogether.³ The same is true of the Karaites in the Middle Ages, who were known both among themselves and to outsiders as "Sadducees", the implication being they were new or neo-Sadducees of these latter days.⁴ Few have doubted that the influence of some Dead Sea Scroll material can be found in

their writings, either that newly appeared in the ninth century or that preserved in some undetermined way as in the Cairo Geniza over the intervening centuries. Here again, the confusion between Zadokite and Sadducee persisted, as well it might be expected to.

Perhaps the only real determining distinction between the Qumran covenanters and the Sadducee party, as described by Josephus and others, was the emphasis by the former on some form of eternal reward (the question of resurrection of the dead apart), as well as their stress on and employment of an esoteric interpretation of scripture. The first-mentioned is the same aspect that is stressed in the New Testament as the characteristic that distinguishes both Pharisees and Christians from Sadducees.⁵ In addition, it has not been lost on commentators that the New Testament employs a kind of esoteric interpretation of scripture similar to that in use among the covenanters, and which is not altogether lacking in Rabbinic literature either.⁶

But who is Zadok? If it is a category or term, what does it refer to? It has been held, particularly in the early days of Qumran research, that Zadok referred to the family of high priests that took over the service at the Temple in David's time — in other words, a euphemism for the original Jerusalem priest line and this has been widely accepted as an adequate understanding of the term.⁷ Though in an esoteric way, this may be some of the thrust of the term desired by the sectaries, it is not the complete sense in which they use it even in their own literature. Two of the most relevant documents in relation to the problem among the numerous materials of the sect are the Zadokite Document and the Community Rule. In the Zadokite Document, reference is specifically made to the appropriate passage in Ezekiel (44: 15), to which the term clearly refers and from which it derives. There are other passages in Ezekiel which bear the same connotation, and the context is the ideal or reconstructed Temple,

er the Temple of the last days, which Ezekiel is so intent upon measuring. "The priests and the levites and the sons of Zadok that kept the charge of My sanctuary when the children of Israel went astray from Me, these it is that shall offer unto Me the fat and the blood."⁸ Here the esoteric exegesis is that the "priests" are those who "repented" or "converted" and departed from the land of Judah. The "levites" are those who joined them, and the "sons of Zadok" are the elect of Israel, chosen in some predestined manner, who will go on functioning or stand at the end of days. One immediately sees that according to the presentation of the Zadokite Document, priests are not necessarily priests in the ordinary sense of the word. They can be, and then again they may not be. The same holds for levites. The sons of Zadok are the very elect of the community itself, predestined and almost, as it were, pre-existent, and it is nowhere stated that they must be priestly in the ordinary sense of the word. They may be, and then again, they may not be.

In the Community Rule, on the other hand, the terms priest and levite appear to be used in a more conventional manner, though there is no guarantee of this. Still, the "sons of Zadok" are defined as "the priests who keep the Covenant", under whose authority those who separate themselves (probably out in the wilderness) place themselves.⁹ Keeping the covenant is not a genealogical definition, but rather a qualitative one. Though there is nothing to rule out the possibility here that such priests are actually descended from the Zadok of David's time, neither is this stated as the origin of the term. It is possible we are dealing with a contradiction, or at least an inconsistency, between the two documents on the priestly requirements of the sons of Zadok. Perhaps one merely complements the other; but whatever is being stated, it seems very clear that the common element that makes an individual a son of Zadok is his perfect righteousness. Particularly in the Community

Rule, the sons of Zadok are "righteous priests" par excellence, those who have separated themselves from falsehood and keep the law or covenant. Again, this is qualitative and may or may not be genealogical. They are defined as "the keepers of the covenant and seekers of his will", i.e., the "sons of light" in the jargon of the community. Often, too, they are simply referred to as the "sons of righteousness", i. e., the "sons of zedek", not Zadok.

Here I think is the crux of the matter. Our sect is very enamored with word play and double entendres. For instance, they seem to enjoy referring to the Pharisees as "seekers after halakot" , not "seekers after halachot", i. e., seekers after "smooth things" ("smoothies" in modern parlance).¹⁰ They also refer to them, not as the builders of the fence around the Torah, but builders of the "rickety wall", although this identification is not at all certain. Zadok is not necessarily simply a proper noun having a specific reference in time and place, for instance, David's Zadok. On the contrary, as the sect uses it, the opposite is true. It is a euphemism, a play on words, and points to a related esoteric meaning to be expounded by a teacher. The esoteric meaning has something to do with ZDK, that is justice or righteousness. That is all that can be said with certainty. In other words, we are dealing here with the sons of zedek or the sons of Zadok or even the sons of the Zaddik interchangeably ("sons" to be sure to be taken figuratively, that is not necessarily lineal descendants, but rather "followers of"). The same Karaites who called themselves Sadducees in the Middle Ages also referred to themselves as Zaddikim, i. e., "righteous ones" or sons of or followers of the righteous one. The same no doubt applies here. Our sons of Zadok may also just as easily be considered "sons of the Zaddik" or the righteous ones, the sons of zedek. This may also point to the original sense of the word "Sadducee". The double "d" in the word in the Greek transliteration is particularly significant here. It is just as likely, perhaps even more likely, that such a usage refers to someone

who styled himself the zaddik or was styled the zaddik, as it does to the followers of Zadok, though the two might simply be synonymous.

The prophecies in the Book of Ezekiel concerning the building of the new or ideal Temple then are at the root of both the terminology, "Sadducee" and "Zadokite." The sons of Zadok according to Ezekiel are those righteous levites or priests who have not stumbled into falsehood, but have kept the covenant. They are then "the righteous" among the priests or levites, and Ezekiel himself clearly intends the double entendre that so appealed to the sectaries. This, too, may have been how the original returnees of the priestly aristocracy under Ezra saw themselves, a kind of righteous remnant, comprising not all priests, but only the zealous ones like Ezra himself. It is doubtful that this included the additional requirement of being an actual descendant of David's Zadok, a difficult relationship to prove even for Ezra, though on the other hand, it need not be completely ruled out. In this sense, too, the Maccabees are in a very real way "sons of Zadok". They, too, are righteous priests who keep the covenant while others are going astray and backsliding. This is to say nothing about the possible corruption of later generations of Zadokite or righteous priests, whether Sadducean or Maccabean. Indeed, the Maccabees, like the Christians to come, styled themselves after the manner of Melchi-zedek ("righteous king" or "king of righteousness", among other possible connotations) as priests of the Most High God.

In Maccabees I, Mattathias is commended for his zeal for slaying in the manner of Phineas, the archetypical "righteous" priest. It will be remembered that Phineas himself won the right to the high priesthood in perpetuity for his family by his zeal in killing backsliders. Simon the Just, or Simon the Zaddik, in the portrayal in Ecclesiasticus, is presented as another of these archetypical "righteous ones", not only as far as the Jerusalem priesthood is

concerned, but also as far as the temple at Heliopolis in Egypt is concerned. In some sense, it must be remembered, the Septuagint, containing books like Ecclesiasticus and Maccabees II, was probably connected with the latter. The idea, propounded by many early commentators on the scrolls, that the Maccabee family "usurped" the high priesthood from an old original "zadokite" line, testifies to an extremely simplistic and probably not very accurate understanding of the conceptions operative here. Just as Simon the Just in Ecclesiasticus based his claim and those of the genealogical line he represented on the "covenant of Phineas", so did the Maccabean family in its presentation of the zealous and righteous behaviour of Mattathias. Judas Maccabee is the avenging righteous priest par excellence. There is no question here of the usurpation of a high priesthood. On the contrary, Judas and his family, from a perfectly good priestly line (even if perhaps not descended from the original Zadok), earn their right to the high priesthood by their zealous behaviour in protecting the community from pollution and idolatry. They are in a true sense the shields of the community, atoning by their perfect righteousness for the sins of the community as a whole. In this sense, they are also perfectly good "Saducees". One is not discussing here the question of the corruption of future generations, which is the inevitable concomitant to holding power, only their prerogatives to such power, confirmed in the Maccabee books and by the Hanukkah festival they institute (i. e., a new feast of booths for a new dedication). The priesthood descended from Simeon II in Egypt evidently also made similar claims for itself, but there is very little indication that they were intrinsically hostile to the Maccabees. On the contrary, they seem to have had parallel notions, though some friction was no doubt inevitable, and the temple in Egypt seems to have continued as a hotbed of zealot activity even after its closing following the dismantlement of the Jerusalem Temple.

This, too, is clearly the root of the term, "priesthood after the order of Melchi-zedek." Once again, we are dealing with a play on the words, Melchi-zedek, king of righteousness or righteous king, and the term plays on the related phrase, merch-zedek, just as we have already seen the euphemism, "sons of zedek", plays on the signification and is a variation of, "sons of Zadok". It is a righteous priesthood after the order of a righteous king, perhaps God or his vicegerent, on earth forever. The use of this term in Psalm 110 very clearly reflects this usage; and because of this, is very possibly a Maccabean psalm, though it can just as easily date from an earlier, more obscure period, when similar thinking was in vogue. That merch-zedek has a priestly implication similar to Melchi-zedek is confirmed for us in the Commentary on Psalm 37.¹⁹ In the same way that in the Zadokite Document the term, "sons of Zadok", does not literally refer to lineal descendants of Zadok, but to those elect or righteous ones who have separated themselves from iniquity either in order to prepare the way for the last days; so too in an earlier usage, the Zadokite (or Sadducean) priesthood did not necessarily represent lineal descendants of David's Zadok, but just as likely a play on the words, righteous or righteousness, i. e., those priests or sons of Zadok who had earned the priesthood by their zeal in protecting the community from pollution and corruption.

This, too, is the usage made of the term Melchi-zedek in the so-called "Last Jubilee" sermon from Qumran. Melchi-zedek is expressly identified as the priest of the Most High God, and the same play on the word, "righteousness", in referring to members of the community and linking this up with the favors vouchsafed to those following this view of the priesthood is evident throughout. In this text the priesthood is seemingly extended to all members of the seed of Abraham, the clear prerequisite being their zealousness or righteousness. Despite problems in translation and reconstruction, there is ample indication that the community conceives of itself here, too, just as much

in terms of being "sons of zedek", righteousness, as they do, "sons of Zadok". This line of thought, extending priestly prerogatives to all members of the Covenant of Abraham, and linking this appointment to a Jerusalem priest, Melchi-zedek, is further developed in terms of its own polemical ends in the Letter to the Hebrews, chapters 5-7. It links the two communities, Christian and Zadokite, at least in terms of ideologies on this one point, whatever one may think of the origins of the letter itself. This conception is proposed, as everyone well knows, as the basis for the whole subsequent priesthood in Christianity, the only difference being the play on the word, righteousness, has dropped out in the Christian approach. That the usage appearing in Hebrews of a priesthood after the order of Melchi-zedek appears in a homiletic/exegetical text of the Qumran community²⁷ should not be underestimated. That the community saw itself, or at least certain of its members, as an "elect", and that this same elect is doubtlessly equally to be seen in terms of "sons of Zadok" or a priesthood of the sort of the Maccabean/Christian order of Melchi-zedek forever is indisputable according to their own texts. The conclusion is unavoidable once again that zedek and Zadok correspond in some way, and that Zadok is not to be taken according to a clear exoteric meaning, but esoterically.

This brings us to moreh ha-zedek, the teacher of righteousness or righteous teacher. Immediately, the parallel to the phrase, Melchi-zedek, and the play on the words, "son of Zadok", should not be missed. The moreh ha-zedek is perhaps the quintessential son of Zadok, i. e., the individual embodiment of what an ideal son of Zadok must be. Solving the problem of whether or not he is the founder of the sect or its ongoing leader is of little import for these purposes. He is a type and what he is the type of is the true son of Zadok. He is also, it should be noted, a zaddik, a righteous one or "just one", as all righteous teachers or teachers of righteousness must necessarily be. This is pointed up very clearly in the Commentaries on Psalm 37 and Habakkuk, where the correspondence is

directly and purposefully drawn between the usage zaddik in the text and righteous teacher. It should be noted too, that in an unpointed Hebrew text the difference between the words, zaddik and Zadok, is only a half-stroke of the pen.²³ For these purposes too, the interchangeability of the terminology, Sadducee and Zaddikin, when referring to the Karaites, should not be forgotten.²⁴ Another group, too, the Elkasaite, who seem to have been absorbed into the Karaites, but also have links, interestingly enough, to the Mandaean followers of John the Baptist, appear to have derived their name from one called, "the zaddik", and provide an additional link between the words, Zadok and zaddik. Two such "righteous ones" emerge in the history of the period from 200 B. C. to 100 A. D., that is Simeon the Just, the epitome, as we have said, of what a proper Zadduki was thought to be both in Jerusalem and Alexandria, portrayed in Ecclesiasticus as resplendent in his priestly robes doing penance on behalf of the entire people on Yom Kippur; and James the Just, the brother of Jesus, i. e., James the righteous one, James the Zaddik.

James has received some attention from scholars, but not nearly the amount he warrants. He has been mentioned in passing when attempts were made to identify the righteous teacher, and J. Teicher in the early years after the discovery of the scrolls did propose a Jewish-Christian or Ebionite origin for them, a group which held the memory of James in high esteem. James, one must unfortunately point out, has been almost systematically ignored by modern Christian scholarship, but not interestingly enough by the early Church fathers, from whom most of our material comes concerning him, credible or not. What is probably being proposed in the end by this paper is that the scrolls do not emanate from a Jewish-Christian environment, as Teicher put it, but actually are "Christian" in the sense the word had to have in the Palestine of this time. In other words, the scrolls are not the work of a later sectarian group of Christians, but rather they are the work of the early Christian community itself and the Jerusalem Church led by James. Our problem in recognizing

this is that we do not have an adequate understanding of early Christianity and tend to mean by Christian what the early Church fathers and authors of the Gospels wanted us to mean by it, without realizing that this was not at all Christianity from the 30's to the 60's of the present era in Palestine. A good example of this paradox is the Book of Revelation in the New Testament. For the ordinary Christian, it is a very difficult book to come to grips with because of its violence, spirit of vengeance, and blatant power lust. And yet this is perhaps one of the most "Christian" of all the early documents of the Church, at least from the point-of-view of Palestinian Christianity (though it is presented in a Hellenistic setting). A comparison of this book with the Manual of Discipline, the War Scroll, and some of the interpretive texts of Qumran is edifying in this regard, but beyond the scope of this paper. This same inability to come to grips with the atmosphere in Palestine prior to the fall of the Temple and just afterwards, stemming from an almost religious addiction to Josephus' ploys, has led many scholars to emphasize the metaphoric quality of the War Scroll (as if the war in question were only imaginary) and the fanciful character of the Copper Scroll (as if people would go to such painstaking efforts for the sake of practical joking).

James was the head of the Jerusalem Church until A. D. 62. In power, position, and prestige he quite clearly ranked above Peter, Paul, John, and others, however unlike most of these, we have direct testimony concerning him from sources outside the New Testament. He seems to have been a very popular anti-establishment leader. It has always struck the writer as somewhat absurd, when dealing with a literature as substantial as the scrolls and a cultural center of the proportions of that which has been uncovered at Qumran, to look for unknown or inconsequential persons when attempting to make identifications. To think that the center at Qumran and probably another in the region

of Damascus not far from Gaulanitis and the Galilee did not exert a powerful influence on any ascetics or voluntary exiles taking to these inhospitable regions (and there were quite a few) is not very realistic. This includes the movement either founded or headed by John the Baptist. Contrary to popular opinion, we know very much about the period in question, when all sources are reckoned up, probably as much as almost any other medieval or ancient period of history. There are very few characters or movements that have not come to our attention in one way or another. Not only is the position of James affirmed for us by Paul's letters and Luke's Acts, with some attempts characteristic of the latter author to obscure or diminish it; it is also discernible in the Gospels, even as we have them, if we read carefully enough, though here too editors have taken great pains to reduce and confuse the position of Jesus' family in the development of early Christianity. In the last-named documents, they have not, it should be noted, succeeded in removing the members of Jesus' family altogether, whatever the embarrassment they present, because they could not. James is also confirmed for us by Josephus, as is his popularity, and depending on him and their own sources, by the Church fathers. He also plays a prominent role in the apocryphal literature emanating from Ebionite and gnostic sources.

James was a zaddik, or the Zaddik, a term we have already shown to be linked in some way in the exegesis of the scrolls with the notion of a "righteous teacher" and the essence of what had to be implied by such phraseology. Eusebius, following Hegesippus, tells us he was so pious that the flesh on his knees came to resemble camel's hide because of the supplication and prayer he continually performed on them on behalf of the people in the Temple. The mention of prayer here is significant because of the suggestion in the

scrolls of disapproval of sacrifice, no doubt because it was presided over by what was considered by the covenanters and others to be an impure and corrupt priesthood. Though this led to a stress on other methods of attaining remission of sins like baptism, lustration, and prayer, it does not imply a disapproval of the location and existence of the Temple per se. On the contrary. The same can be said of Jesus' activities in the New Testament, which despite his reported utterances, seem always to gravitate towards the Temple. Even more explicitly it characterizes James' religious activities, which are always completely focused on the Temple milieu. There is also some indication that he was a life-long nazirite in the manner of Samuel (also a priest) and perhaps too, John the Baptist (probably priestly as well), not to mention Elijah.

Here, significantly, Eusebius provides the tantalizing information that James entered the Holy of Holies to do penance on behalf of the whole people. Epiphanius embellishes this with the startling additional notice that he wore the mantle of the high priest and entered the Holy of Holies alone on Yom Kippur to make this atonement in the name of the people, which indeed he would be entitled to do were he high priest. ** Until the discovery of the scrolls, it has not been possible to understand what these two Church fathers may have been trying to communicate in their garbled, though complementary, presentations of what has to be considered extremely important information if it is true. This information has been dismissed, not surprisingly, by numerous critics as the product of overly active, romantic imaginations, even though many of these same people entertain with equanimity New Testament material relating to empty tombs, resurrections, miraculous cures, and virgin births. Still, given the clear theological underpinnings of the Church fathers, it is very difficult to understand how they could have managed to concoct or dream up such fantasies without some basis for them in tradition. Fortunately, with the material now at our disposal in the scrolls, it is possible to make some sense of

these claims, even if they are not true, and it is hoped that with the coming publication of the Temple Scroll further light will be shed on them. By some, James has been called "the pope of Ebionite fantasy". The problem is, however, this material has come down to us through the testimony of orthodox Church fathers, not fanatic sectarians.

If James did carry out such a function, i. e., that of a righteous or "Zadokite" priest (according to our exposition of the term), even if only at the end of the period of the 'last days', some 30 to 40 years after Jesus' death, then some relationship between a group claiming their rights as an opposition priesthood (i. e., "the sons of Zadok", a possible "priesthood after the order of Melchizedek", and their nominal leader, the moreh ha-zadok, waiting out in the wilderness for the purification of the Temple, even perhaps of animal sacrifice itself), and the early Christian community in Jerusalem is almost certain.

To further convince oneself of this, it must be remembered that even the final war against the Romans was begun by zealous priests (I avoid using the term "Zealot" because of its pejorative connotations) of the lower priesthood. When the Zealots finally did take over Jerusalem, almost the first thing they did was to eliminate the corrupt high priesthood and elect their own high priest by lot — a simple stone-cutter whose name, not surprisingly, turned out to be Phineas. Josephus, who has done more than any individual to obscure the religious foundations of the Zealot movement, rails against this man as being completely unworthy of the dignity of high priest in every way. So vitriolic is his condemnation, that there is some indication that he is not just reacting to his humble origins, but also very possibly the meanness of his blood. It will be remembered that 70 years before at the time of the Varus War, the people led by Judas the Galilean (and perhaps an individual referred to as Zadok) demanded among other things the same right to appoint their own high priest. This is the first time to our knowledge such a popular claim

was raised, and represents an obvious indictment of the priesthood then functioning.³⁸ That priesthood, which had been sponsored and appointed by Herod and his successors (the so-called "Herodians") after his destruction of the Maccabean family, was evidently deemed to be corrupt and illegitimate by the vast mass of the population. It should be noted that this is the Pharisaic/Sadducean priestly establishment so familiar to us from the Gospel portrait and contemptible alike to Christians, Zealots, Zadokites, and Baptists. The idea that the Maccabean priesthood was considered illegitimate by popular sentiment is just not supportable, as the widespread employment of Maccabean names clearly shows. The search then for righteous uncorrupt priests is a constant theme of 70 years of tumultuous history in Palestine coextensive with the birth of Christianity and quite possibly the material represented by the scrolls (all questions of other proposed datings aside). It should be remembered as well that one of the malaises triggering the final cessation of sacrifice on behalf of the Romans was the plundering by the incumbent high priests of the support tithes due to a more zealous and purity-conscious lower priest class.³⁹

When one considers James' title, the Zaddik, in the context of the preceding analysis concerning a priesthood after the order of Melchi-zedek (the only other one possessing such a title in this period was a high priest basing his appointment on the covenant with Phineas) so clearly running through Maccabean pretensions, the claims of the scrolls, and those of the early Christian Church (i. e., a "righteous priesthood" in contradistinction to the one sponsored by both Herodians and the Roman procurators and supported by both Pharisaic and Sadducean aristocracies); the possibility that James functioned as one such righteous "priest", at least in his followers' eyes, cannot be discounted. If Jesus was the high priest of the last times according to the theology presented in Hebrews, then why not James, his brother and successor, in the manner of an Islamic Khalifa? This totally sidesteps the question of whether Jesus or his brother possessed priestly blood (a possible messiah of Aaron and

Israel), which could never be resolved to everyone's satisfaction. From the analysis done above, it is sufficient to remember that both the scrolls and the early Christians do not appear to insist on priestly blood as a prerequisite for being a son of Zadok (or zedek) or a high priest of the last days.

The most reliable material concerning James' death is provided by Josephus in a famous passage in the Antiquities.⁴⁰ Ananus ben Ananus, a scion of the same family involved in the death of Jesus, took advantage of an interregnum in the Roman governorship to call a rump Sanhedrin and have James condemned on a charge of blasphemy. This charge of blasphemy can be made sense of in the context of James' life in a way that a similar charge levelled against Jesus according to Gospel accounts cannot. If, indeed, James went into the Inner Sanctum of the Temple on Yom Kippur as a kind of opposition high priest to make a proper righteous atonement for the sins of the people, which coming from the Zaddik could alone be considered efficacious; then it is possible to conceive of certain circles considering the pronunciation of the divine name in such circumstances blasphemous.⁴¹

From the relationship of these two individuals, James and Ananus, elements emerge which link up, however tenuously, with at least one righteous teacher and the wicked priest as presented in the Habbakuk Commentary. Not only this, but the very word, "zaddik", is used in at least three places in this Habbakuk text. The context is the struggle of the wicked vs. the righteous, e. g., "For the wicked encompasses the righteous" (1:4) and "the wicked swallows up one more righteous than he" (1:13) In both cases the direct esoteric correspondence that is drawn is to the righteous teacher and his struggle with the wicked priest and/or "the liar". It should be noted, too, that the historical backdrop to these events is the imminent invasion by the Kittim and the coming destruction of "the last priests of Jerusalem," whose riches will be swallowed up by the

army of the Kittin.

The writer does not think it is necessarily possible or required to make precise correspondences in data, as generally the material in the scrolls is by nature so esoteric as to defy it. Nor are we necessarily dealing with a single embodiment of the individual types in question. Still, the story of James' life, as we gingerly piece it together, when looked at in the framework of the Habbakuk Scroll, does provide some interesting correlations. In the trial of James the Just a wicked priest or "liar" did clearly flout the law in the presence of the whole congregation (Hab. 1:13). James did meet a tragic death at the hands of this same individual, and serious problems did very possibly arise between them in connection with Yom Kippur, leaving aside the exact nature of them (Hab. 2:15). This same priest, Ananus, did come to a brutal end not long after James' death, and his killers reviled his lifeless corpse and flung it without burial over the city wall (Hab. 2:7-8).⁴² This same individual was called by "the name of truth," at least by Josephus, who goes so far as to ascribe the fall of the city to the removal of his wise counsel and cite the fall of its first wall as an immediate retribution for his death (Hab. 2:5-6).⁴³ This priest fits the description in Habbakuk even better than Menahem's antagonist, Eleazar, who was only a Captain of the Temple (all questions of other possible identifications aside). In contradistinction to him, Ananus held the high priesthood on several occasions, and particularly during the lapse in Roman governors at the time of James' death and in the early days of the uprising against Rome, was powerful enough to actually rule in an independent fashion.⁴⁴

The "final times" were prolonged and were certainly thought to have exceeded anything the Prophets said, as far as Jewish or Gentile Christian doctrine was concerned (Hab. 2:3); and following the death of James, numerous people, including grown men, the aged, women, and children, were massacred by the

Romans, who took no pity even "on the fruit of the womb" (Hab. 1:17). The wicked priest of this analysis was paid the reward which he himself tendered to "the peer", and as he himself plotted the destruction of "the peer", so too was he destroyed (Hab. 2:17). One could go on and on in this vein, but perhaps to diminishing effect, since all such rehearsals are to a certain extent self-serving, as are their rebuttals. For the moment, I will restrict myself to answering two of the most likely of these last: how can you treat the Habbakuk Commentary as a witness to the events surrounding the fall of the Temple when archaeological evidence shows very conclusively that the monastery fell no later than the year 68 A. D? This is probably true, but just because the monastery fell in this year, does not obviate the possibility that some of its inhabitants returned to go on living in its ruins or remained living in the caves around (where they probably lived anyhow in periods of overcrowding.) The Monastery was probably some distance off the main road, as today, and once having reduced it, it is doubtful that the Romans would have left a garrison of any size, especially in the difficult years, 68-70 A. D. when the siege was on. What is more likely is that they simply destroyed it and then moved on to return again sometime later. It is certainly not the case that control of the Jericho road obviated the possibility of a return, as De Vaux, Cross, and others seem to think. Particularly if the inhabitants of the monastery were connected in any way with those people holding out on Masada, as archaeological finds made at the last-named location indicate, the ruins at Qumran would have been re-employed by irregulars as an observation post and an early-warning position for the more defensible Masada. As long as they refrained from harassing the road, which would have served no purpose, no Romans would have bothered them.

The second is, how can you deal with the references in the Commentary on Nahum, which seem to imply the material has a Maccabean ambiance? First of all, the material in the Commentary on Nahum is retrospective, because it refers to the coming of the Kittim (the Romans?) as an event that happened after the events being described, clearly those centering about the Demetrius—Alexander Jannaeus episode. Also, there is no reason to assume that the sectaries knew their history any less well than, for instance, Josephus. On the contrary. The whole point of the reference to Demetrius is to condemn the

Pharisees, or "seekers after smooth things", who cooperated with and brought foreigners into the city. It is distinctly pointed out in the commentary that they presently control the city, and "the sword of the gentiles will not depart" until the city goes to ruin and their synagogue is dispersed. The sectaries know their history very well. The period in which the Pharisees were prominent in the affairs of the city was from the Herodian to the Roman periods. This includes the priesthood as well, since there are Pharisee priests, of which Josephus is an excellent example. They know very well that it is the Pharisees, along with Sadducees like Ananus, who have always felt most comfortable under foreign rule, and this is the thrust of their historical allusion. The condemnation of crucifixion, not insignificantly, is a point made in passing.

The Commentary on Psalm 37 continues the link-up already noted in the Habbakuk Commentary. The language and atmosphere is the same throughout, including constant reference to "the poor" and "the elect", references which we are so familiar with in early Christianity, as well as in Ebionite terminology. Here, though, a slight shift is made, and the teacher of righteousness is identified with "the priest" (23-24). This motif is carried on into the next line, where in the very same manner as the Habbakuk Commentary, the wicked priest is portrayed as wishing to slay the righteous teacher: "The wicked watches out for the righteous (zaddik) and seeks to slay him" (32-3). The same precise correspondence is again drawn between the zaddik in the text and the righteous teacher. The wicked priest is then said to have laid hands on the righteous teacher, and is himself finally delivered up to the "violent of the nations". The latter proceed to execute judgement on his flesh, and it is certainly not unremarkable that Ananus is slain and mutilated by Idumaeans, who ran amuck in Jerusalem after being invited in by the Zealots. This presentation is

finally topped off with the information that "the Priest" (the righteous teacher) and the men of his council are arrested and tried by the wicked "of Ephraim and Manasseh" (the Sadducees and the Pharisees), who "afterwards... shall be delivered into the hand of the violent among the nations for judgement". This corresponds almost precisely with Josephus' testimony that James and some of his companions were arrested and brought before the Sanhedrin. The combining of "the Priest" with both the righteous teacher and the zaddik in the Psalm 37 Commentary probably does more to confirm the identification of James, as we have him portrayed by the early Church fathers, than any other evidence.

Concerning the notice in the Habbakuk Commentary that the wicked priest pursued the righteous teacher "to the house of his exile", there is material in the Pseudo-Clementine literature, relating to a flight after the debate on the Temple stairs with the Sadducees and Pharisees, particularly Caiaphas (the brother-in-law of Ananus). James is attacked in the midst of the disputation by a character clearly intended to be Paul, though he is referred to as "Simon" in the peculiar evasiveness of the Pseudo-Clementines. He is also labeled "the liar", and is represented throughout as the adversary of the group par excellence. James, who fell in a swoon, is carried away and with 5000 of his supporters flees to Jericho, where he manages to elude the pursuing Paul by going outside the city together with his followers to visit the sepulchres of two comrades, that miraculously "whiten" themselves every year. Of course, much of this is fanciful, and one does not take seriously the identification of the "spouter of lies" with Paul, but the fact that similar terminology is clearly in use in this literature is noteworthy. One does not wish to make too much of the locale, Jericho, but then one should not ignore it either, because as far as the scrolls are concerned it is important.

Not only do we have such references in the Pseudo-Clementine literature, based as they are probably on a lost "acts" of James, probably known as "The

Ascents of Jacob" after the debate on the Temple steps; one quotation in Eusebius, which appears to have come down through both Hegesippus and Clement of Alexandria, shows the exact same exegesis was in use among the supporters of James in passages of almost identical import. It was clearly the practice of his followers to search Scripture concerning the events of his life, and Eusebius tells us, they found mention of him among the prophets, i. e., "the prophets declare concerning him". The passage in question is from a favorite prophet of both sectaries and Christians, Isaiah, and again it relates to the events surrounding the death of James and his destruction by the "wicked", i. e., the wicked priest. In doing so, it parallels in language and sense the passages from Habbakuk and Psalm 37 we have already seen applied to the fate of the righteous teacher, including the use of the word, "zaddik", and its application to the suffering just one: "Woe to their souls for they have devised evil counsel against themselves saying...'Let us take away the righteous (zaddik), because he is offensive to us.' Therefore they shall eat the fruit of their doings. Woe to the wicked. Evil shall be upon him according to the works of his hands " (Is. 3:10) It should also be noticed that the ambiance is one of the imminent destruction of Judah and Jerusalem, which exactly parallels that of Habbakuk. Isaiah 3:1 reads, "Behold now the Lord of Hosts is taking away from Jerusalem and Judah support of every kind," and 3:8 reads, "...Jerusalem is ruined and Judea has fallen, since their words and deeds affront the Lord, insulting his glory." The only difference is that Eusebius employs the Septuagint reading of the passage rather than the Massoretic (here the Isaiah Scroll agrees with the Massoretic), but aside from a small shift in signification, the use of the term, zaddik, and the central thrust, contrasting the righteous with the wicked in the context of the imminent downfall of Jerusalem, is common to both. The use of the term zaddik in

both Isaiah and Habbakuk, and its application to both James and the righteous teacher in such similar contexts is so striking as to be very persuasive. When taken together with the other parallels we have been noting, the evidence becomes extremely heavy. But what can be considered "persuasive" among scholars in relation to such identifications? If we can show an individual the facts of whose life and position fit comfortably with descriptions as we have them, surnamed in such a revealing manner, and concerning whose name such equivalent exegesis was done, would this be considered sufficient? Probably not, but then the challenge must be returned, that so far identifications concerning alternative candidates have stood on flimsier material.

Besides "the Zaddik", which as we have shown provides one of the most fertile fields imaginable for esotericists, Eusebius clearly intends us to understand that James was known by another epithet culled from Scripture, 'Oz le-
'Am, the "Protection", shield, or strength of the People. ⁴⁹ As Eusebius presents it, James was so popular among the people, that he was surnamed in an honorific way, "ablias", i. e., "protection of the people". I have only been able to find this usage in two psalms, but doubtlessly it is to be found elsewhere as well. The context of both usages, however, is interesting. The first in Psalm 68 comes among such phrases as: "Sing to God that rides on the heaven of heaven... his power is in the clouds," not to mention its proximity to Psalm 69 a favorite source of Gospel material. ⁵⁰ The second is Psalm 77 and comes before the phrase, "Thou has with thine arm redeemed thy people, the sons of Jacob and Joseph." James could only have been thought of as providing such strength or protection through his perfect righteousness, or as Eusebius puts it, his piety, i. e., in his function as the Zaddik, a kind of moreh ha-zedek or a true "son of Zadok", one of those high priests consecrated by name from the beginning of time after the order of Melchi-zedek.

Not only is James important enough according to early Church fathers, that the events of his life are to be found forecast in Scripture; the Gospel of Thomas presents him as being of so essential a nature that both earth and heaven are predicated on his being. Thomas portrays Jesus as saying in response to his disciples' concern about who would succeed him and lead them after his death: "In the place where you are to come (i. e., Jerusalem), go to James the Just, for whose sake heaven and earth came into existence." ⁵¹ Again we may take into consideration the possibility of some exaggeration, but that does not entitle us to dismiss the testimony simply as tendentious. If nothing else, it reflects something of the esteem with which James was held by his contemporaries. Even Christian literature allows that James was permitted to go on functioning in Jerusalem for some 30 years while other less popular or more controversial apostles were either stoned, arrested, or beheaded there, some it would seem almost on sight. James, too, as we have noted, shared a clear regard for the Temple with the scrolls, as both the Book of Acts and the testimony of the early Church fathers attest, but his regard is not necessarily expressed in a conventional priestly manner with regard to the fat and fragrance of sacrifice. Rather he seems to fulfill his role as shield or defender of the people through his absolute righteousness, expressing itself in prayer or nazirite activity.

There is then an aspect of the same predestined pre-existence associated with James' being. The same quality is associated with the "sons of Zadok" by the Zadokite Document, who will constitute an elect of the last days. Origen is very much put out that he finds in his copy of Josephus material relating the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple to the death of James. He comments, good Christian that he is, that Josephus should have said, Jesus, not James. Eusebius repeats the same material, evidently ascribing it to Hege-

sippus and Clement. He then supplies the relevant quotation from Josephus, which clearly has some spurious aspects to it. Nevertheless, it must have appeared in his copy of Josephus, though it is nowhere to be found in ours. ⁵³

It is nothing less than peculiar that Josephus says the very same thing about the high priest, Ananus, the arch-enemy of James, in the extant copy of the Jewish War. ⁵⁴ We are clearly dealing with difficulties in textual transmission which require further elucidation. However this may be, the point is that in some circles the death of James was considered of such importance that the tragedy that thereafter overtook the Jewish people was in some way related to it, and this, by the way, is some of the thrust of the Oblitas epithet. In a similar manner, Josephus relates that the tragedy that overtook Herod Antipas' army in the Aretas affair was considered by the people to be related in some way to his taking the life of John the Baptist. ⁵⁵ The writer does not wish to argue here whether the fall of Jerusalem was necessarily considered a punishment by these circles, as the Church fathers present it in line with their theology. Rather, the thrust of the imagery, as we have it, is somewhat different, i. e., once the "protection", the mantle of righteousness, was taken away from the city, as personified or incarnated in the person of James, then the city no longer could remain in existence (or as Isaiah 3:1 puts it in the Eusebius passage already quoted in relation to James' death, once "the support" was taken away from the city, Jerusalem could no longer survive); just as in the Gospel of Thomas, the existence of heaven and earth was in some way tied to James' being.

In the same manner, Jewish mysticism has preserved the legend of the ten "just men", the zaddikim, without whose existence the world could not survive. Note the use of the same terminology, which of course goes back to the Genesis story about Sodom and Gomorah, also alluded to in the same Isaiah 3 passage

we have been expounding in the line prior to the one referring to "the zaddik". Indeed, the connection of the scrolls with the whole Jewish kabbalistic tradition, as it progressed through various schismatic movements like the Karaites and Gnostics, has not been completely lost on commentators. Still, the development and significance of the term, ha-zaddik, in terms of its connection with the moreh ha-zedek and the whole Zadokite movement in the Second Temple period needs further elucidation.

The sicarii, too, seem to have felt similarly bereft after the loss of their leader Menahem, to the extent that the continued existence of Jerusalem no longer seemed of very much consequence to them, though the manner and circumstances of their own ends were. In their retreat to the fastness of the fortress, Masada, they continued the struggle outside Jerusalem, but it would seem in a half-hearted fashion, more defensively than offensively. Their concern now seemed riveted on the pious manner of their end, towards "making a pious end" in Maccabean parlance⁵⁶, in expectation of the imminent return of their bodies. The Jewish-Christian survivors of James' Jerusalem Church also reportedly left Jerusalem at approximately the same time in response to some mysterious oracle. Purportedly they crossed the Jordan to Pella in the Damascus region.⁵⁷ It should not come as a surprise to the reader that the writer thinks there is a connection between the sicarii movement and the early Christian Church in Jerusalem, which indeed there must be if both are connected in some way to the Zadokite sectaries at Qumran. The finds made on Masada are incriminating enough in this regard, including the tell-tale fragments of Ecclesiasticus.⁵⁸ It still has never been determined why no surviving members of the community at Qumran ever returned to take away these precious documents, even if just to peddle them, since the parchment and labor they represented alone would seem to have been worth the trouble. Aside from Del Medico's hypothesis,

that we are dealing with a kind of genizah,⁵⁴ the only other satisfactory explanation that presents itself is that nobody could. Nowhere was such a complete and final break made of the sort required to explain such a phenomenon except among the Maccabean-inspired sectaries at Masada.

It is not contended here that we have proven anything by the preceding discussion. On the contrary, where the scrolls are concerned, it is very difficult to prove anything to everyone's or anyone's satisfaction. It was felt, however, that the striking parallels between the person we know as James the Just and the personality presented in the scrolls as the righteous teacher should be pointed up in a consistent fashion. It is also not being contended that James was the teacher of righteousness, if indeed such a single individual existed. He certainly was a teacher of righteousness. If this is also the title of an office having to do with a sectarian opposition high priesthood, then from everything we know about him in his role as Bishop of the so-called Jerusalem Church, he fits perhaps better than any other candidate proposed so far almost all the qualifications and most of the criteria.

1. Cf. R. H. Charles in Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, Oxford, 1913, pp. 785-97; S. Schechter, Fragments of a Zadokite Work, Cambridge, 1910; Lévi, "Un Écrit Sadducéen antérieur à la ruine du Temple", Revue des Études Juives, lxi, 1911, pp. 161-205; and G. Margoliouth, "The Sadducean Christians of Damascus", The Expositor, Dec., 1911, pp. 499-517 and March, 1912, pp. 212-35, and in Athenaeum, no. 4335, Nov. 26, 1910.
2. Only in Charles, cf. above, and G. R. Driver, The Judaean Scrolls, Oxford, 1965, 256-66, have I found a clear exposition of it. See, too, H. J. Schoeps, Theologie und Geschichte des Judentums, Tübingen, 1949, pp. 113-47.
3. See, for instance, Justin Martyr, Dialogue with Trypho, 80, where "Sadducees" are listed with Jewish heretical groups; Filaster in Diversarum Haeresum Liber, 5; and Jerome in Migne, Patrolog. Lat. xxvi, 163-5. In the Pseude-Clementine Recognitions, i, 53-4, it is specifically noted that the Sadducees are a group considering themselves more "righteous" than the others who came into being about the time of John the Baptist. For problems in Talmudic references to Sadducees, see B. Talmud, Erubim, 68b-69a, Sanhedrin, 38a and 100b, Hullin 87a, Niddah 33b-34a, Mishnah Yadaim, iv, 6-8, etc. In The Aboth de Rabbi Nathan 5, it is stated that the Sadducees and the Boethusians split from the Pharisees, the former taking their name from one "Zadok".
4. Cf. Maimonides on Aboth, i, 3 and Abraham ibn Ezra on Dan. 11:31 in Gallé, Daniel avec Commentaires, p. 141 for the view from outside. From inside see, Embden and Filipowski, Liber Juchassin...R. Abraham Zacuti, 13a, Trigland, Diatribes de Secta Karaeorum, pp. 16-17, and Hassan b. Massiah, quoted in Poznanski, REJ, xliv, p. 76f.
5. See Matt. 22:23, Mk. 12:18-27, Lk. 20:27-40, and Acts 4:2 and 23:8.
6. See for instance Matt. 1:23, 2:6, 2:15, 2:18, 2:23, 3:3; Mk. 1:2-4, Lk. 7:27, etc. among numerous instances. In Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, Chapter 4, such types of exegesis are supplied particularly in relation to the fall of the Temple in A.D. 70, one in particular from Isaiah 10 reappearing in almost the same manner in Dead Sea Scroll exegesis. The Karaites too used the very same kind of exegesis. See for example the references cited in Driver, p. 265.
7. See, for instance, F. M. Cross, The Ancient Library of Qumran, Doubleday, 1961, pp. 101 and 128f.; G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, London, 1962, p. 63, and J. T. Milik, Dix ans de découvertes dans le Desert de Juda, Chap. 3; F. F. Bruce, Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 1956, p. 11, etc.
8. Damascus Document, iii-iv.
9. Community Rule, v.
10. Thanks. Psalms ii, 15 and 31-3, Commentary on Nahum, ii:11, and Brownlee in H. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, 1955, pp. 249-50. There are numerous double entendres and plays on words of this kind in the scrolls, and for a thorough discussion, see Driver.
11. S. I. Luzki, Orah Zaddikim, Vienna, 1830, p. 19f.
12. It is interesting to note that in some sense the terms, Zadok and zadek, have been associated with the Jerusalem priesthood or the area of Jerusalem itself for quite some time. Melchi-zedek, of course, is mentioned in Genesis 14:18 as King of Jerusalem and Priest of the Most High God. Adoni-zedek (relationship to Melchi-zedek undetermined) was mentioned in Jo-

shua 10:1 as King of Jerusalem. Zadok is one of David's high priests and instrumental in deciding upon the Solomonic line. There is also evidence that Aaron, i. e. the whole priesthood taking its descent from him, was also styled in some traditions, "Zadok" (in the sense of "righteous one"); cf. Midrash R. Leviticus 1:3.

13. See The Testament of Levi 8:14-15 and the use of the same title to characterize Hyrcanus in Ant. xvii, 6.2. For other instances in pseudepigrapha see Charles, ii, p. 309.
14. I Mac. 2:54.
15. Numbers 25:7-13: "Phinehas the priest...has turned my wrath away from the sons of Israel, because he was the only one among them to have the same zeal that I have... In reward for his zeal for his God he shall have the right to perform the ritual of atonement over the sons of Israel."
16. See Cross, pp. 129-141, who on p. 135 speaks in terms of a "usurpation", after just noting that the Oniad house of Simon the Just had based its claim to the high priesthood on "the covenant of Phineas". F. F. Bruce in Second Thoughts..., p. 100, sums up the discussion fairly accurately with the words: "...in the eyes of the Qumran community every ruler of the Hasmonean dynasty, not being a member of the house of Zadok, held the high-priestly office illegitimately and was ex officio a Wicked Priest." Almost every observer, too conveniently overlooks the fact that Judas himself clearly held the high priesthood for a time, an office that was "bestowed" upon him, according to Josephus, by "the people", i. e. a clear popular mandate based on his zealousness; cf. Ant. xii, 10.6 and 11.2. Their unwillingness to come to grips with this evident popular election can only be understood in terms of the a priori scheme into which they wish all data to fit.
17. On the covenant sealed with Phineas and his descendants forever because of his zeal, see Eccles. 45:24, and on its cruciality to the claim of Simon the Just and his descendants, see 50:24. It is interesting to note that in the Hebrew version of this text found in Cave 2, the sectaries added in line 51:12 the pregnant little phrase: "Give thanks to Him who elects the sons of Zadok to be priests," another notice that calls into question their original priestly qualifications, while at the same time stressing the connection of their election to their zeal.
18. Josephus relates how 600 surviving sicarii fled to Egypt to escape the Roman repression and how the temple at Heliopolis was suppressed; War, vii, 10.1-4. The relationship of the Zealot movement to the Maccabee one has been investigated at some length by Farmer, Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus, New York, 1957; but what has never been stressed enough are the priestly connotations evident in the origin of its name. Rather, the conception arose, influenced no doubt by Josephus' artful evasions, that we were dealing here with a group of secular nationalists; not a group patterning itself on the avenging nature of righteous priests — the Levites who take Moses' part in the Golden Calf episode, the sons of Levi who go through the Canaanite Shechem killing all its inhabitants.
19. See Fragment B and Fragment A: col ii.
20. The reconstruction I am using is Gaster's; but see also Milik in Journal of Jewish Studies, xxiii, 1972, pp. 96-126; Fitzmyer in JBL, lxxxvi, 1967, pp. 23-41, etc.
21. See the import of line 7 and the direct reference in line 24. Cf. Community Rule, iii, 20-22 and Commentary on Psalm 37:36. In ix, 14 of the Community Rule, the reading "sons of the Zadok" actually occurs, and despite attempts to emend it, including to ha-zaddik, may actually be intended to stand as is.

22. See Driver's comments on Del Medico's thesis that the caves were a genizah, particularly for non-canonical material, which call into question whether we are entitled to speak in terms of a "community" at all; The Judaean Scrolls, pp. 385-93.
23. See, for instance Driver's note on the attempt by some to reconstruct the phrase ha-zadek in Community Rule, ix, 14 to ha-zaddik. Cf. also the connection of zedeck and zaddik in Scheeps, p. 143.
24. Cf. above, p. 4.
25. See R. Eisler, The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist, tr. A. H. Krappe, New York, 1931, pp. 243 and 409. Also Epiphanius, Haeres. liii.
26. Eccles. 50:1-24. This text has always been thought to portray a typical Sadducean mentality; but the fact it was found at both Qumran and Masada shows it to be Zadokite as well.
27. That the Latin, justus, or the English, the just one, is equivalent to the Hebrew, ha-zaddik or the zaddik, is self-evident; but Eusebius confirms it explicitly in E.H., ii, 23.
28. See T. H. Gaster's comments in The Dead Sea Scriptures, New York, 1956, p. 16f. and H. J. Schonfield in Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls, New York, 1960, pp. 105-8.
29. See "The Dead Sea Scrolls — Documents of the Jewish-Christian Sect of Ebionites", JJS, ii, 1951, pp. 67-99 and "The Damascus Fragments and the Origin of the Jewish Christian Sect", JJS, ii, 1951, pp. 115-43. Teicher's original incisive insight is based on Margoliouth's work of 1910-11. Unfortunately, it is marred by an over-zealous attachment to the Ebionites per se and their literature, and a terribly superficial analysis and identification of Jesus and Paul as righteous teacher and wicked priest, as well as liar, prophet, messiah, and everything else. Perhaps the best part of his work is his analysis of the tentativeness of all arguments based on palaeography, orthography, and style, pp. 69-77 and 80-87. This is complemented by a similar extensive analysis of the same questions done by Driver, pp. 410-39; and has never been answered in any serious way by critics, who by disposing of their identifications, think they have disposed of their background analyses. It is not sufficient to say, as Cross does, p. 74, that such views are "uninformed", without addressing himself to their substance. In any event, for the purposes of this paper, it is sufficient to note that even he admits that documents from the first century do exist among those at Qumran.
30. For the fearful effect of such power hunger on a layman's mind, see D. H. Lawrence's entertaining study, The Apocalypse, Viking, 1932.
31. See Galatians 1:19 and 2:1-13; I Corinthians 15:7; Acts 12:17, 15:1-29, and 21:18-26 for the position of James in the early Church and his status as head of the central triumvirate — referred to in Paul's letters, sometimes with bitterness, as the three "pillars".
32. In Acts, Luke is reticent in revealing the true identity of James; and were it not for Paul, the Church fathers, and apocryphal material, we would not know it. For their parts, the Gospels deliberately go out of their way to downplay the status and position of Jesus' family (cf. Mt 12:46, 13:53-8, Mk 6:1-6, etc.). Written from a Hellenizing point-of-view, James' position suffers, while Peter's is magnified. A different picture emerges in sectarian Eastern/N. African literature. A shift, however, occurs in the resurrection narratives, based as they are probably on real claims, and here the confusion of the editors becomes manifest. It is also interesting to note that the identity and experiences of the minor apostles are shrouded in mysterious obfuscation, particularly those with the same names as Jesus' brothers.

33. Eusebius, loc. cit.
34. Ibid. and Epiphanius, Haeres. lxxviii. Epiphanius is emphatic about James' priestly qualifications also in xxix,3 and lxxviii,13.
35. T. Zahn, quoted in H. J. Schoeps, Paul: The Theology of the Apostle etc., Philadelphia, 1961, p. 67. Here again, the revisions of modern scholarship of the ideas of the old Tübingen School do not particularly represent an improvement.
36. War, iv, 3.8. Phanas ben Samuel or Phineas according to Rabbinic tradition; cf. T. Joma, i, 6.180. There is also some notion in Rabbinic literature of a connection of such a Phineas with Elijah redivivus.
37. Josephus no doubt was at pains to obscure his own early connections as a member of the lower priesthood with this movement. He does this by obscuring its priestly connections and its theological underpinnings, playing up instead its lawless and political activities. There is ample indication in Vita that Josephus is reacting to exactly such kinds of charges made against him by Justus of Tiberias, and it should not be forgotten that he was appointed military commander of Galilee in the early stages of the "Zealot" revolt against Rome, a position fitting his priestly qualifications. It also should not be forgotten that he himself spent some two years in the wilderness with some mysterious "Banus", clearly a "bather" of some sort; cf. Vita 2, 65, and 74.
38. Of course, we have the claims referred to above that Judas Maccabeus was elected high priest by the popular will of the people. For these claims and the tumultuous events surrounding Herod's death, see Ant. xvii, 9. 1. That the Zealots were clearly the popular party from 7 A.D. on, including among the younger priests, despite Josephus' reticence concerning this state of affairs, is clear from Ant. xviii, 1. 1.
39. War, ii, 17.2-5, where the whole struggle between upper and lower priesthoods, younger and older, poorer and richer, is graphically documented. For the plundering of the tithes due the lower priests by the high priests, not mentioned in The Jewish War, see Ant. xx, 8. 8. Here Josephus champions the cause of the lower priesthood, as indeed he must have, and speaks sympathetically of James; whereas in The Jewish War, he pours accolades on James' executioner, Ananus. For James' championing of the cause of the lower priesthood and his connection generally with them, see S.G.F. Brandon, Jesus and the Zealots, New York, 1967, pp. 124-33. It is also interesting to note how in this period the Levites won the right to wear the linen, Ant. xx, 9. 6, much to Josephus' annoyance, a preference also evinced by James; cf. Eusebius, E.H. 23.
40. Ant. xx, 20. 1
41. Mishnah Sanhedrin, 7. 5, where it is explicitly stated a charge of blasphemy may not be entertained except in circumstances of pronouncing of the divine name. The strict laws of evidence, too, remain in effect in such circumstances.
42. War, iv, 4. 2. Ananus and his family are clearly not only the enemies of the early Christians, but from War, iv, 3. 7-13, also those of the Zealots. Josephus devotes several sections to a speech he makes, trying to persuade the people to cooperate with Rome, as he does to Agrippa II, from which it is clear Ananus heads the party of Roman sympathizers, who would be considered backsliders or corrupt by both Zealots and Zadokites, not to mention Christians.

43. Ibid. His opinion of Ananus is quite different in Vita 37-8, where he complains of him bitterly and calls him corrupt. It is strange that both Origen in Contra Celsum, i. 47, and Eusebius, E.H., ii, 23, find in their Josephus editions material relating the very same events to the death of James. We are clearly involved in some very crucial textual problems.
44. See above, as well as the episode in Antiquities relating to James' death.
45. See De Vaux, L'Archéologie et les manuscrits de la Mer Morte, pp. 394-9 and Cross, p. 75, who cites other references too. Indeed, archaeological evidence at the site shows that some Jewish occupation continued on up through the Bar Kochba War. What these people did with the material in the caves is never addressed. Even coins from the third and fifth year of the Jewish revolt have been found, years when few coins could have been minted; and fewer still found their way out of Jerusalem. Finding Roman coins at a given site does not necessarily bespeak of a Roman occupation anymore than coins from the first or second years of the revolt do that these coins were deposited in those years. The problem with Cross, De Vaux, Dupont-Sommer, and others, who have practically vanquished all opposition with their Essene theories, is that they take the term, "Essene," too literally. As Josephus and Philo use it (the first, a self-professed Pharisee; the second, if not a Pharisee, from a family of Roman sympathizers and satraps), the term is as much generic as anything else and certainly papers over a multitude of problems. That a group so violently anti-Roman and anti-establishment, i. e., anti-Pharisaic and Sadducean if most scholars have it right, as the Qumran one so clearly is, could have been spoken of in terms of such approbation and admiration by Josephus and Philo, compromised as they are beyond the realm of credibility, whatever the superficial resemblances. In this period, when making identifications, it is safer to link up common enemies or common friends, rather than crediting at face value testimony by people like Pliny or Hippolytus (not to mention Josephus himself, so unreliable, as we have seen, where matters of politics and religion are concerned).
46. See Commentary on Nahum 2:12.
47. See Recognitions, i, 70-1.
48. Loc. cit.
49. Ibid.
50. In Psalm 69 we have the revealing phrases: "that make me a stranger to my brothers, an alien to my mother's other sons. Zeal for your house devours me (7-9)"; "when I was thirsty they gave me vinegar to drink" (21); "by your saving power, God, lift me up" (29); and "...God will save Zion and rebuild the towns of Judah: they will be...handed down to his servants' descendants(35f.)", clearly a suffering servant-type psalm. The reference to the "rider" on the clouds comes at the end of Psalm 68 and is something like the proclamation put in James' mouth in both Eusebius and Epiphanius, when he is asked to speak in the Temple to calm the multitudes on Passover.
51. The Gospel of Thomas, 12.
52. Loc. cit.
53. One might respond here to Origen in the manner of Pontius Pilate according to John, who responds to the Temple leadership in the matter of the titulus phraseology, "I have written what I have written."
54. Loc. cit.
55. Ant. xviii, 5. 2.

56. See II Mac 12:38-45. The key words here for our purposes are: "Judas urged the people to keep themselves free from all sin, having with their own eyes seen the effects of the sin of those who had fallen... For if he had not expected the fallen to rise again, it would have been superfluous and foolish to pray for the dead, whereas if he had in view the splendid recompense reserved for those who make a pious end, the thought was holy and devout." Cf. II Mac 6:28, 7 (the martyrdom of the seven brothers), and 14:46. It should also be noted that Maccabees II portrays Judas and his original companions as ten zaddikim, who retreat into the wilderness, there to eat nothing but "wild plants to avoid contracting defilement" (5:22). Clearly they are intended to stand as a righteous remnant, upon whose existence the world is predicated.
57. See Eusebius, iii, 5 and Epiphanius, De Mens. et Pond., xv, 2-5 and Haeres., xxix, 7 and xxx, 2. Much discussion has centered around the authenticity of the Pella flight tradition, with Schoeps, pp. 47 and 267; Hengel, Die Zeloten, Leiden, 1961, p. 306f.; Teicher, op. cit.; and others accepting it; and Brandon, pp. 207-220; Farmer, p. 125; and G. Strecker, Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoclementinen, Berlin, 1958, pp. 229-31, expressing reservations.
58. Those practitioners of the Essene theory have never satisfactorily explained the existence of Qumran material at Masada; unless, of course, the Essenes change character as the first century progresses, growing more militant, which is not very different than what we have been saying here in taking the term "Essene" in a generic manner. The absence of any reference to the Essenes in the New Testament, while most other groups are referred to in one way or another, is very revealing in this regard. It must also be remembered that for his description of the sectarian situation in Palestine, Josephus is not necessarily relying on his own knowledge, often very sketchy for any period before the mid-fifties, but on sources going all the way back to the first century B. C. In his own time, the Essenes put up a very heroic resistance and one John the Essene is a very active military commander; cf. War, ii, 8. 10; 20. 4; iii, 2. 1. It should also be remembered by those who wish to date Zadokite commentaries relating to the fall of Jerusalem and the Temple in the first century B. C. or before, that the very same Isaiah 10:33f passage that is expounded in the scrolls as relating to the war against the Kittim, is expounded in Aboth de Rabbi Nathan in exactly the same kind of exegesis as relating to the fall of the Temple in 70 A. D.; Cf. Commentary on Isaiah and R. Nathan 4.
59. Del Medico, L'énigme des manuscrits de la mer Morte, Paris, 1957, pp. 23-7 and Driver, loc. cit.

Before drawing some general conclusions about the above as it relates to the scrolls, Jewish Christianity, the Jerusalem Church, the Essenes, etc., let us apply the theorizing we have done with regard to zaddik and Zadok to a specific problem, that of the Zadok mentioned by Josephus in the Antiquities, though not referred to in the Jewish War or anywhere else for that matter. The results one achieves should help test the usefulness of the theory, if not its validity; and incidentally it should clarify the problem of whether we are dealing with one teacher or a series of teachers when approaching the terminology, mereh ha-zedek. In further applying this connection of zaddik with Zadok, let us first go back and say some general things about Essene-hypothesizing, Zealot-hypothesizing, and handling Josephus' testimonies.

Roth and Driver in propounding their Zealot hypotheses were the first to call attention to this interesting note in the Antiquities, but their over-hasty identification of the righteous teacher with Menahem and/or Judas the Galilean left much to be desired and has been rightly criticized by many scholars. One thing the identification did do, however, which was probably what it was intended to do in the first place, was to take into account in an appropriate manner the militant character of the community under consideration, which quite clearly did not believe in turning the cheek to anyone, except over the short-run for reasons of expediency.⁶⁰ Its members were vindictive, vengeful, petty, and quarrelsome, harboring grudges for long periods of time, unforgiving of their enemies and only slightly less of renegades within their own ranks. Their concerns are apocalyptic in character and they are certainly preparing for an ultimate war of destruction against their enemies (regardless of the attempts by some scholars to portray such sentiments in the War Scroll as "metaphoric"), who include most of the

peoples of the earth. In short, the mentality or attitude is very similar to what we encounter in the Book of Revelation in the New Testament, and the malice, blood lust, desire for vengeance, and completely unforgiving spirit in the latter can hardly be considered of symbolic import only. Still, the identification of the Qumran sectaries with the quietist, peace-loving Essenes, according to the portrait in Josephus, Philo, and Pliny (a group, not surprisingly, so congenial to the despotic and bloodthirsty spirit of Herod), was also propounded in haste by the majority of scholars in this field, and is even less convincing, unless these Essenes have somehow changed character along the way.⁶¹

3p. The sect, as it reveals itself in its own writings, mostly resembles the early Christians, i. e., the Jewish Christians of the 30's to the 60's in Palestine, who go it would seem, again not surprisingly, unmentioned in Josephus and Philo, good Pharisees and/or Hellenizers that they present themselves as being. The reason for this is doubtlessly the Christian extreme messianic militancy and the group's consequent reputation for being agitators, held in disapprobation, as well as disdain, in Rome.⁶² It should be remembered that whatever the Christians were in this period, they were certainly "messianic", as the name first coined according to Acts in Antioch, indicates. As such, they had to be considered subversive in a Roman political context, if not also in a Palestinian, at least before the Hellenizing tendencies implicit in Paul's doctrines, the Gospels, Acts, and later even more gnosticizing presentations vanquished the field after the fall of the Temple in 70 A. D.⁶³ A change can even be detected in the official Roman attitude towards them after 90 A. D. (about the time Josephus felt free enough to publish some of his revised portraits in the Antiquities), but even the new tendencies could not wholly escape a certain stigma of subversiveness. In this period, it is often useful for purposes of identification to see

who the enemies are of given people or a given sect. Josephus and Philo are both Pharisees, the former avowedly so (as is Paul not surprisingly), and it would be very strange indeed to find them talking in terms of the approbation they do about a sect as intensely anti-Pharisaic as the Qumran one clearly was.

Here some elucidation about what we must mean by Phariseeism in the fluid and developing political situation of the two centuries under investigation might be necessary. The Pharisees might have been the popular party in Alexander Jannaeus' time (under the leadership of Simeon ben Shetach), the period to which Josephus' sources obviously go back. They were no longer the popular party in his son Aristobulus' time (Hyrcanus II clearly being the Pharisaic, but not the popular, candidate for High Priest), though many scholars, considering Josephus' pronouncements to be static, insist on seeing them as such. When Herod took undisputed power in the 30's B.C., he destroyed the previous, undoubtedly more zealous and nationalistic Sanhedrim, which had insulted him, and replaced it with a more docile and manageable one, the one dominated by Pharisaic and Sadducean elements we are so familiar with from New Testament portraits, the one probably headed by Hillel and Shammai.⁶⁵ By 4 B. C., even from Josephus' works it is quite clear that the popular pendulum has swung over to the Zealot side, who were in all things like the Pharisees, except in Josephus' own words, they had an inviolable attachment to liberty.⁶⁶ As far as Philo is concerned, it should be remembered that his nephew, Tiberius Alexander, was the pre-Roman and Herodian-backed, probably Pharisaic, governor of Palestine, who was particularly hard on all Zealot groups, going so far as to crucify two sons of Judas the Galilean, Jacob and Simon (all names amazingly close to those in Jesus' family itself). It is only in the New Testament that one finds the same anti-Pharisaic and anti-Sadducean zeal that one finds in the scrolls, if the documents in the former can be relied on in this regard; and

the only reason we fail to recognize the group that produced the latter documents as being "Christian" is our deficiency in understanding what Palestinian and apocalyptic Christianity generally was like in its earliest days before the fall of the Temple and the destruction of the Jerusalem center. We recognize gentile, Johannine, Pauline, and/or Gnostic Christianity quite well, but unfortunately this recognition gets in the way of our ability to recognize early Christianity, which is almost indistinguishable from pure Messianism, Zealot or otherwise.

Teicher, who in the early days suggested a Jewish Christian origin for the scrolls, also suffered from these same preconceptions and by his work almost single-handedly discredited the very hypothesis we are discussing. Picking up some of the more obvious parallels and taking the New Testament testimonies at face value, he made ludicrous and absurd identifications on the flimsiest of evidence, while at the same time managing to miss almost everything we have so far said in this article.⁶⁷ Perhaps the main difference between the group under discussion here out of which the scroll literature emerged and Christianity as we came to know it was that this group did not believe in "loving those that hate you" or either turning your cheek to or being forgiving of your enemies, as the Community Rule so eloquently testifies.⁶⁸ But then again, neither did the Christianity portrayed in the Apocalypse and neither probably did the Jerusalem Church. John the Baptist is very explicit in this regard, if the presentation of him in the Gospels can be believed. He berates the scribes and the Pharisees in a vicious manner, calling them "vipers"⁶⁹ and telling them the ax was at the trunk of the tree, the fire in the fan; and he quite literally hounds Herod Antipas, another "Herodian" and probably Pharisaic ruler, on a point of law, until the latter is finally forced to put him to death.⁷⁰

It must always be remembered, even when dealing with the term Essene, that

most of the evidence we have comes from Josephus, and though usually accurate, he can hardly be considered a reliable witness when it comes to matters of politics or belief. Josephus, though clever and canny, was not particularly profound. He was working usually in an uncritical way off earlier sources now lost. He really knew very little about the sectarian situation, except in his own day, which on the whole he chooses to conceal from us for very real reasons of his own. When he uses the term, Essene, it is not at all clear that he is not talking in a generic way, meaning all groups on the apocalyptic, esoteric side of the Judaism of his period. In many ways he implies this by leaving Christianity out of his discussion of the sectarian situation he provides. In the same way, it is certainly also very surprising that of these principal groups, the only one going unmentioned in the New Testament is the Essenes. When Josephus describes a sectarian situation, it is also not at all clear that he is not reflecting a time fifty or even a hundred years before his birth lifted baldly from the source or authors he was drawing on. The period Josephus can be relied upon for his own observations is that of the mid-fifties onwards, which is why the sparseness of testimony for the whole period from 4 B. C. to 55 A. D. His sources simply left off there. When Josephus mentions Essenes in the pre-Christian epoch, they are usually star-gazers or fortune tellers of an itinerant variety often setting up shop in the Temple.⁷¹ Later on, however, if they exist at all as an organized group, they even lead partisan raids and participate in the resistance against the Romans.⁷² The Essenes of the earlier variety probably dropped out of existence during the Herodian or early period of the Roman procurators, and if our sect can indeed be considered Essenes, then they are Essenes of the more militant character expressed in the scrolls.

In their zeal (and I use the term advisedly) in identifying Judas

the Galilean or his son or grandson, Menahem, as the righteous teacher, these partisans of the Zealot theory can perhaps be excused, because they were reacting to what they felt to be an incomprehensible bias or lacuna in the previous theorizing and an unwillingness or inability to come to grips with the true nature of the sect under consideration as it revealed itself in its very own writings. The banal charade that preceded the release of information concerning the Copper Scroll is a good example of this. ⁷³

It should be noted, however, that Josephus does provide us with very real information about at least one righteous teacher from the period 4 B. C. onwards. This is not to rule out persons like Simeon the Just and the unknown writers of Daniel and Enoch, who might have been righteous teachers of a previous period. In his earliest work dealing with the period under consideration, The Jewish War, Josephus clearly knows nothing or very little about a teacher named Zadok. Here he describes Judas the Galilean as being the sole mover behind the census uprising of 6-7 A. D. and one of several ones behind an earlier revolt following the death of Herod in 4 B. C. He also designates him as the originator of the movement he calls, "the Zealots", even though Judas' father Mezekiah had already been involved in such activities thirty years before, and a clear link between it and the activities of Judas Maccabee are discernible at least in kind. ⁷⁴ It also should not be overlooked that in all his works, it is always the mention of what Josephus conceives to be the origin of the Zealot party, that triggers his discussion of the sectarian situation generally. Despite the paucity of information he reveals about the Zealots, which must have had real teachers and doctrines; he implies that far from being the most insignificant sect they were very likely the most prominent, at least in terms of numbers, all questions of Sadducean and Pharisaic political and economic influence aside. ⁷⁵ Were it not for the clarifying material in Luke vis-a-vis Mark, we might never have been

so keenly aware that the native term for this movement was "Cananaean" and of its "priestly" thrust. Accordingly, it is not surprising to find this movement so popular around the time of 66 A. D. among the lower priesthood in the Temple.⁷⁶ The native term, "Cananaean" found also in the Talmud, clearly shows from what the idea of priestly zeal originated, that is the zeal of Phineas, zeal which entitled its priestly practitioner to the privilege of the High Priesthood forever. Once again it is plain we are dealing with another movement surrounding the notion of righteous priests protecting the community by their zeal and piety from corruption from within and contamination from without, similar to the earlier Maccabean one and perhaps even earlier "Sadducean" one, going all the way back through Onias' and Simeon's perfect righteousness to Ezra's pious zeal.⁷⁷ Though reticent about this movement in The Jewish War, because of personal embarrassment, political considerations, or ignorance, by the time of the Antiquities the ice seems to have melted sufficiently for Josephus to show it to have been the popular party and its influence from the time of Judas the Galilean to the fall of the Temple (not to mention beyond) to have been chiefly responsible for the tragedies that overwhelmed the nation.⁷⁸

In the Antiquities, written some fifteen or twenty years after the War, Josephus introduces a second character about whom he clearly knows (or wants to reveal) very little. He knows nothing about his birth, life, or death, only that he was important in founding the "Zealot" (sic!) movement. Prior to the writing of the Antiquities it is not even clear he had even heard about him. In the interim between the writing of the works in question someone had perhaps told him about another individual who was responsible for the unrest that gripped the nation for the next seventy, even one hundred years (or he had found it in one of his sources, though it would have been perfectly in keeping with Josephus' aims to have left out the priestly characteristics of this

movement, portraying it simply as a non-sacerdotal, revolutionary, and anti-establishment, i. e., anti-Roman, one) — this was "a Pharisee named Zadok".⁷⁹

What could Josephus have possibly meant by a "Pharisee" in this context, all questions of Zadok aside? He might simply have meant someone who was a teacher, "a rabbi" in the parlance of the Pharisees themselves (just as he describes Menahem and Judas as either sophists or "rabbis".⁸⁰) There is very little else he could have meant by such terminology, especially when he goes directly on in both works to discuss the sectarian situation of the time. Certainly, he does not mean to imply that either Judas or Zadok are actually Pharisees, or he would have simply listed them under his description of the Pharisee party that follows. The distinguishing characteristic of the Pharisees from the Sadducees, as both Josephus and the New Testament well know, was the belief by the former in resurrection of the dead, a belief of tremendous importance to all apocalyptic and zealot groups from Maccabean times to Masada and beyond. This also might have been something of what was implied in the term Pharisee as distinct from Zadok (i. e., Zadokite or Sadducee) in such a context, a distinction also not out of keeping with the Qumran material in question.

Again let us emphasize that Josephus knows almost nothing about the individual concerned. He doesn't know where he was born, the events of his life, or what became of him. He has only heard of him in the context of updating his earlier discussion in the Jewish War. What he then conceives of as a name might just as readily have been a title, for instance, the Zaddik, which would then translate out, using the esoteric symbolism already pointed out as being in use among the Zadokites or Zaddikim, as a teacher named the Zaddik, i. e., a teacher named "the righteous one". What distinguishes this theory from that argued by Zealot proponents is that the writer does not think that ~~that~~ the terminology "sons of Zadok" refers to a specific name. This is altogether too mundane and reduces

the whole approach to the level of banality. What we are saying is that wherever one does see the terms, "Zadok" or "zaddik", one must pay very special attention to them, for we are possibly dealing with the "sons of the Zaddik" or the "sons of Zadok" used in a very special way, not the followers of an actual man named Zadok.

Finally, who might this zaddik be, if indeed he is a zaddik? For those who wish to stick to the terminology, a Pharisee named Zadok, the possibility still cannot be ruled out that this is a title rather than a proper name. Much speculation in the last thirty years has centered on the question of the overtones in the scrolls and certain striking hints here and there of Christianity, and much effort has been expended analysing these with uneven, usually abortive, results. The problem in the writer's mind has always been the same, an inability to come to grips with the early nature of Christianity and the movement centered around the person of John the Baptist. The writer will now make a final identification, that is of "a Pharisee named Zadok" in Josephus' garbled parlance with John the Baptist, which seems to fill in all the difficulties and brings the argument full circle. We then have a series of righteous teachers beginning with John the Baptist and ending with James the Just, or perhaps starting earlier and going all the way back to Judas Maccabee (it should be understood here we are not discussing the whole Maccabean family and we are going according to the presentation in Maccabees II) or Simeon the Zaddik, or perhaps extending on through such an individual as Simeon bar Cleophas, also alluded to in the New Testament as belonging to a family line that witnessed the resurrected Christ. ⁸¹ If one wishes to go this far, Jesus too can be designated a zaddik and is specifically referred to as such in at least three places in the Book of Acts, ⁸² but we have been purposefully avoiding the problem of Jesus' place in this scheme because of the difficulties presented by the curtain of intricate theology that has

sprung up about his person and coming. All the above-mentioned individuals are presented as being in some way or another bona fide priests, and so is Jesus according to the Melchi-zedek theology developed in Hebrews and the "True Prophet" ideology appearing in the gospels and Ebionitism.

Even the "Son of Man" appellation is first used as a form of self-address by a priest, Ezekiel, who also happens to be the progenitor of our Zadokite terminology, and as developed in Daniel, probably authored by a priestly zaddik of the Hassidaean kind, it does not necessarily refer to a Davidic messiah, but just as likely to a priestly one, carrying on the original implications of Ezekiel. But one can go further than this: towards the end of the famous Suffering Servant passage in Isaiah 53, understood universally as the epitome of the scriptural explanation of Jesus' suffering and death, the phrase occurs,

, i. e., "by his knowledge will my

servant the Righteous One, justify many," and continues, "For he shall bear their iniquities."⁸³ This is obviously the crux of the understanding of Jesus' death, searched for and found, not surprisingly in Isaiah, and carried to its extreme conclusion in Gentile Christianity in particular through Paul's theology, John, and later gnosticizing trends. Once again, the tell-tale word, "zaddik" (referring as it always does in Qumran material to the righteous teacher), appears in the appropriate place; ~~just~~ as it does in the passage from the same prophet related in Eusebius, through Hegesippus, to Jesus' brother, James' death. If Jesus was recognized as one of the series of righteous teachers by the sect, and the analysis we

are doing seems to imply he was, then this is the exegesis they would have applied

to his death. Paul, too, quotes the passage, "the Righteous One shall live by

faith" in two letters, and it is repeated in the all important Letter to the

Hebrews.⁸⁴ The number of times it is quoted is striking enough to show its

importance, but even more significantly it is from the pivotal Habakkuk text

and the same passage is interpreted in the Qumran commentary in almost exactly

the same way with the additional notice given that the faith in question should

be in the righteous teacher. Once again the term zaddik in the text is linked

up directly to the righteous teacher, as well as in the New Testament manner to the individual members of the community. The only real difference between the two approaches is that whereas Hebrews attempts to use the passage to justify faith apart from the Law, the Qumran exegesis revealing its tell-tale Jerusalem Church/Jamesian preference specifically applies it to "those who observe the Law (italics mine) in the House of Judah." The appearance of this phrase, explained in the crucial Mabbakuk Commentary in terms of how the members of the community should relate to the righteous teacher or Zaddik, in three places in the letters of the New Testament, concerning how the early Christians should relate to their messiah/saviour, can hardly be considered fortuitous.

We are dealing here, when it comes to a consideration of the Zadokite priesthood and the idea of the zaddik, one of the incarnated righteous ones, with what amounts to a Caliphate — the kind of Caliphate that later surfaces in Shiite Islam, including even the notion of incarnation; and depending on where the line is punctuated or interrupted, that is with Simeon (Sadduceeism), Onias (the Heliopolis line), Judas Maccabee (the Hasmonaeans and/or Hassidaeans), John the Baptist (Masbuthaeans, Sabaeans, Mandaeans, Elkasaites, and others), Jesus (Christianity), James the Just and Simeon bar Cleophas (Jewish Christianity); one gets parallel-wise in Shi^cism, Five-Imam Shi^cism, Seven-Imam Shi^cism, or Twelve-Imam Shi^cism with all the variations in between, including such strange offshoots as Isma^cilism (the "Assassins", not surprisingly parallel to the Sicarii), the Druse (a Shiite group cultivating the same secretiveness as the Nazoraeans and Elkasaites, and in the same region), even Bahaiism, not to mention Anan Ben David and Karaism. ⁸⁶ The parallels are even closer than this, including the same terminology, Sadiq, applied to perhaps the principal imam, Ja^cfar as-Sadiq ⁸⁷ and a popular name among Shiites to this day, and the notion of the mahdi, the imam who has gone into temporary occultation expected to return

either imminently or at the end of time. The list of incarnated righteous ones is about the same in Ebionitism and Shi^cism. Each imam is preceded by his dā^cis or "caller"s, i. e., propogandists very much like the messianic ones active in the first-century Roman Empire; and the same probably was true of the undoubtedly parallel movement, Karaism, according to some interpretations, "Caller"ism. Not infrequently such imams became the centers of far-flung subversive underground cadres. Muhammad is the Apostle to the Arabs just as Paul is the Apostle to the Gentiles (both of whom are self-appointed); he is also the "true Prophet". Schoeps has already pointed up to a certain extent the connection of Jewish Christianity to Islam, though not in any systematic fashion, and nobody can doubt even from a cursory reading of Muhammad's work, not to mention the wider literature of Shi^cism, the reality of the connection.⁸⁸ I cite these parallels not by way of claiming any discovery, but to show how extensive the possibilities are when approached within the framework made possible by this way of seeing things.

The proposed identification of Zadok with John the Baptist also fulfills what I would like to call the criterion of importance, which has been ignored all along by most commentators on the scrolls. The scrolls just represent a body of literature that is too important and of too extensive a history to have left no trace on the society in which they appeared; and contrary to what many people seem to think, we have quite an extensive picture of that society. We probably know almost as much about it, taking the sum total of our sources and evidence, as any other period in history before the modern epoch. The problem with both Roth and Driver is that they just did not know enough about the zealous nature of early Christianity, in this case particularly Roth, and therefore, their efforts collapse around and are rendered absurd by their attempts to squeeze all their identifications into the context of Judas' family per se. A proper

portrayal of the zealous nature of early Christianity is provided in the work of Robert Eisler, who is ignored by most scholars in the field because of the speculative and tentative nature of many of his identifications and reconstructions.⁸⁹ Of course, there is much that is conjectural and over-enthusiastic in his work, but the very real contribution he made in helping to understand the zealous nature of early Christianity, and in particular the movement headed by John the Baptist, should not be overlooked or discarded because of this. It should be remembered that Robert Eisler had to make these identifications without the aid of the scroll material. Unfortunately, his life was shortened by a period in Nazi concentration camps. Had he lived in order to bring his erudition to bear on the scrolls in a systematic manner, the results he would have achieved would undoubtedly have been noteworthy.⁹⁰

One has only to look at a work like the Community Rule to see the character, mission, and type of religious calling of John the Baptist apparent in almost every section. What is more, it employs the very same language in characterizing its activities and the role and meaning of its exodus into the desert as John the Baptist does his own, i. e., "prepare a way in the wilderness" for "him", four dots or the word, "him", replacing the Isaiah and New Testament usage, YHWH. There is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the New Testament presentation of the words and mission of John the Baptist, since it was only an epitome characterizing what was understood to be the essence of these. Once again, as in all such instances of precise and undisputable link-ups, the reluctance, even unwillingness displayed by commentators to grasp the obvious is incomprehensible. "The way" is the way of the law and the practitioners of this way are those who have gone out from the habitations of men to prepare a way for the visitation of God (in whatever form it was expected to take). This same terminology linking members of the early Christian community with those who follow "the way" is so common

in the Book of Acts, particularly in the latter, more reliable, part, that one is left reeling from the correspondence.⁹² Such conceptions as the "Sons of Heaven", the Messiah of Aaron (John the Baptist), and the Messiah of Israel (possibly Judas the Galilean and/or Jesus⁹³) are constantly referred to, and the light and dark imagery so familiar in the Gospel of John with the very same significations is employed throughout. The only difference between the Community Rule and early Christianity, as we know it, as far as general spirit is concerned is the vindictiveness, militancy, inflexibility, and vengefulness of the former. It fairly revels in the coming destruction of its enemies, the sons of Satan or Belial — but to expect anything different is due, as I have repeatedly stressed, to a gross misunderstanding of the nature of early Christianity, and all of Messianism for that matter.⁹⁴

Perhaps the most important proof to offer in regard to John the Baptist's identity with "Zadok" and candidacy for righteous teacher would be to show he was or could have been alive in either 4 B. C. or 7 A. D., and from this perhaps almost everything else falls into place, or at least becomes a distinct possibility. Perhaps this dating problem has been the stumbling block all along. He could then be seen in perhaps his true role, a kind of opposition High Priest, an Elijah redivivus, answering the call of the Zealot (or Messianic?) Party for a popular priest elected by the populace to take the place of the Maccabean priesthood (temporary in any case) defunct since the drowning of Miriamme's younger brother in the pool at Herod's summer palace near Jericho and Qumran.⁹⁵ Why didn't such a messianic forerunner come sooner than 4 B. C.? The answer is there was no need for him as long as there was a Maccabean claimant for the High Priesthood and aspirant for the throne, regardless of what has been claimed about the popularity or unpopularity of the Maccabean family. As soon as these two lines came to an end in Judas the Galilean's father, Hezekiah's time, the

messianic agitation we are so familiar with started in deadly earnest and was to continue for the next one hundred and seventy-five years.

But it is not at all sure that John the Baptist had not started on his mission in 4 B. C., or certainly 7 A. D. The problem is that before the discovery of the Zadokite document we tended to see all these events through the prism of the New Testament, an optical apparatus that is faulty at best. No one seriously entertains that the Gospel of Luke, and in particular its infancy narratives, are accurate with regard to the dating of the birth and ministry of John the Baptist, and it must be quickly affirmed, that aside from the Slavonic Josephus, this is the only material we have to go on. It does not seem to me that one can say that the Slavonic Josephus is any more or less accurate than the Gospel of Luke (or the Gospel of Matthew for that matter), even if one is based on the other (m. b., we are not saying here which is based on which). It is the material in the infancy narratives (not to mention the genealogy) in the Gospel of Luke that contradicts at almost every turn the material in the Gospel of Matthew, reducing the evidence in both to a house of cards and rendering even a precise dating of the birth and death of Jesus an impossibility that no scholar yet has even come near surmounting.

There is, however, a phrase in the Gospel of Matthew that does imply that John the Baptist was alive and well at a far earlier period than the time of the appearance of Jesus.⁹⁶ One does not have to resort to Mandaeen literature to prove this, though one could. It is completely fanciful to suppose that John is the same age as, or only six months older than, Jesus, if Jesus is the age we have him as in the portrait of the gospels. He is far too well known a character at the time Jesus appears. He has far too much prestige. Not only is Jesus quoted as saying about him, "among all these born of women a greater than John the Baptist has never been seen," but he adds the additional phrase, "Since

John the Baptist came (or from the days of John the Baptist up) until this present time, the Kingdom of Heaven has been subjected to violence and the violent are taking it by storm."⁹⁷ Whatever one might want to make of the doctrinal gist of this purported statement, it certainly implies that John has a tremendous amount of prestige, far more undoubtedly than Jesus at the time the speech is supposedly uttered. But in addition, the very strange implication, even overt verification, cannot be avoided, that somehow John the Baptist's coming is coextensive with the Zealot movement (also acknowledged here as undoubtedly messianic), and quite a good deal of time has passed between these events and the present day. This can only mean he has been in business since 6-7 A. D., may even earlier, probably from 4 B. C. onwards when the messianic outbreaks and violent uprisings began.⁹⁸

Besides, the Gospel of Luke's portrait of John's age is out of character with his whole mission, which has him pepping in and out of hiding, a kind of Hanan the Hidden⁹⁹, to appear like some wild man to threaten and cajole the assembled multitudes, who receive him awestruck presumably at his capacity for survival and his already widespread reputation. Such reputations could hardly be imputed to two barely thirty year-old young men, who have according to the information presented in the gospel accounts been born within six months of each other, been preaching only one to three years at best, and have missions that are cut short almost as soon as they begin, i. e., whose efforts are abortive. To make a reputation of the kind John the Baptist seems to have enjoyed, which Josephus confirms for us in the Antiquities,¹⁰⁰ he would have had to, at least in this writer's view, have been in circulation for quite a substantial period prior to Jesus. We are not after all in the age of instant communications and instant fame of the kind engendered by modern mass media, but rather a gradual process of building-up prestige on the basis of oral communication would have been required.

This is implied in the gospel accounts anyhow, and is the whole point of connecting Jesus with John in the first place. In the passages in Matthew and

Luke where John is waiting for Jesus to begin his work, John seems like a much older, even almost tired, man, and he is not even sure, though he has supposedly baptised him, whether Jesus is the one who is supposed to come and take up his charge or whether he will have to wait for another.¹⁰¹ Jesus might be unknown, but John the Baptist is not. Everyone knows the material in the New Testament which shows there was some antagonism between the followers of John the Baptist and the followers of Jesus, or at least that their followers were not necessarily coextensive. Mandaean literature provides us with testimony also of this hostility. The passage in Matthew, noted above, even seems to testify that John came into prominence in the time of Archelaus, and this is picked up in the presentation of him in the Slavonic Josephus, or vice versa, i. e., at the time of the census revolt described by Josephus and attributed by him in the Antiquities to Zadok.

We are nowhere arguing that Josephus knew that John the Baptist and a Pharisee named Zadok were one and the same. On the contrary, he obviously did not (or did not wish to tell us), which is why we do not know it today, but this is no reason for not proposing the possibility. If we are to arm ourselves with the paucity of information that Josephus possesses or is willing to divulge about either John the Baptist or a Pharisee named Zadok, then obviously we will get nowhere. As well, we put ourselves on a level with the mentality displayed in Josephus, as if there were something sacrosanct in his writings (as indeed the early Church seems to have thought and the Greek Orthodox Church still does to some extent to this day.) The identification of John the Baptist with a Pharisee named Zadok, or a former Pharisee named the Zaddik, i. e., the teacher of righteousness, is only that, a theory or a proposed identification. There is no way it will ever be proved to everyone's or even anyone's satisfaction, short of some outstanding new finds. On the other hand, it cannot be disproved either, and if anyone thinks he can, let him do so. This theory at

well as, it would seem, Essene and Rechabite). Josephus himself is a self-professed example of the first-named, and there were certainly many others from the Herodian period on through the procurators, the Herodian family and the Romans both displaying clear Pharisaic preferences. James, too, possesses these priestly qualifications, as the portraits of him in the early Church fathers attest, though by this time the priestly requirement for the righteous teacher might have been redefined in the manner of the Damascus Document, i. e., as being symbolic, or as in Christian theorizing, a priesthood after the order of Melchi-zedek forever based on the embodiment of the expression of "perfect righteousness", i. e., the word made flesh.

If we are to depend on the material in the infancy narrative of the Gospel of Luke and admit priestly blood in both Jesus and James on their mother's side (her name, Miriamme, commemorating as it perhaps does the last reigning embodiment and doomed hope of the Maccabean priest line, might add some weight to this), then this strain is also carried forward in Christianity, particularly Jewish Christianity, not to mention the shift in the Damascus Document from the Messiah of Aaron and the Messiah of Israel of the Community Rule to the Messiah of Aaron and Israel. Such transformations of dramatis personae do have significance and cannot simply be fobbed over. As well, they are entirely in keeping with the sect's esoteric manner of exegesis, which does develop and is ongoing taking account of new facts and new events. Therefore, we end up with a teacher called "the Zaddik" for the identification of the second un-named and little known progenitor of the Zealot movement and forerunner of the tax revolt, antagonistic to both the Pharisaic and Sadducean forms of the Judaism of his time and hostile to both the Herodian family and Roman overlordship. What well-known or little-known character from the period under consideration meets these qualifications more than John the Baptist?

A nagging criticism, which could have been raised all along and perhaps should be answered, has to do with time factors. There seems to be some indication that the Temple Scroll, for instance, contains material that would relate it to either the third or second centuries B. C. It has been the claim of those building the case for time factors on paleographic evidence, that much of the material found at Qumran has a first or second century B. C. ambience. Additionally, when making actual link-ups in textual matters and identifications, the period favored by a majority of scholars is the one from early Maccabean times down to the first fall of the Temple in 63 B. C. First of all, to take all of these types of criticisms together, since we are dealing with a Zadokite priest line that may go all the way back to Simeon the Just, i. e., the period covered in Ecclesiasticus, and before, there is nothing in the line of argument proposed in this article that would rule out materials being collected at Qumran from as early a period as textual and paleographic evidence might require. Since this is a sect, and the sect obviously has an extremely rich and ongoing, if checkered, history; the literature it exhibits is, not surprisingly, quite extensive and on the whole unfamiliar, since it was not one of those that managed any overt survival (but rather a subterranean one). Whatever the implications found, therefore, in documents like the Temple Scroll (untreated in this article), paleological or otherwise, these have very little to do with the specific identifications found in this treatment and may just as likely throw light on the earlier, more obscure, development of Zadokite or "Sadducean" thinking.

The interesting thing about the Temple Scroll, however, is that it does seem to be a Deuteronomio-type code of some kind, which, therefore, shows our group to be law-orientated, which the Jerusalem Church certainly was, in contrast to the Pauline-dominated, diaspora, Gentile one that later developed.

Whatever its variations from normative Jewish law may turn out to be, the scroll along with other documents like the Damascus one, is very probably the sect's answer to Parisaic halachah, that is its own normative legal orientation presented in pseudepigraphic style. It would not be at all surprising if it did go back to Judas Maccabaeus' time, Judas for these purposes being a righteous teacher/zaddik-type. The text, along with others, may even represent the original "Sadducean" position as far as legal matters were concerned. The law after all is ongoing and developing, and even in Judas' time, we have the notice in Macc. II that he collected and put together documents of this type, i. e., we are no sooner done with efforts like the Torah, Kings, Chronicles, etc., then we move into Maccabean and/or other efforts.¹⁰³ There is no break. The important thing to note about the document is that it was Temple-oriented, as was Sadduceism, as was Judas (as the "Rededication or Hannukah commemoration clearly shows), as were all "zealous" priests from 4 B. C. to 70 A. D., as was the Jerusalem Church, as was James¹⁰⁴, as Jesus certainly was, if the steady gravitation of the events of his life towards the Temple and Jerusalem according to the gospels is any indication and if the Temple - cleansing episode is authentic.

It should be noted that most identifications made here usually relate to texts found in single copies and probably penned quite late in the history of the sect, representing perhaps the weekly exegesis of the current righteous teacher. The identifications are unique, as is the exegesis in question, and refers to these texts only. That there may be other events referred to in the extensive literature of the sect, which we have not illuminated in our arguments, is taken for granted. The point is, that we have identified what we thought could be identified. One problem with those who persist in making paleographic identifications (aside from the obvious difficulty that, because a text was copied in the second century B. C. does not preclude its use by sectaries in the

first century A. D.; on the contrary, many of these texts show signs of extensive usage as in any library) and those who insist on making all identifications from the time of the High Priest Jonathan to Alexander Jannaeus or beyond to the fall of the Temple in 63 B. C., is that they fail to explain what the adepts of the sect were doing with these documents over the next one hundred to two hundred years. Are we to assume that they simply sat by stoney-faced, praying over them or reciting them by rote, "stone-walling" it so-to-speak in pious seclusion, that they were not involved in and there was no reaction to the almost unbelievable events that were overwhelming Palestine from the time of the coming of the Romans to the fall of the Temple in 70 A. D. and beyond? Short of claiming that the manuscripts were put into the caves in 63 B. C. or 44 B. C., etc., clearly unsupportable, they cannot account for one hundred years of crucial intervening history. What is more, they certainly cannot account for the mysterious presence of the Copper Scroll or the tell-tale appearance of both Ecclesiasticus and Qumran-type material at Masada.

In contrast, the theory being presented here does take into account quite a long-standing development, while at the same time proposing workable solutions to certain specific and important latter-day problems. That the documents were deposited in the caves around 70 A. D. or afterwards (this is not to rule out the possibility of their deposit as late as the Bar Kochba era) is indisputable. In addition, that the archaeological team on Masada found the "bones" portion from Ezekiel buried under the synagogue floor there is in now way surprising and fits in completely with the theorizing we have been doing. In true Maccabean/Christian fashion, they expected the imminent coming of the Messianic Kingdom and that they would "get their bodies back", the equivalent to Paul's statement about Jesus (who incidentally makes "a pious end", though Paul tries not to), that "if Jesus did not rise from the dead, then I am no Christian" (italics mine)! 105

To sum up: I can only identify some Qumran texts, particularly late ones, as relating to James, not all of them, though James is the springboard to the whole theory and the true "dear" to Jesus. I do not think that because James headed what has come to be known as "the Jerusalem Church", he spent all his time in Jerusalem; neither did all the members of that church, if the testimony of the Pseudo-clementines can be taken as indicative. To have a center at Qumran for purposes of initiation and training, not altogether out of keeping with information in Acts and Paul's letters, is not completely far-fetched. Neither does this preclude the movement of "the teacher" of the day, i. e., the Zaddik, back and forth between the two locations and other elders or notables of the movement carrying out the role of opposition high priesthood, which clearly the righteous teacher and his entourage were seen as being in the scrolls, i. e., a "righteous" or "Zadokite" high priesthood. Certainly the center at Qumran existed before the "Christian" movement per se and to talk only of identifying this material with the so-called "Jerusalem Church" or the Ebionites, as Teicher tried to do, is simplistic and rather back to front. It is also why I allude to other related offshoots and movements, like the Zealots, Sicarii, and Essenes, if indeed these can truly be distinguished in any separate way. I make no claims for the commencement of the traditions at Qumran, only for the terminus ad quem, which I put sometime around the fall of the Temple and Masada. This is in accord with archaeological evidence showing Jewish habitation up to the Bar Kochba period. The incredible thing about scroll research has been, that while all kinds of origins have been suggested, no one has proposed the simple "Sadducean" one, which is quite literally what the scrolls proclaim themselves to be. This is probably because of the deficiency in our knowledge of Sadduceeism and the mistake we make in identifying the later Maccabean, Herodian, and Roman-sponsored variety with an original, more puritanical, kind that went on functioning albeit in a subversive manner. If we begin with a proper notion of "the zaddik" and link this up with the role and function of the righteous teacher, all the rest follows.