



Dong-Hyuk Kim (Yonsei University)

1. Introduction

Messianism has become one of hotly debated subjects in the Qumran study these days. At the center of this debate stands a famous phrase from the *Damascus Document* (or CD), that is, משיח אהרן וישראל, “the messiah of Aaron and Israel”.¹⁾ This simple phrase has raised several difficult questions. What is the exact meaning of the phrase? What is the function of the figure(s)? More basically, how many messiahs do we see? The last question is the problem I want to discuss in the present study.

1) Four passages in CD are relevant, CD XII, 23–XIII, 2; XIV, 18–19; XIX, 10–11; XIX, 35–XX, 1. The first three contain the above phrase, while the last has “a messiah from Aaron and from Israel”.

The answer to the last question will be either one or two. There being only two options, however, the problem seems far from reaching an agreement. On the one hand, many scholars see the double messiahship in the phrase,²⁾ and Frank M. Cross, for example, asserts that “[t]he putative single messiah is a phantom of bad philology”.³⁾ On the other hand, not a small number of scholars have challenged this view recently,⁴⁾ so L. D. Hurst argues that the two-messiah theory at Qumran is not “a deduction from the evidence” but

-
- 2) Among many, those who support the double messiahship in CD are Frank M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (3rd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 187–191; idem., “Notes on the Doctrine of the Two Messiahs at Qumran and the Extracanonical *Daniel Apocalypse* (4Q246)”, Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks (eds.), *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995* (STDJ 20; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 1–13 (almost the same material as Cross, *Ancient Library*, 187–191); John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Related Literature* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995), esp. 74–101; Devorah Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature”, Michael Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (CRINT; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 483–550; Craig A. Evans, “The Messiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls”, Richard S. Hess and M. Daniel Carroll R. (eds.), *Israel’s Messiah in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic Press, 2003), 85–101; Florentino Garcia Martinez, “Two Messianic Figures in the Qumran Texts”, in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 14–40; Louis Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (New York: KTAV, 1976), which is a revised and updated translation of *Eine unbekante jüdische Sekte* (New York, 1922), 209–256; Bilhah Nitzan, “Eschatological Motives in Qumran Literature: the Messianic Concept”, Henning Graf Reventlow (ed.), *Eschatology in the Bible and in Jewish and Christian Tradition* (JSOTSup 243; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 132–151; William M. Schniedewind, “Structural Aspects of Qumran Messianism in the *Damascus Document*”, Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich (eds.), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 523–536; James C. VanderKam, “Messianism in the Scrolls”, Eugene Ulrich and James C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 211–234.
- 3) Cross, *Ancient Library*, 188.
- 4) Those who argue for the single messiahship of “the messiah of Aaron and Israel” include Martin G. Abegg, Jr., “The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?” *DSD* 2 (1995), 124–144; George J. Brooke, “The Messiah of Aaron in the *Damascus Document*”, *RevQ* 15 (1991), 215–230; L. D. Hurst, “Did Qumran Expect Two Messiahs?”, *BBR* 9 (1999), 157–180; Géza G. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), esp. 221–225. Xeravits does not uniformly argue for the single messiahship, but he believes that he cannot find a consistent doctrine of the double messiahship. Xeravitz, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 225.

“a creation from modern scholars”.⁵⁾ As an attempt to solve the numerical problem of “the messiah of Aaron and Israel” in CD, the present study will first analyze the phrase grammatically, then investigate the relevant passages in CD, and lastly examine the evidence from other scrolls and the Hebrew Bible. Our discussion will be limited to philology, for the meaning and function of the phrase can be treated adequately only as a separate study.

2. “The Messiah of Aaron and Israel”—Can We See Double?

The fundamental question to begin with is, Is it possible to understand “the messiah of Aaron and Israel” as double figures? In this section I will advance a grammatical analysis of the phrase itself.

Since the *nomen regens* of the phrase (i. e., “the messiah”) is in the singular, the more natural reading of “the messiah of Aaron and Israel” would point to a single messiah, thus, “the messiah who will originate from Aaron and Israel”. Here, however, as Louis Ginzberg pointed out as early as in 1922, the phrase “Aaron and Israel” is redundant and awkward. Ginzberg observed that while it is possible that the German Constitution reads “The German Emperor must be a German and a Prussian”, it would be absurd to reverse the order and say “a Prussian and a German”, “for every Prussian is *eo ipso* a German”. Likewise, “An Aaronide is an Israelite of the first order; hence a משיח אהרן is automatically also simultaneously משיח ישראל”.⁶⁾ If there is only one messiah, why not call him “the messiah of Aaron”?⁷⁾ Therefore, “the messiah

5) Hurst, “Two Messiahs?”, 180.

6) Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect*, 227.

7) Cross, *Ancient Library*, 188.

of Aaron and Israel” as a single person would be absurd in most cases.⁸⁾

For this and other reasons, many scholars understand that “the messiah of Aaron and Israel” refers to two messianic figures, that is, “the messiah of Aaron and the one of Israel”. Their argument rests first of all on the following suggestion: Although “the messiah of Aaron and Israel” has a singular *nomen regens*, it may produce a plural meaning in the Hebrew grammar by means of a distributive construct structure. In a distributive construct, a singular *nomen regens* that is followed by multiple *nomina recta* can have a plural meaning. Examples of both Biblical Hebrew (hereafter, BH) and Qumran Hebrew (hereafter, QH) have been recorded by Martin G. Abegg, Jr. in his 1998 article (hereafter, referred to as Abegg’s *later* article or so, in contradistinction to his 1995 article).⁹⁾ In BH there are a few: וְרֵאשֵׁי־עֵרֶב וְזֵאֵב, “the heads of Oreb and Zeeb” (Judg 7:25); יַד־מֹשֶׁה וְיַד־אַהֲרֹן, “the hands of Moses and Aaron” (Ps 77:21).¹⁰⁾ Abegg, in his 1995 article (hereafter, referred to as Abegg’s *earlier* article or so), however, argues that these examples cannot support the plural reading of “the messiah of Aaron and Israel”.¹¹⁾ Citing Joüon, who observes that a singular noun can express a plural meaning “in a case where several individuals have something in a similar manner, especially a *member* (*hand*,

8) Except for one case. If the phrase “Aaron and Israel” designates one entity, “the messiah of Aaron and Israel” would more naturally be a single person. See below.

9) Abegg, “The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls”, P. W. Flint and James C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1:334–335. It is to be noted that here in his 1998 article Abegg changed his position from his 1995 article (“Messiah at Qumran”, above n. 4; hereafter, referred to as Abegg’s *earlier* article). He was once a key-proponent of the single messiahship with the earlier article, but now in the later one abandons his former conclusion and joins the majority. Even though Abegg has changed his position, I will still discuss and critique his earlier view in this study especially because there are still followers of his earlier view.

10) Abegg, “The Hebrew”, 334–335; VanderKam, “Messianism”, 230; Nitzan, “Eschatological Motives”, 146. See GKC §124r.

11) Abegg, “Messiah at Qumran”, 129–130.

head, heart, mouth)”,¹²⁾ Abegg does not believe that the word “messiah” qualifies as a “member”.¹³⁾ Abegg would probably be correct in saying that “messiah” would not qualify as a member. However, we do not know if this case does not make a new grammatical discovery. A grammar, especially like one for BH, cannot *prescribe* a certain structure. It only *describes* what the corpus presently shows. If we encounter a new linguistic phenomenon, it is the grammar that needs to be revised.

Moreover, there seems to be a biblical example that does not include a “member”. In Gen 14:10, we read “Now the valley of Siddim was full of tar pits; and the *kings of Sodom and Gomorrah* fled, and they fell into them” (italics added; NRSV). The Hebrew of the italicized phrase is מְלִיכֵי-סְדֹם וְעִמּוֹרָה, and the previous context (vv. 8-9) requires that מְלִיכֵי should mean two kings rather than one. Indeed, the accompanying verbs are in the plural: וַיִּפְּלוּ and וַיִּנְסוּ. Abegg, however, rejects the MT and prefer the readings of the Samaritan Pentateuch, Peshitta, and LXX: “king of Sodom and king of Gomorrah”. Abegg maintains that although the MT is shorter and more difficult and thus might be understood to be the original, “the lack of a similar structure elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible apart from distributive members such as ‘head’ and ‘hand’ implies that in this instance the canons of text criticism fail and produce ‘garbage’ rather than the best text”. “At the very least”, he concludes, “the witness of the Samaritan Pentateuch . . . indicate[s] that a plural meaning was not expected from such a structure”.¹⁴⁾ However, it seems forced to claim that since there is not such a structure the reading of the MT is an error;

12) Paul Joüon, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (trans. and rev. Takamitsu Muraoka; SubBi 14; 2 vols.; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2000), 504 (§136). Italics original.

13) Abegg, “Messiah at Qumran”, 129–130.

14) *Ibid.*, 130.

Abegg judges the text to be inauthentic on the basis of a grammar which is reconstructed from the Hebrew Bible. But, as I said earlier, a grammar of BH is not prescriptive, and an absence of a certain structure does not render that structure ungrammatical. Abegg here “levels” a difficult text for the sake of a reconstructed grammar. It is quite possible that the reading of the MT is, though rare, original and grammatical and that the copyist of the Samaritan Pentateuch just wanted to change a less common structure to a more common one, following the general tendency of the Samaritan Pentateuch.¹⁵⁾ It is not methodologically sound to dismiss the evidence of Gen 14:10, which shows a distributive construct that does not include a member:

Moreover, QH presents surer evidence for a distributive construct. Although in BH this construction seems like more or less an exception rather than a rule,¹⁶⁾ Abegg in the later article observes that “this distributive construct is used with some frequency in QH”.¹⁷⁾ Some QH examples cited by several scholars include מות אלעזר ויהושע, “the deaths of Eleazar and Joshua” (CD V, 3-4); מבווא יום ולילה, “beginnings of day and night” (1QS X, 10); מוצא ערב ובוקר, “departures of evening and morning” (1QS X, 10); and ישראל ואהרון, “the names of Israel and Aaron” (1QM III, 13-14); and ישראל ולוי ואהרון, “the names of Israel and Levi and Aaron” (1QM V, 1).¹⁸⁾

Therefore, all pieces of the evidence discussed above enable us to read

15) Bruce K. Waltke, “Samaritan Pentateuch”, *ABD*, 5:936–937.

16) As Brooke observes, Brooke, “The Messiah of Aaron”, 222.

17) Abegg, “The Hebrew”, 334. However, Abegg previously wrote that he had “not been successful in locating any additional cases of such a ‘distributive singular’ in the scrolls” after he “grammatically tagged approximately 15% of the Qumran corpus for computer analysis”. Abegg, “Messiah at Qumran”, 130.

18) Abegg, “The Hebrew”, 334–335; VanderKam, “Messianism”, 230; Nitzan, “Eschatological Motives”, 146. Abegg, retracting his former opinion, adds as a further example of משיח אהרן וישראל. Abegg, “The Hebrew”, 335 n. 16.

“the messiah of Aaron and Israel” as referring to two figures. However, one objection is still to be discussed. The passage in CD XIV, 19 has been almost unanimously restored with the help of 4Q266 (= 4QD^a). The line reads [עד עמוד משיח אהרן וישראל וכפר עונם]. The problem here pertains to the following finite verb **יכפר**, whose most natural subject would be **משיח אהרן וישראל**. If **משיח אהרן וישראל** is an example of a distributive construct, it would have to take a plural verb like the case of Gen 14:10 in which **וַיִּפְּלוּ וַיִּנְסוּ** and **מֶלֶךְ-סָדָם וְעַמָּהָה** accompanies **וַיִּכְפֹּר**. This makes a pressing case for those who argue for the single messiahship while presenting a stumbling block for the others. For this problem, however, Ginzberg proposed two possibilities even before the discovery of the Qumran scrolls. The first suggestion was to reconstruct “God” in the lacuna and take it as the missing subject of the verb, for “the concept of divine forgiveness of Israel’s sins at the time of Messianic redemption is prevalent throughout the literature”.¹⁹⁾ However, Ginzberg’s reconstruction can no longer hold because we now possess evidence from Cave 4. Ginzberg’s second suggestion was that the verb is in the passive, that is, **יִכְפָּר**, “their iniquity will be atoned for”. In this case, as Ginzberg notes, the verb will not be affected by the number of “the messiah of Aaron and Israel”.²⁰⁾ James C. VanderKam, who himself supports the dual messiahship, believes, however, that for the verb **כפר** the *pu’al* form is not “the most obvious reading”, but he at the same time suggests that “the number of the verb is not decisive because it simply agrees with the singular subject **משיח**”.²¹⁾ Although VanderKam’s latter point should not be readily dismissed, he cites no actual examples from the Bible or the scrolls.

19) Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect*, 252.

20) *Ibid.*, 252–253.

21) VanderKam, “Messianism”, 230.

The single piece of evidence we possess (מְלִדֵי-סָרִים וְעַמָּרָה, Gen 14:10) shows plural verbs. With our current knowledge of Ancient Hebrew, Ginzberg's second suggestion (reading יִכְפֹּר) seems better. Cross further supported the passive reading of יִכְפֹּר. He notes that for the verb כָּפַר both its *nitpa'el* (Deut 21:8; 1 Sam 6:3) and *pu'al* (Isa 22:14; 27:19) are attested in the Bible. He also observes that אֵת, which would be required if the definite עֵינִים were an object, is lacking in the sentence.²²⁾ Consequently, there is still no decisive argument against the plural reading of מְשִׁיחַ אֶהְרֵן וְיִשְׂרָאֵל, and understanding וְיִשְׂרָאֵל as a plural remains a good possibility.²³⁾

3. “Aaron and Israel”—Are They One or Separate?

One last possibility that “the messiah of Aaron and Israel” refers to a singular person should yet be discussed. If the latter part of the phrase (i.e., “Aaron and Israel”) designates one entity rather than two separate entities, the whole phrase “the messiah of Aaron and Israel” may more naturally be read as a singular person.

H. H. Rowley, for example, argues that “Aaron and Israel” refers to the Qumran sect itself, and thus one single entity:

-
- 22) Cross, *Ancient Library*, 188. Strangely, this subject is not discussed by Brooke or the earlier Abegg, both of whom are supporters of the single messiahship. Moreover, Abegg, in his earlier article where he argues for the single messiahship, makes a self-contradictory mistake. Whereas Abegg takes יִכְפֹּר in CD as active (“Messiah at Qumran”, 130), later in the same paper when he treats 4Q285 he remarks, “Definite objects in QL are regularly introduced by the particle אֵת whereas pronominal objects are nearly always suffixed to the verb” (“Messiah at Qumran”, 138–139).
- 23) On the function of atonement, see Hee Kyung Chung, “A Study on the Twofold Function of the Sin Offering in the Light of the Kipper Act by Using Structural Criticism and Text Linguistics: Focused on Leviticus 4”, *KJOTS* 22/1 (2016), 10–37.

the community of the sect is itself described in the *Manual of Discipline* as a 'house of holiness for Israel . . . and a house of unity for Aaron,' The sect itself therefore represents Israel and Aaron, and the title of Messiah has reference to the character of the sect, and not his personal descent. The Messiah who shall arise from Aaron and Israel is thus the Messiah who shall arise from the sect . . .²⁴⁾

While Rowley does not provide further evidence, Hurst, who has a similar opinion with the earlier Abegg, advances the case. According to Hurst, further evidence for a communal interpretation of "Aaron and Israel" may be found in the role of the messiah expressed in CD XIV, 19. Here, as we already saw in the above grammatical discussion, the messiah of Aaron and Israel takes part in "pardoning iniquity". Hurst writes, "The term used for 'pardoning iniquity' in CD is *kpr* ("atone for, expiate") the identical verb applied to God in 1QS 2:8, 11:14 and CD 2:5, 3:18, 4:6, 9, 10. Elsewhere in the scrolls the term *kpr* is predicated of *the community* (1QS 5:6, 8:6, 10, 9:4; 1QM 2:5, 1QSa 1:3)".²⁵⁾ "Therefore", Hurst claims, "we may see the expiatory role of the community, a role that devolves upon its figurehead, the Messiah".²⁶⁾

Despite Rowley's suggestion and Hurst's elaboration, the original problem raised by Ginzberg still remains. That is, "Aaron" is a subset of "Israel". It is not like, for example, "Ephraim and Manasseh", both of which are needed to constitute the house of Joseph. The community could have been called "Israel" or, if the members wanted to emphasize their priestly identity, "Aaron", but probably not "Aaron and Israel". As for Hurst's argument, it should be noted that atonement is not monopolized by the community;

24) H. H. Rowley, *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1952), 41.

25) Hurst, "Two Messiahs?", 169. Italics original.

26) Ibid.

atonement can also be made by the messiah(s) or God. Hurst's argument is not definitive,

On the other hand, I suggest that "Aaron and Israel" in CD represent two separate entities. First, look at CD XIX, 35-XX, 1:

From the day of the gathering in of the Teacher of the Community until the coming of a messiah from Aaron and from Israel (משיח מאהרן ומישראל).²⁷⁾

Here, instead of the usual "the messiah of Aaron and Israel", we read "a messiah *from* Aaron and *from* Israel". It is difficult to understand why the writer used מן twice unless the phrase "Aaron and Israel" designates two entities. The fact that "from" is used repeatedly, I believe, counters the understanding of "Aaron and Israel" as one entity.²⁸⁾

Further evidence against "Aaron and Israel" as being one entity is the absence of this phrase in the scrolls. According to a concordance, the phrase "Aaron and Israel" does not occur at all in the scrolls except in the phrase "the messiah(s) of Aaron and Israel". If the phrase "Aaron and Israel" designates one entity and is thus a word for one concept, it is strange that we do not find an independent case of "Aaron and Israel" or a phrase that includes "Aaron and Israel" but is not "the messiah(s) of Aaron and Israel".²⁹⁾

27) Translation by Geza Vermes with slight modifications. All the translations of the scrolls cited in this paper are from Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (rev. ed.; London: Penguin, 2004).

28) I have found from the OT 13 verses which contain a similar construction (Josh 11:21; Judg 7:23; 18:2; 2 Sam 8:8; 1 Kgs 2:31; 1 Chr 18:8; 19:6; 2 Chr 9:28; Neh 5:13; 12:29; Isa 3:1; 11:11; 65:9). All contain a sequence of "from [one word] and from . . ." with "from" being מן in Hebrew. In none of these examples the objects of the preposition could be taken as a single unit. My sampling is of course not exhaustive, but it certainly bolsters my point.

29) See further Collins, *Scepter*, 79.

Up to this point my discussion has been centered upon the phrase “the messiah and Aaron and Israel”. Two points have been presented. First, the Hebrew language has a distributive construct structure and thus it is legitimate to see double figures in the phrase “the messiah of Aaron and Israel”. Second, the phrase “Aaron and Israel” more plausibly designates two entities rather than one.

Nevertheless, the points I have hitherto made are hardly definitive.³⁰⁾ For example, the existence of a distributive construct does not exclude a singular reading, since it is possible that our phrase may not belong to this construction. To advance our case, one more thing needs to be proved: that is, “Aaron” and “Israel” are not only two different entities but also matching partners in a coordinating relationship. This cannot be argued in the scope of our specific phrase (i. e., “the messiah of Aaron and Israel”). Thus I now examine some immediate contexts of the expression and then discuss the wider contexts of some Qumran and biblical texts.

4. Dual Leadership in the *Damascus Document*

Those who argue for the double messiahship believe that “the messiah of Aaron” is a priestly messiah and “the messiah of Israel” is a royal one. Thus the dual messiahship of “Aaron and Israel” in CD will be an expectation of diarchy by an eschatological priest and an eschatological ruler. It is not difficult to find in CD the passages that show such eschatological double leadership. Moreover, the eschatological passages are not the only places where dual

30) As many scholars who support the double messiahship say. For example, Schniedewind writes, “The expression אהרן וישראל may by itself be insufficient evidence”. Schniedewind, “Structural Aspects”, 526.

leadership prevails. As many scholars have observed, dual leadership dominates in CD's mundane life as well as in its expectation of the future. Below I discuss the passages that point to this duality. Some are situated in the eschatological future; others in the past or in the present mundane lives.

First, one of the most famous messianic passages in CD is the pesher on the Balaam oracle in CD VII, 18-21:

The *star* is the Interpreter of the Law who shall come to Damascus; as it is written, *A star shall come forth out of Jacob and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel* (Num 24:17). The *sceptre* is the Prince of the whole congregation, and when he comes *he shall smite all the children of Seth* (Num 24:17; italics from the original translator).

As John J. Collins notes, the “scepter” of the biblical passage is interpreted as “the Prince of the whole congregation”, who is clearly a royal messiah or “the messiah of Israel”.³¹⁾ “The Interpreter of the Law”, whom the pesherist identifies with the “star”, must be the counterpart of the royal messiah, that is, the priestly messiah or “the messiah of Aaron”. It may be contended that not every part of the original biblical citation necessarily has to receive a matching interpretation in the pesher. Thus, the “star” and the “scepter” may be “merely parallel terms reflecting ancient Canaanite poetic style”.³²⁾ To this contention William M. Schniedewind replies, “Not at all”. According to Schniedewind, “there are no rhetorical redundancies in the Bible for the Qumran interpreters. . . . Rather, each part of the parallelism has its own individual meaning, each

31) Collins, *Scepter*, 80.

32) Schniedewind, “Structural Aspects”, 534.

part has its own individual referent”. Therefore, the pesher “as illustrated by Num. 24:17 tells us something of the way in which the expression משיח אהרן וישראל ‘anointed of Aaron and of Israel’ must be understood”.³³⁾

The second passage that attests to the bicephalic nature of CD is the beginning of the scroll,

For when they were unfaithful and forsook Him, He hid His face *from Israel and His Sanctuary*. . . . And He caused a plant root to spring *from Israel and Aaron* to inherit His Land (CD I, 3-8; italics added).

According to Schniedewind, this description of the rise of the movement clearly indicates a “corresponding duality” between the punishment and the restoration.³⁴⁾ This duality, of course, is of the secular and the sacred.

Our third evidence, again from Schniedewind’s discussion, is the metaphor of a “sure house”.

And He built them a sure house in Israel whose like has never existed from former times till now (CD III, 19).

33) Ibid. A subject which must be treated in a separate study is the problem of redaction. As Collins notes, the interpretation of the Balaam oracle in CD VII, which clearly mentions two separate messianic figures, is much more complicated by the parallel passage in CD XIX, which mentions “the messiah of Aaron and Israel” but does not treat them (or “him” for some) separately. Some scholars believe CD XIX is more original and thus the Balaam oracle is a secondary insertion. For them, then, the document originally expected a single priestly messiah, who is “the messiah of Aaron and Israel”. Their theories about the redaction history of CD cannot be definitive, however, and until further textual evidence becomes available, the best would be to treat both documents equally. See the discussion by Collins, *Scepter*, 80–82, and also Philip R. Davies, “Judaisms in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Case of the Messiah”, Timothy H. Lim et al. (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 219–232.

34) Schniedewind, “Structural Aspects”, 529.

Schniedewind notes that since the “sure house” will be built “in Israel”, this passage would be “implicitly a reference to a royal house, and not the eternal priesthood”.³⁵⁾ Indeed, as Schniedewind observes, the biblical motif of a “sure house” (2 Sam 7:16) is God’s promise toward King David.

Your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever before me; your throne shall be established forever (2 Sam 7:16, NRSV).

“However”, Schniedewind continues, “it should be emphasized that biblical tradition interpreted **ביתך וּמַמְלַכְתְּךָ** and **וְנִאֲמַן בֵּיתְךָ** as two separate promises—**ביתך** “your house” referring to the temple and **מַמְלַכְתְּךָ** “your kingdom” referring to the Davidic monarchy. . . . It should not be surprising then that the priest are also promised a ‘sure house’”. Accordingly, we read in the prophecy against Eli’s house that God will raise up for himself “a faithful priest”, whom God will build a “sure house” (1 Sam 2:35). Schniedewind concludes that the reference in CD III, which starts by saying that a “sure house” will be built “in Israel”, moves its focus on the priesthood in the following context, where the scroll cites and interprets Ezek 44:15.³⁶⁾

Our fourth and last evidence of dual leadership in CD pertains to the present mundane lives. Collins pays attention to two sections of CD which highlight two leading individuals in the organization of the sect. According to Collins, “the ‘rule for the assembly of the camps’ in CD 14 singles out two authoritative figures, the priest who enrolls the congregation and ‘the guardian

35) Ibid., 530.

36) Ibid., 530–531.

(מבקר) of all the camps”. CD XIII says that “wherever there are ten people in a ‘camp’ there should be a priest in charge, and the passage goes on to define the role of the ‘guardian of the camp,’ who is clearly a different figure”.³⁷⁾

5. Further Evidence from Other Scrolls and the Scripture

For our discussion, it is also useful to examine some other passages in other scrolls and in the Bible. The first passage to consider is from 1QS, the only case in which 1QS refers to a messiah:

They shall depart from none of the counsels of the Law to walk in all the stubbornness of their hearts, but shall be ruled by the primitive precepts in which the men of the Community were first instructed until there shall come the prophet and the messiahs of Aaron and Israel (משיחי אהרן וישראל), 1QS IX, 9-11).

The reference to plural messiahs is unique in the Qumran literature. When this text was discovered, many thought that it would finally end the debate, because it unambiguously refers to plural messiahs. Of course, we should be cautious when we travel outside one document. It is still significant, however, to observe that another scroll from Qumran, which the community cherished as importantly as the *Damascus Document*, also speaks of the multiple messiahship. The phrase may not prove the dual messiahship of CD, but at the very least it demonstrates that a similar picture was drawn by another document written and copied by the same people.

For some, however, the reference in 1QS speaks against the double

37) Collins, *Scepter*, 77.

messiahship. For example, George J. Brooke writes that “[w]ith 1QS IX, 11 confirming that two figures would more readily be referred to through the use of a plural construct *nomen regens*, the arguments need not be rehearsed further; the most likely understanding of the phrase ‘Messiah of Aaron and Israel’ [in CD] is that it refers to one single figure”.³⁸⁾ However, our understanding of the dual messiahship does not depend on 1QS only. Instead, it significantly relies on the existence of a specific Hebrew structure, that is, the distributive construct. Brooke’s argument is irrelevant to the existence or absence of the construction. The phrase “the messiah of Aaron and Israel” may have already become a fixed expression, and there may have been difference in grammatical context which triggered the addition of a plural ending in 1QS IX. Abegg, in the later article where he supports the multiple messiahship, is probably correct in arguing that “the instance of the plural at 1QS 9:11 . . . perhaps reflects a sense that the distributive construct would have seemed ambiguous after the singular ‘prophet’”.³⁹⁾

Second, in addition to the above expression, 1QS provides us with a broader background for the plural understanding of messianism. As Collins notes, the bifurcation of leadership in CD which I have mentioned earlier is also seen in the *Community Rule*. For example, in the *Rule of the Congregation*, the priest and the guardian dominate.⁴⁰⁾ Along with the only reference to the messiah in 1QS IX, 11, the organization of the sect as presented in 1QS clearly shows that the document uniformly speaks of two messiahs,⁴¹⁾ for, as Collins remarks, “[n]o fragment of the document suggests

38) Brooke, “The Messiah of Aaron”, 222.

39) Abegg, “The Hebrew”, 335.

40) Collins, *Scepter*, 77.

41) *Ibid.*, 83.

the expectation of a single messiah”.⁴²⁾ Therefore, although it is impossible here to address all of the evidence from Qumran, at least CD and 1QS, which are two of the most important documents of the sect, coherently support the double messiahship of both a royal messiah of Israel and a priestly messiah of Aaron.⁴³⁾

Lastly, scholars have observed that the priestly/royal double leadership has biblical precedents. The examples include Moses and Aaron in the Pentateuch, the king and the High Priest in the preexilic monarchy, Joshua the high priest and the ‘scion’ Zerubbabel in the restoration period, who were called the “two sons of oil” in the book of Zechariah (4:14).⁴⁴⁾ Again, these cannot constitute definitive evidence for understanding “the messiah of Aaron and Israel” as two messiahs, but they provide adequate contexts for such understanding.⁴⁵⁾

6. Conclusion

Discussing the numerical problem of the phrase “the messiah of Aaron and

42) Ibid.

43) Ibid. Also Evans, “The Messiah”, 95. Cross goes further and definitively asserts that “[a]t Qumrân, in the Damascus Document, in the Rule, in the War Scroll, in the Testimonia, and as well, in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, there is the doctrine of the two messiahs, with the Balaam Oracle concerning the Star and the Scepter, the two eschatological figures, a favorite proof text”. Cross, *Ancient Library*, 188. Therefore, although the problem of the origin of the double messiahship at Qumran should be treated as a separate study, we should note that Qumran’s double messiahship did not develop from the “older” single messiahship; it seems that the double messiahship was more original.

44) Collins, *Scepter*, 77; Nitzan, “Eschatological Motives”, 145; Cross, *Ancient Library*, 187.

45) Cross argues that “[t]he two figures, priestly and royal, persist in later Jewish doctrine of eschatological offices down to Christian times”. Cross, *Ancient Library*, 187.

Israel” of the *Damascus Document*, I have advanced the case in four steps. First, I asked a question whether “the messiah of Aaron and Israel” could be read as referring to more than one figure. Three points have been presented: (1) “the messiah of Aaron and Israel”, if singular, would be intrinsically redundant and awkward; (2) the existence of a distributive construct in the Hebrew grammar makes it possible to read “the messiah of Aaron and Israel” as plural; (3) **יכפר**, which could support a singular reading if it were active, seems to be passive because there is no **את** before **עונם**. Second, I asked whether the phrase “Aaron and Israel” refers to one single entity or two separate entities. The usage of the words in CD suggests us to take “Aaron and Israel” as two separate entities. Third, I examined some relevant passages in CD. The dual leadership of the sacred leader and the secular one prevails not only in the eschatological context, but also in the past and the present. Fourth, I briefly examined data from other scrolls and the Bible. The data too have given our theory more plausibility.

The present study has treated only the linguistic or philological aspect of messiahship in one particular document from Qumran. A broader discussion of messiahship in Qumran should include documents such as 4Q246, 11QMelch, or 4QTestimon^{ia}. I hope, however, that the present study serves as a stepping stone for getting into this important subject in the study of the scrolls, and, further, the Judeo-Christian tradition.⁴⁶⁾

46) Some important OT passages that we can address in this regard include Pss 2; 110; Hag 2:22–23; Zech 6:12–13, some of which, it should be noted, seem to support the single messiahship. For a recent contribution by a Korean scholar on OT messiahship, see Seong Hyuk Hong, “Shalom in the Messianic Prophetic Texts”, *KJOTS* 21/1 (2015), 121–152.

Bibliography

- Abegg, Martin G., Jr., "The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls", P. W. Flint and James C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1:325-358.
- _____, "The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?" *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995), 124-144.
- Brooke, George J., "The Messiah of Aaron in the Damascus Document", *Revue de Qumran* 15 (1991), 215-230.
- Chung, Hee Kyung, "A Study on the Twofold Function of the Sin Offering in the Light of the Kipper Act by Using Structural Criticism and Text Linguistics: Focused on Leviticus 4", *Korean Journal of Old Testament Studies* 22/1 (2016), 10-37.
- Collins, John J., *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Related Literature* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995).
- Craig A. Evans, "The Messiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls", Richard S. Hess and M. Daniel Carroll R. (eds.), *Israel's Messiah in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic Press, 2003), 85-101.
- Cross, Frank M., *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (3rd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995).
- _____, "Notes on the Doctrine of the Two Messiahs at Qumran and the Extracanonical Daniel Apocalypse (4Q246)", Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks (eds.), *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995* (STDJ 20; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 1-13.
- Davies, Philip R., "Judaisms in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Case of the Mes-

- siah”, Timothy H. Lim with Larry W. Hurtado, A. Graeme Auld, and Alison Jack (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 219-232.
- Dimant, Devorah, “Qumran Sectarian Literature”, Michael Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (CRINT; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 483-550.
- García Martínez, Florentino, “Two Messianic Figures in the Qumran Texts”, Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks (eds.), *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995* (STDJ 20; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 14-40.
- Ginzberg, Louis, *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (New York: KTAV, 1976).
- Ginzberg, Louis, *Eine unbekante jüdische Sekte* (New York, 1922).
- Hong, Seong Hyuk, “Shalom in the Messianic Prophetic Texts”, *Korean Journal of Old Testament Studies* 21/1 (2015), 121-152.
- Hurst, L. D., “Did Qumran Expect Two Messiahs?”, *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 9 (1999), 157-180.
- Joüon, Paul, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (trans. and rev. Takamitsu Muraoka), (SubBi 14; 2 vols.; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2000).
- Nitzan, Bilhah, “Eschatological Motives in Qumran Literature: the Messianic Concept”, Henning Graf Reventlow (ed.), *Eschatology in the Bible and in Jewish and Christian Tradition* (JSOTSup 243; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 132-151.
- Rowley, H. H., *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1952).
- Schniedewind, William M., “Structural Aspects of Qumran Messianism in the

- Damascus Document”, Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich (eds.), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 523-536.
- VanderKam, James C., “Messianism in the Scrolls”, Eugene Ulrich and James C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994).
- Vermes, Geza, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (rev. ed.; London: Penguin, 2004).
- Waltke, Bruce K., “Samaritan Pentateuch”, David Noel Freedman (ed.), *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 5:932-940.
- Xeravits, Géza G., *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

Keywords

the *Damascus Document*

Dead Sea Scrolls

messiah

messiah of Aaron and Israel

Qumran

“아론과 이스라엘의 메시아”: 한 사람인가, 두 사람인가?

김동혁

연세대 외래강사

예일대학교 Ph.D.

쿰란의 메시아사상에 관한 학자들의 논의는 여러 주제를 아우르지만, 그중 한 가지 난제는 다마스쿠스 문서에서 만나게 되는 간단한 어구인 “아론과 이스라엘의 메시아”와 관련된다. 즉, 이 어구가 한 명의 메시아를 가리키는가, 두 명의 메시아를 가리키는가의 문제이다. 한편으로 다수의 학자들은 이 어구가 두 명의 메시아를 가리킨다고 생각한다. 그러나 다른 한편으로 적지 않은 학자들은 이 어구가 한 명의 메시아를 가리킨다고 이해한다. 본 연구는 이 어구가 두 명의 메시아적 인물을 가리킴을 논증한다. 이를 위해 논문은 우선 이 어구를 문법적으로 분석하고, 그다음 다마스쿠스 문서의 관련 본문들을 탐구하고, 마지막으로 다른 두루마리들과 구약 성서의 증거를 검토한다. 논의는 주로 문헌학적인 측면에 집중한다.

첫째, 논문은 “아론과 이스라엘의 메시아”가 복수의 인물을 가리킬 수 있음을 논증한다. 세 가지 사항이 제시된다. (1) “아론과 이스라엘의 메시아”가 만일 단수의 인물을 가리킨다면, 이 표현 자체가 잉여적이고 어색하다. (2) 히브리어 문법에 분배 구문

www.kci.go.kr

이 있다는 사실은 “아론과 이스라엘의 메시아”를 복수 의미로 이해하는 것을 가능하게 해 준다. (3) CD XIV, 19에 나오는 히브리어 동사 *ykpr*는 만약 능동 형태라면 단수의 메시아를 지지해 주는 증거가 되겠지만, 문맥에 직접 목적어 표시사가 없는 점을 고려할 때에 복수 형태라고 생각된다. 둘째, “아론과 이스라엘”이라는 어구는 한 개체가 아닌 두 개체를 가리킨다. 셋째, 다마스쿠스 문서에서 종교 지도자와 세속 지도자가 함께 일하는 이중의 리더십은 종말론적 맥락에서뿐 아니라 과거 및 현재의 맥락에서도 중요하게 나타난다. 넷째, 다른 사해 두루마리 자료와 성서 자료 역시 이중 메시아사상을 간접적으로 뒷받침해 준다.

본 연구는 다마스쿠스 문서 속 메시아사상의 문헌학적 측면만을 다루지만, 이를 통해 사해 두루마리의 메시아사상 및 더 나아가 유대-기독교 전통의 메시아사상에 관한 연구로 나아가는 학도들이 더욱 많아지기를 기대한다.

검색어

다마스쿠스 문서

메시아사상

사해 두루마리

아론과 이스라엘의 메시아

쿠파란

- 투고일: 2018년 1월 18일
- 심사일: 2018년 1월 31일
- 게재 확정일: 2018년 2월 1일

www.kci.go.kr