

THE QUMRÂN SCROLLS, THE EBIONITES AND THEIR LITERATURE

JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J.

The Johns Hopkins University

THE importance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for both Old and New Testament study has become increasingly recognized, as these texts are published and studied. Though it will be many years before their exact value can be fully assessed, constant efforts are being made by scholars to interpret these documents. It is not surprising that some interpretations find almost immediate acceptance in scholarly circles, while others are rejected or subjected to long debate. For it is only by a gradual sifting process that the value and importance of these texts can be ascertained.

Shortly after the publication of three of the Qumrân scrolls by the American Schools of Oriental Research, J. L. Teicher of Cambridge wrote an article in the *Journal of Jewish Studies*, in which he maintained that the Qumrân sect, in whose midst these scrolls originated, was Ebionite.¹ This interpretation has not been accepted by most scholars, who at present prefer to regard the group who lived at Qumrân as Essenes (or at least as a branch of the Essenes). Nevertheless, the fact was recognized that Teicher had indicated a source from which further information might be drawn.² Teicher has continued to write a series of articles on the Ebionite sect of Qumrân and the early Church.³ More recently, however, Oscar Cullmann published an article in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*,⁴ claiming that the

Editor's Note.—This article has been developed out of the first of the papers delivered at the 1955-56 Seminar on the Qumrân Scrolls, conducted by Prof. W. F. Albright, at the Johns Hopkins University. To him the author wishes to express deep gratitude for his interest, his corrections, and the time taken to read the final copy.

¹ "The Dead Sea Scrolls—Documents of the Jewish Christian Sect of Ebionites," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 2 (1951) 67-99.

² A. Dupont-Sommer, *Nouveaux aperçus sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1953) p. 205. W. F. Albright, "Chronology of the Dead Sea Scrolls," Post-script to W. H. Brownlee's translation of the Dead Sea Manual of Discipline, *BASOR Suppl. Stud.* 10-12, 1951, p. 58, n. 3.

³ Cf. *Journal of Jewish Studies* 3 (1952) 53-55; 111-18; 128-32; 139-50; 4 (1953) 1-13; 49-58; 93-103; 139-53; 5 (1954) 38; 93-99.

⁴ "Die neuentdeckten Qumrantexte und das Judenchristentum der Pseudoklementinen," *Beilage zur Zeitschrift f. d. Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 21 (1954) 35-51.

remnants of the Essenes went over to the Ebionite group after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. Another recent article, by Hans Joachim Schoeps, puts forth the theory that the Qumrân sect, the Essenes of Philo and Josephus, the Ossaeans of Epiphanius, the disciples of John the Baptist, and the Ebionites (the latter as the descendants of the Jerusalem *Urgemeinde*) all became representatives of an apocalyptic-gnostic Judaism.⁵ This brief survey of opinions suffices to show that the connection between the sect of Qumrân and the Ebionites has been discussed in scholarly circles and that the question merits our attention. The present article intends to review the evidence for this connection and to sift the valid from the invalid claims that have been made. A *mise au point* is obviously needed, to see whether the parallels in tenets and practices of both groups are such as to warrant the assertion that the Qumrân sect was Ebionite or passed over into Ebionism or even influenced the latter group.

The matter will be discussed under three main headings: the identification of the Ebionites; their literature; the comparison of Ebionites and the Qumrân sect.

The sources of information regarding the Qumrân sect are mainly the Dead Sea Scrolls, as published by the American Schools and the Hebrew University, as well as the Damascus Document. The latter is generally recognized today as a work of this group, even though it was not found at Qumrân originally. Any information that is drawn from other sources (e.g., Philo or Josephus) is valid only insofar as the identification of the Qumrân sect as Essene is correct.

THE EBIONITES

Relatively little is known about the Ebionites. Most of the data concerning them has been preserved in patristic literature, and it is not easy to interpret. Scraps of information are found in Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, Hippolytus, Eusebius, and Jerome, while Epiphanius devotes a full chapter to them in his *Panarion*. Literary borrowing took place in some cases, so that it is not always easy to tell when the patristic writer is supplying data gathered from independent sources. In the preface of his *Theologie und Geschichte des Juden-*

⁵ "Das Gnostische Judentum in den Dead Sea Scrolls," *Zeitsch. f. Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 6 (1954), 1-4. [Hereafter referred to as Schoeps 2.]

christentums, Prof. Schoeps claims to set a new landmark for scholarly research in the study of the Ebionites by being the first to take into account Rabbinic literature and the translation of the Old Testament by Symmachus, the Ebionite. The data from Symmachus are quite fragmentary and do not really concern us here.⁶ The interpretation of the material in the Rabbinic sources is so intimately connected with the question of the identity of the *Mînim*⁷ that anything which might be gathered from such a discussion would remain quite problematical. Consequently, in a discussion of the relationship between the sect of Qumrân and the Ebionites, we prefer not to use these sources for information regarding the latter.

The English name, Ebionite, is derived from the Latin *Ebionitae*, found in Jerome (*Ep.* 112,13) and in the Latin translation of some of Origen's works of which the Greek originals are now lost (*Hom. in Luc.* 17; *Hom. in Gen.* 3,5). Another Latin form is *Ebionaei*, found in Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 1,26,2; 5,1,3), which is the transliteration of the Greek *Ebiōnaioi* (*Adv. haer.* 3,21,1; cf. Origen, *Contra Cels.* 2,1; 5,61,65; *De princ.* 4,22; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3,27). This seems to be, in turn, a transliteration of the Aramaic 'ebyōnāyē', derived from the Hebrew 'ebyōnîm, meaning "the poor." Another Greek form, *Ebiōnoi*, is found in Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 4,33,4), but this looks like a copyist's misspelling.

As the name of a sect, this word appears for the first time in Irenaeus

⁶ The questions and problems connected with Symmachus and his translation of the Old Testament are so numerous that it is too hazardous to try to draw any definite conclusions from this source. Important as is the study made by Schoeps, one may still ask whether he has really proved his point; cf. the reviews of his books by R. Bultmann in *Gnomon* 26 (1954) 180, and by G. Bornkamm in *Zeitsch. f. Kirchengeschichte* 64 (1952-53) 197.

⁷ Cf. H. J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* (Tübingen Mohr, 1949) pp. 21-25. [Hereafter referred to as Schoeps 1.] Also J. Thomas, *Le mouvement baptiste en Palestine et Syrie (150 av. J.-C.—300 apr. J.-C.)* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1935) pp. 161-62. This author identifies the *Mînim* with Ebionites and the Nazōraioi. But Ralph Marcus, "Pharisees, Essenes and Gnostics," *Journ. of Bibl. Literature* 73 (1954) 159 remarks: ". . . it has become clearer in recent years that while the term *Minim* in the Rabbinic and patristic literature of the third century and afterwards may refer to Jewish Christians, in Tannaitic writings it chiefly designates Jewish Gnostics." Prof. Marcus quotes L. Ginsberg: "I may state with certainty that only in a very few places does *Minim* refer to Judeo-Christians, while in most cases it describes Jewish Gnostics" (*ibid.*, n. 4). Cf. also Bultmann, *op. cit.*, p. 179; and G. Bornkamm (*op. cit.*, p. 197) who speaks of the "nur hypothetisch verwendbaren rabbinischen Zeugnisse über das Judenchristentum."

(*Adv. haer.* 1,26,2 Latin: *Ebionaei*; 3,21,1 Greek: *Ebiōnaioi*). He offers no explanation of its meaning or origin, but several were given in antiquity. They were called Ebionites: (a) because of the poverty of their intelligence (Origen, *De princ.* 4,22; *Hom. in Gen.* 3,5; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3,27; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 30,17); (b) because of the poverty of the law which they followed (Origen, *Contra Cels.* 2,1); (c) because of the poverty of the opinions they had of Christ (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3,27); (d) because they were "poor in understanding, hope, and deeds" (Epiphanius, *Pan.* 30,17). These are obviously pejorative afterthoughts, which scarcely give us a clue to the origin of the term.

Epiphanius (*Pan.* 30,1; 30,17; etc.) also derived the name from a founder, named Ebion. Tertullian (*De praescrip.* 33; *De carne Christi* 14,18) speaks of a man named Ebion. Despite this tradition, which also ascribes to him certain fragments in the work, *Doctrina patrum de incarnatione Verbi*, modern scholars are inclined to look on Ebion merely as an eponymous hero, a personification of the sect itself.⁸ However, since preliminary reports about the contents of the thirteen Coptic codices from Chenoboskion, Egypt, have been indicating that the patristic data regarding the early heretics are more reliable than is often supposed, a word of caution is injected here.⁹ Perhaps the name Ebionite actually does mean "follower of Ebion."

We know from the New Testament that certain early Christians were referred to as "the poor" (Rom 15:26; Gal 2:10). This may refer, of course, merely to the poor members of the community at Jerusalem.

⁸ Cf. J. Thomas, *op. cit.*, p. 160; Schoeps 1,9. The latter maintains that this idea of Ebion as a founder is due to Hippolytus, but he gives no references for this statement (cf. p. 9, n. 2). This is but one example of the carelessness that is found in this book amid an otherwise mammoth display of erudition, which makes it necessary to use Schoeps' work only with the greatest caution. Cf. Bornkmann's review, p. 196: "leider in Zitaten und Literaturangaben fehlerreich." Similarly Bultmann, *op. cit.*, p. 189. In the light of such criticism it is quite surprising to read the highly laudatory review of Schoeps' books written by P. Benoit, O.P., in *Rev. biblique* 57 (1950) 604-9: "un magistral exposé"; "d'une richesse peu ordinaire"; "... par le soin scrupuleux qu'il met à prouver scientifiquement tout ce qu'il avance. . ."

⁹ Cf. G. Quispel, "Neue Funde zur Valentinianischen Gnosis," *Zeitsch. f. Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 6 (1954) 289-305; H.-Ch. Puech et G. Quispel, "Les écrits Gnostiques du Codex Jung," *Vigiliae christianae* 8 (1954) 1-51; V. R. Gold, "The Gnostic library of Chenoboskion," *Biblical Archaeologist* 15 (1952) 70-88; W. F. Albright, "The Bible after Twenty Years of Archeology," *Religion in Life* 21 (1952) 548.

But it is possible that the name *Ebiōnaioi* grew out of a practice of referring to the first Christians in Jerusalem as the poor, especially after the destruction of the city in 70 A.D. At some time during the first two centuries (it is impossible to be more precise) this designation was restricted to those who lived in Palestine and Syria, and who continued to observe the Mosaic Law. It seems likely that the original use of the word was in no way connected with an heretical sect.

The Ebionites were, then, a Jewish-Christian sect, first mentioned by Irenaeus *ca.* 175 A.D., which flourished during the second, third, and early fourth centuries (at least). In the New Testament there is mention of Jewish Christians, who believed in Christ but also observed the Mosaic Law (Acts 15:1 ff.; 21:21; Gal 2). This was the community at Jerusalem, headed by St. James. It is not unlikely that remnants of this group after the destruction of Jerusalem developed into the Ebionite sect, acquiring heterodox notions in time from other sources, such as Cerinthus and the Elchesaites. Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 3,5) tells us:

The people of the church in Jerusalem were commanded by an oracle given by revelation before the war to those in the city who were worthy of it to depart and dwell in one of the cities of Perea which they called Pella. To it those who believed on Christ migrated from Jerusalem, that when holy men had altogether deserted the royal capital of the Jews and the whole land of Judaea, the judgement of God might at last overtake them for all their crimes against the Christ and his Apostles.¹⁰

It is important to note here that Eusebius does not call these emigrants by the name of Ebionites, nor have we any reason to assume that he was speaking of them specifically. They were merely some of the Christians of the original community of Jerusalem. Justin distinguished two sorts of Jewish Christians, those who observe the Mosaic Law but do not require its observance of all others, and those who maintain that this observance is necessary for salvation. Justin would communicate with the former, but not with the latter (*Dial. cum Tryph.* 47; 48). Schoeps equates the Ebionites with the more intransigent group.¹¹ By the time of Irenaeus there was definitely a sect named *Ebiōnaioi*, who were considered heretical by him and were listed among the Gnostics

¹⁰ Kirsopp Lake's translation in the Loeb Classical Library, *Eusebius* 1,201.

¹¹ Schoeps 1,8.

CHART 1

TENETS AND PRACTICES OF THE EBIONITES AND NAZORAIOT ACCORDING
TO THE FATHERS*The Ebionites*

- a) they depend on Cerinthus and Carpocrates (Iren, Tertull, Hipp)
- b) they believe in one God, the creator of the world (Iren, Tert, Hipp)
- c) they use the gospel of Matthew only (Iren, Tert [?], Epiph)
- d) they reject Paul as an apostate from the law (Iren, Orig, Epiph)
- e) they exegete the prophets *curiosius* (Iren)
- f) they practice circumcision (Iren, Orig, Epiph)
- g) they observe the Sabbath (Euseb, Epiph)
- h) they live according to the Jewish way of life, according to the law (Iren, Tert, Hipp, Orig, Euseb, Epiph)
- i) they face Jerusalem when they pray (Iren)
- j) they hold the observance of the Mosaic Law as necessary for salvation (Hipp, Euseb)
- k) they reject the Virgin Birth of Christ (Iren, Tert, Orig, Euseb, Epiph)
- l) they hold Christ to be a mere man (Iren, Tert, Hipp, Euseb, Epiph)
- m) they maintain Jesus had to merit his title, Christ, by fulfilling the Law (Hipp, Epiph)
- n) they reject virginity and continence (Epiph)
- o) they use purificatory baths (Epiph)
- p) they use remedial baths (Epiph)
- q) they admit baptism (Epiph)
- r) they celebrate the mysteries with unleavened bread and mere water (Epiph)
- s) they hold that Christ came to abrogate sacrifice in the temple (Epiph)
- t) they believe that God set the devil and Christ to rule over this world and the world to come respectively (Epiph)
- u) they give up all goods and possessions (Epiph)
- v) they permit divorce (Epiph)
- w) they admit Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, Joshua, but none of the prophets (David, Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Ezekiel, Elijah, Elisha) (Epiph)
- x) they claim that Christ alone is the *prophētēs . . . tēs alētheias* (Epiph)
- y) they use the book, *Periodoi Petrou dia Klēmētos* (Epiph)
- z) they abstain from meat like Peter (Epiph)

CHART 1—*Continued**The Nazōraioi*

- a) they believe in one God, Creator of the world (Epiph)
- b) they use the Gospel of Matthew only (Euseb, Epiph)
- c) they reject Paul as an apostate from the Law (Orig, Euseb)
- d) they practice circumcision (Epiph)
- e) they observe the Sabbath (Euseb, Epiph [Euseb says they observed Sunday too])
- f) they follow the Jewish way of life according to the Law (Euseb, Epiph)
- g) they do not reject the virgin birth of Christ (Orig, Euseb, Jerome; Epiph is not sure about this)
- h) they deny Jesus' preexistence as God (Euseb)
- i) they call Jesus the Son of God (Epiph, Jerome)
- j) they believe in the resurrection of the dead (Epiph)

(*Adv. haer.* 1,26,2). He mentions specifically that they rejected the virgin birth of Christ (5,1,3; 3,21,1) and denied the Incarnation (4,33,4).¹²

Tertullian adds no new details, except to speak of *Ebion*, not of the *Ebionaei*. One phrase of his, however, is interesting, for he mentions that Ebion was influenced by Cerinthus, "non in omni parte consentiens" (*Adv. omn. haer.* 3).¹³ It is generally agreed that the christological tenets of the Ebionites came from this Cerinthian influence. Hippolytus (*Philosoph.* 7,34; 10,22) adds a few details to our knowledge, but they are not important here (see Chart 1).

It is Origen who first distinguishes for us two kinds of Ebionites: those who admit the virgin birth of Christ, and those who reject it (*Contra Cels.* 5,61). Both groups, however, reject the epistles of St. Paul (5,65). Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 3,27) has likewise recorded the fact of two groups of Ebionites.

But others the wicked demon, when he could not alienate them from God's plan in Christ, made his own, when he found them by a different snare. The first Chris-

¹² It is important to remember that the type of patristic writing in which the Ebionites are usually mentioned is heresiography. They were classed as christological heretics; such a classification, though important to the theologian, leaves us, however, with a paucity of details for our comparison with the Qumrân sect.

¹³ Perhaps it would be better to describe this work as Pseudo-Tertullian; it is generally held today that cc. 46-53 of the *De praescriptione* are actually a digest of Hippolytus' lost *Synagoga*; cf. J. Quasten, *Patrology 2* (Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1953) 169-70.

tians gave these the suitable name of Ebionites because they had poor and mean opinions concerning Christ. They held him to be a plain and ordinary man who had achieved righteousness merely by the progress of his character and had been born naturally from Mary and her husband. They insisted on the complete observation of the Law, and did not think that they would be saved by faith in Christ alone and by a life in accordance with it. But there were others besides these who have the same name. These escaped the absurd folly of the first mentioned, and did not deny that the Lord was born of a Virgin and the Holy Spirit, but nevertheless agreed with them in not confessing his pre-existence as God, being the Logos and Wisdom. Thus they shared in the impiety of the former class, especially in that they were equally zealous to insist on the literal observance of the Law. They thought that the letters of the Apostle ought to be wholly rejected and called him an apostate from the Law. They used only the Gospel called according to the Hebrews and made little account of the rest. Like the former they used to observe the sabbath and the rest of the Jewish ceremonial, but on Sundays celebrated rites like ours in commemoration of the Saviour's resurrection. Wherefore from these practices they have obtained their name, for the name of Ebionites indicates the poverty of their intelligence, for this name means 'poor' in Hebrew.¹⁴

Epiphanius, who of all the patristic writers gives most space to the Ebionites, supplies names for the two groups. The more orthodox group, which probably admits the virgin birth of Christ (*Pan.* 29), is called *Nazōraioi*; the more heterodox group is labelled *Ebiōnaioi* (*Pan.* 30). The identification of the *Nazōraioi* as an orthodox group of Jewish Christians, related somehow to the Ebionites, is admitted by many scholars; but the identification has problems connected with it that we cannot discuss here.¹⁵ It is complicated by the fact that Jerome equates *Ebionitae*, *Nazaraei*, and *Minaei*.¹⁶ At any rate, we are sure that there was a definite group of christological heretics in the early centuries of the Church who were called Ebionites.

Among the details supplied by Epiphanius, mention is made of the influence of the Elchesaïtes on the Ebionites (*Pan.* 30,17). He goes to the trouble of indicating that this influence affected the followers of

¹⁴ Kirsopp Lake's translation, *op. cit.*, pp. 261-63.

¹⁵ Cf. J. Thomas, *op. cit.*, pp. 156-70, for a detailed discussion and references to the literature on the subject. Schoeps (1,8 ff.) likewise discusses the problem briefly.

¹⁶ Cf. *Ep.* 112,13 (*PL* 22,924): "Quid dicam de Ebionitis, qui Christianos esse se simulant? Usque hodie per totas Orientis synagogas inter Judaeos haeresis est, quae dicitur Minaeorum, et a Pharisaeis nunc usque damnatur: quos vulgo Nazaraeos nuncupant, qui credunt in Christum Filium Dei, natum de virgine Maria, et eum dicunt esse, qui sub Pontio Pilato passus est, et resurrexit, in quem et nos credimus: sed dum volunt et Iudaei esse et Christiani, nec Iudaei sunt nec Christiani."

Ebion, not Ebion himself. Elchesai was an heretical leader who preached (*ca.* 100 A.D.) a doctrine of baptism unto the remission of sins which was heavily infected with Gnostic ideas (so, at least, it is usually judged). Schoeps,¹⁷ following C. Schmidt and others, maintains that Epiphanius has confused the Ebionites with the Elchesaites, so that his account of the Ebionites can be accepted only when there is outside control. It is true that Epiphanius adds details about the Ebionites not found elsewhere in patristic writings. If we glance at Chart 1, we will see that the items listed under *n-z* come from Epiphanius alone. Among these we find mention of dualism, various types of baths, peculiar ideas on the prophets, Christ—all of which have been associated with Jewish-Christian Gnosticism. Has Epiphanius confused the Ebionites with the Elchesaites? We just do not know. It is just as reasonable to admit the explanation given by J. Thomas,¹⁸ that the Ebionites were influenced by three groups: the Essenes, the early Christians, the Elchesaites.

Before terminating this section on the identification of the Ebionites, we shall mention briefly the opinion of J. L. Teicher regarding the Qumrân sect, which he maintains is Ebionite. One might be surprised that we are bringing up this point now. The reason is that, since Teicher does not depend upon a discussion of the Pseudo-Clementines for his "proof" that the sect is Ebionite,¹⁹ his views can be best set forth here.

From the description thus far given of the Ebionites, one might well wonder if there be any connection between them and the sect of Qumrân. Certainly the climate of opinion in which the latter group lived was that of the Old Testament, as is evident to all who are

¹⁷ 1,11; Schoeps is continually stressing throughout his book that the Ebionites were not Gnostics. He finds it convenient for his thesis to attribute all Gnostic elements that might be found in the Ebionite tenets to the Elchesaites. This may well be true, but it does not follow that Epiphanius has confused the Elchesaites and the Ebionites. Later Ebionites may well have been Gnostics, precisely because of the Elchesaite influence. Does not this seem to be indicated by the fact that Epiphanius notes a distinction between Ebion and later Ebionites?

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 171-83; Cf. Bultmann, *op. cit.*, p. 185.

¹⁹ In his first article on the Ebionites and the Dead Sea Scrolls (cf. note 1 above) Teicher gives one reference to two places in the Pseudo-Clementines; cf. p. 98, n. 4. This is supposed to support his contention that Paul is the adversary referred to in the *Pešer* on Habakkuk and in the Pseudo-Clementines.

acquainted with the Qumrân literature.²⁰ The New Testament, on the other hand, is definitely the framework and background of the Ebionite way of life, even though they have retained the observance of the Mosaic Law. This we know from patristic information and from the Pseudo-Clementine writings. Yet for Professor Teicher the Qumrân sect is Ebionite, Christ is the Teacher of Righteousness, and Paul is the "Man of Lies." The Ebionites, being Christians, were affected by Diocletian's edict of persecution, and so, rather than hand over their sacred books according to the royal decree, they hid them in the caves at Qumrân. The Qumrân sect is Ebionite because they are mentioned in the *Pešer* on Habakkuk as 'ebyônîm (12:3,6); and Qumrân is "in the vicinity" of the spot in Transjordan where the Ebionites lived. Efforts have been made to point out the weaknesses in the arguments and opinion of Prof. Teicher,²¹ but he writes on undaunted. In an article such as this a detailed refutation is out of place.²²

²⁰ Cf. Karl Georg Kuhn, "Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament," *Zeitsch. f. Theologie u. Kirche* 47 (1950) 207.

²¹ Cf., for instance, G. Vermès, "Le 'Commentaire d'Habacuc' et le Nouveau Testament," *Cahiers Sioniens* 5 (1951) 337-49; K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakkuk-Kommentar* (Tübingen: Mohr) p. 244; H. J. Schoeps, "Der Habakkuk-Kommentar von 'Ain-Feshkha—ein Dokument der hasmonäischen Spätzeit," *ZAW* 63 (1951) 249-50. Also by Schoeps, "Handelt es sich wirklich um ebionitische Dokumente?," *Zeitsch. f. Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 3 (1951) 322. [Hereafter Schoeps 3.]

²² Cf. n. 3 above for references to his articles. Just a few points will be mentioned here. For the identification of Jesus as the True Teacher and Paul as the "Man of Lies" Teicher is relying on the article of G. Margoliouth, "The Sadducean Christians of Damascus," *Athenaeum* 4335 (Nov. 26, 1910) 657-59, where the identification is merely asserted. Prof. Teicher does little more when he says, "The 'True Teacher' is, in fact, Jesus. He is addressed as such in Mark 12.14, 'Master (Teacher) we know that thou art true.'" This is the only evidence given that the *môreh haššedeq* of the Qumrân literature is Jesus. Another point is the problem of the Jewish Christians mentioned by Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 3,5; quoted above). All we know is that they were early Christians from Jerusalem, most likely Jewish. Pella, the place to which they went according to Eusebius, is about 50-60 miles away from Qumrân, as the crow flies, and on the other side of the Jordan—hardly "in the vicinity of the 'Ain Feshkha cave." (*JJS* 2:93) Another gratuitous statement is the assertion that the Ebionites are mentioned by name in the *Pešer* on Habakkuk (12:3,6). K. Elliger (*op. cit.*, p. 244) has pointed out that the article would be necessary before 'ebyônîm for this word to be capable of meaning "the Ebionites." Unfortunately for Elliger, the word has turned up with the article in the recently published *Pešer* on Ps 37, where the words 'byunym (line 9 of col. 1) and 'dî h'byunym (line 10 of col. 2) are found. Cf. J. M. Allegro, "A Newly Discovered Fragment of a Commentary on Psalm XXXVII from Qumrân," *Pal. Explor. Quarterly* 86 (1954) 69-75. This still does not prove that 'ebyônîm means "Ebionites," for the word is obviously used in all places in the sense

The most serious difficulty, of course, with Teicher's opinion is that of chronology. The latest possible date for the deposit of the manuscripts is the destruction of Qumrân in A.D. 68-69.²³ Though our first explicit mention of the Ebionites dates from Irenaeus (*ca.* 175 A.D.), and though it is quite probable that they existed as a sect much earlier, there is simply no evidence for their existence in the first century A.D., either before or after the destruction of Jerusalem. Consequently, the simple identification of the Qumrân sect and the Ebionites is an untenable opinion.

EBIONITE LITERATURE

By Ebionite literature we mean here the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* and *Recognitions*, often called merely the *Pseudoclementines* (PsC).²⁴ Various spurious works circulated in antiquity under the name of Clement of Rome, and among these was the romantic novel which exists today under the title of *Homilies and Recognitions*. The PsC contain five documents: (a) the *Epistle of Peter to James*, instructing the latter that the accompanying writings are not to be entrusted to any but the initiated; (b) *Diamarturia* or *Contestatio*, the "oath" to be taken by the initiated concerning these writings; (c) *Epistle of Clement to James*, telling of Peter's martyrdom, Clement's ordination, Peter's instruction to Clement his successor, and Peter's order to

found so often in the Old Testament, God's poor. DSH 12:10 can easily be translated, "who robbed the possessions of the poor"; meaning "what little they had." The parallelism between the "poor" and the "simple" in DSH 12:3-4 cannot be disregarded. For other passages in the Qumrân literature where 'bywonym means the "poor", cf. DSW 11:9,13; 13:14.

²³ Cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Jewish Sect of Qumrân and the Essenes* (London: Valentine Mitchell, 1954) p. 158: "The excavations of Khirbet Qumrân, by establishing that the manuscripts were conveyed to their hiding-place about A.D. 66-70, show that Dr. Teicher's dates are too late, and accordingly suffice to undermine the whole of his theory." Cf. G. Vermès, *Les Manuscrits du Désert de Juda* (2nd ed.; Paris: Desclée, 1954) p. 36; Schoeps 2,1. These authors' remarks are all based on the report of R. de Vaux, "Fouille au Khirbet Qumrân," *RB* 60 (1953) 94; *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*, 1953, p. 317.

²⁴ For the purpose of this paper we do not have to consider the translation of the Old Testament by Symmachus, nor the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, which are generally judged to be Ebionite compositions. The latter is "some sort of reworking and extension of the Hebrew original of the canonical Gospel of Matthew" (J. Quasten, *op. cit.*, 1,112). Cf. the remarks of Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

write down an epitome of his sermons in the various cities that it might be sent to James, the bishop of Jerusalem; this serves as an introduction to the *Homilies*, for Clement says that he is sending *Klēmentos tōn Petrou epidēmiōn kērygmatōn epitomē*; (d) *Homiliai*, 20 books of the "Homilies"; (e) *Anagnorismoi*, 10 books of the "Recognitions."²⁵

The *Homilies* (hereafter, *Hom*) and the *Recognitions* (hereafter, *Rec*) are two forms of a novel about the fate of the various members of the noble family of Clement of Rome. Clement himself is portrayed as a searcher for truth, going about to the various schools of philosophy for a solution of his doubts concerning the origin of the world, the immortality of the soul, etc. At length he hears that the Son of God has appeared in distant Judea. After a long journey, which takes him to Egypt and Palestine, he meets Peter in Caesarea, is instructed in the doctrine of the True Prophet, and becomes a Christian. He is invited by Peter to accompany him on his missionary journeys in pursuit of Simon Magus. Meanwhile, curious circumstances bring about the break-up of Clement's family: his mother and two brothers leave Rome because of a warning his mother receives in a dream, and sail for Athens; but they are shipwrecked and separated. Finally, father, mother, and the three sons set out to find each other, and the successive recognitions of the members of the family, aided by the efforts of Peter, give the title of "Recognitions" to one of the versions of this novel. The greater part of the novel is given over, however, to the sermons of Peter and his debates with Simon Magus. This is responsible for the title of the other extant version, "Homilies." Actually there is as much homiletic material in the *Recognitions* as there is recognition in the

²⁵ The *Hom* are extant today in Greek; the text has recently been edited by Bernhard Rehm, *Die Pseudoklementinen: I, Homilien*, in the series, *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte* 42 (Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, 1953). The *Rec* are extant only in a Latin translation (or, according to many scholars, a Latin adaptation) by Rufinus (ca. 405 A.D.). A new edition has been promised for the Berlin *Corpus*. For the time being we must use the text found in Migne, *PL* 1,1158-1474. There is also a Syriac MS, dated 411 A.D., which contains the text of *Hom* 10-14 and *Rec* 1-4; cf. W. Frankenberg, *Die syrischen Clementinen mit griechischem Paralleltext* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1937; *TU* 48/3). A few other fragments also are extant; cf. J. Quasten, *op. cit.* 1,61. An English translation (which must now be checked against the new critical edition of the *Hom*) can be found in A. Roberts and Donaldson, *Ante-Nicene Christian Library* (Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark) 3 (Recognitions, 1875), 17 (Homilies, 1870).

Homilies. Long passages parallel each other, sometimes with word-for-word identity.

Popular in the last century as the basis of the Tübingen-School theory of opposition between the Petrine and Pauline churches of early Christianity,²⁶ the PsC were first subjected to critical study by Adolf Hilgenfeld, a disciple of that same school, toward the end of the 19th century. Since the beginning of this century numerous scholars have worked over them; among these are especially Waitz, Heintze, Carl Schmidt, Cullmann, Thomas, Rehm, and Schoeps.²⁷ Waitz was the first to subject the PsC to a searching literary analysis and to uncover the *Grundschrift* (hereafter, *G*). *G* was thought to have been a novel, composed of material that dates back to subapostolic times, in which Peter was the dominant figure. Though *G* is now lost, fragments of it are thought to be extant in the PsC, well reworked by different redactors.

G is considered to be a compilation, composed of fragments of five works: (a) the *Kérygmata Petrou*, sermons of Peter on his missionary journeys, digested by Clement; (b) the story of the wondrous deeds of Simon Magus and of his debates with Peter; (c) Appion-dialogues in *Hom* 4–6 and *Rec* 10: Clement argues with Appion against the latter's pagan ideas about fate, astrology, polytheism; cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3,38,5; (d) the Graeco-Oriental Recognition-novel, about the members of the family of Clement of Rome; (e) Bardesanes' *Book of the Laws of the Lands*.²⁸

²⁶ In the PsC Paul is alluded to, frequently under the designation of *inimicus homo* or *ho echthros anthrōpos*, being depicted as the adversary of James, the Bishop of Jerusalem. Though Peter is identified with the camp of James, we do not find Paul pictured as the enemy of Peter; the latter role is played by Simon Magus throughout. But the critics of the last century found no difficulty in asserting that the figure of Simon Magus was really a literary mask for the real opponent, Paul; cf. J. Chapman, "On the Date of the Clementines," *Zeitsch. f. Neutest. Wissenschaft* 9 (1908) 150–51.

²⁷ The chief works are: Hans Waitz, *Die Pseudoklementinen, Homilien und Rekognitionen, eine quellenkritische Untersuchung* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904; *TU* 25/4); Carl Schmidt, *Studien zu den Pseudoklementinen* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1929; *TU* 46/1); Oscar Cullmann, *Le problème littéraire et historique du roman pseudo-clémentin: Étude sur le rapport entre le Gnosticisme et le Judéo-Christianisme* (Paris: F. Alcan, 1930); J. Thomas, *op. cit.*, pp. 174 ff.); Bernhard Rehm, "Zur Entstehung der pseudoclementinischen Schriften," *ZNW* 37 (1938) 77–184; H. J. Schoeps, 1,37–61 *et passim*. An extensive bibliography is to be found in the last cited work; cf. also J. Quasten, *op. cit.* 1,62–63.

²⁸ The inclusion of this last section is rather doubtful; cf. J. Quasten, *op. cit.* 1,263.

This compilatory character of *G* is responsible for the impression of the reader that the *Hom* and *Rec* are quite a hodgepodge. Waitz maintained a date in the early 3rd century for the composition of *G*; with slight variations this has been more or less generally admitted.²⁹ Practically all scholars admit today the existence of *G* and its compilatory character. The relationship of *G*, however, to the later reworkings, whether *Hom* and *Rec* represent independent versions of *G* or depend one on the other, is a question that has been hotly debated; it does not concern us here. A Syriac version of *Hom* 10–14 and of *Rec* 1–4 is extant in a manuscript dated 411 A.D. Its text of *Hom* is slightly different at times from the Greek, and Schoeps is of the opinion that it represents an earlier form of the novel.³⁰

It has been quite generally held that the PsC are Ebionite in origin; however, not all scholars agree. Evidence for the Ebionite origin comes from Epiphanius (*Pan.* 30,15), who tells us that they used the *Periodoi Petrou dia Klēmentos*. This is the name by which *G* apparently went in antiquity.³¹ Schoeps, following other scholars, maintains that the *Kērygmata Petrou* (hereafter, *KP*) were definitely the Ebionite writing among the sources of *G*, having been written by an Ebionite of the second century who led the defense of his co-religionists against the attacks of the Marcionite Gnosis.³² The extent of the original *KP* was first determined by Waitz on the basis of the summary given in the third book of *Rec*, chap. 75. Clement mentions here that he has already sent to James a book of Peter's sermons, the contents of which he proceeds to summarize, dividing them into ten *tomoi*. Using this as a starting point, Waitz indicated the passages of the PsC that originally belonged to the *KP* section of *G*. This reconstruction of *KP* was checked by subsequent studies, accepted by many, expanded in slight details by still others, and enjoys a certain vogue today. However, as early as 1908 Dom John Chapman questioned the analysis.³³ In 1932

²⁹ Cf. Schoeps 1,38.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

³¹ Cf. Origen, *Comm. in Gen.* according to *Philocalia* 23 (PG 12,85); *Opus imperf. ad Matt.*, ser. 77; perhaps also Epiphanius, *Pan.* 30,15; Jerome, *Comm. in Gal.* 1,18; *Adv. Iovin.* 1,14.

³² Schoeps 1,313; "... ein rein ebionitisches Werk aus der Zeit des antiagnostischen Kampfes ..." (p. 58).

³³ *Op. cit.*, p. 147 ff.

Ed. Schwartz and M. Goguel rejected it.³⁴ Schoeps is of the opinion that their arguments were answered by Waitz and others "gebürend."³⁵

However, Bernhard Rehm, a student of Schwartz and editor of the latest critical edition of the *Hom*, has proposed an entirely different analysis of the redactions. While admitting an original *G*, he believes that the recognitive section was the nucleus (therefore not *KP*) about which the four other sections clustered. *G* was reworked in an early form of *Hom*, which was suspect in the Church at large, but found reception among the heretic Ebionites. An attempt to make the novel orthodox resulted in an early redaction of *Rec*. This analysis of Rehm cannot be lightly dismissed—and so the question arises whether there really were any *KP* at all. Bultmann, in his review of Schoeps' *Theologie*, states this question quite frankly and in the end admits his extreme skepticism, as do others, about the whole literary analysis of the sources of PsC.³⁶

We have gone into details here merely to show how uncertain the reconstruction, extent, and original character of *KP* really are. Who is right, Schoeps and those he follows, or Rehm? Schoeps would have us believe that the *KP* were originally Ebionite, reworked later by Christians of different hues. Rehm proposes that the original *G* was Christian, later contaminated by Ebionite notions. It is obvious that the answer to this problem, if it can ever be found, will radically determine one's use of the *KP* in a comparison of Ebionite and Qumrân tenets and practices. Cullmann has made such a comparison, utilizing the Qumrân material that had been previously published, and the *KP*, apparently according to his own reconstruction of the document, as if this were a *chose acquise*. Nowhere in the article does he mention the analysis of Rehm, not even the summary given in the *Einleitung* of the latter's critical edition.

In the following section of this paper we are going to compare the Ebionites and the sect of Qumrân. For the sake of this comparison we shall accept the list of passages of the PsC which are judged by Schoeps

³⁴ "Unzeitgemässe Beobachtungen zu den Clementinen," *ZNW* 31 (1932) 151-99.

³⁵ Schoeps 1,44.

³⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 181. Cf. Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, pp. 197-98; J. Quasten, *op. cit.* 1,61-62. For Rehm's views see the introduction to his critical edition, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, cited above, pp. vii-ix; and especially his article, quoted in n. 27 above.

CHART 2

KERYGMATA PETROU

(found in the following passages of the PsC, according to the studies of Waitz, as modified by subsequent scholars, Bousset, Cullmann; the references in parentheses indicate the additions of Schoeps, *Theologie*, pp. 45-53)

<i>Hom</i> 1: 18-20	<i>Rec</i> 1: 15-17, 22-24, 32-44, 46-71,
2: 6-12, 14-18, 33-34; 38-40,	74 (omit 23; add 27-31, 45)
43-52 (omit 6-12, 14-15,	2: 20-48, 55, 62-65 (omit 55,
34; add 41, 42)	62-65; add 66-67)
3: 17-28, 33-38, 43-56 (add	3: 2-10, 12-30, 52-61 (add
2-10; 39-42)	33-38)
8: 2-20 (add 21-23; omit 2-3)	4: 2-20 (add 1, 21, 25-26)
9: 1-23	5: 34-35
11: 16, 19-33 (add 35)	6: 4-14
15: 5-11	
16: 5-14, 16 (add 15, 21)	
17: 3, 6-19 (add 4-5)	
18: 6-10; 19-66	
19: 1-23	
20: 1-10.	

as belonging to *KP*. His list represents the latest investigation and the widest range of passages that could pertain to the original *KP*.³⁷ The validity of such a list, of course, depends on how the previous questions are resolved. In all references to the PsC we shall indicate, in parentheses, whether or not the passage belongs to *KP*, according to this list (see Chart 2).

COMPARISON OF THE EBIONITES AND THE SECT OF QUMRÂN

We shall discuss in detail various points of similarity and dissimilarity that exist between the Ebionites and the Qumrân sect, to see whether there is any basis for the assertion that the latter was or became Ebionite. It will be evident that we are not trying to trace the

³⁷ Cf. Schoeps 1,50-53. This list incorporates passages ascribed to *KP* by Waitz, Bousset, Cullmann, and Schoeps. Cf. Schoeps 1,38 for a description of his "orthodox" position in this matter. It is to be noted that Bornkamm (pp. 197-98) criticizes Schoeps for expanding the list of the other scholars "ohne nähere Begründung."

history of each idea or practice that we take up; nor are we trying to list all the possible sources from which either group may have derived its tenets and customs. We are concerned merely with the influence of Qumrân on the Ebionites.

At the outset it should be noted that the PsC do not depict the Ebionites as living a communal existence, as does the Manual of Discipline with respect to the Qumrân sect. There is nothing "monastic"⁸⁸ about the group described in PsC. Hence the comparison will not be based on rules, ways of acting, punishments, etc., such as are found in DSD.⁸⁹ But there are many other points that can well be compared.

Dualism

This term is used normally of those opposites which have been found in Gnostic literature, the Johannine and Pauline writings, Greek philosophy, and elsewhere. It should be obvious that the principle of contradiction, being a basic metaphysical principle, could be made the support for many sets of opposites which are not specifically "dualistic." Such notions as the Levitical contrast of clean-unclean, God's creation of the heaven and the earth, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, could be forced into a system of dualism. But we may ask, with what right? Consequently, we must beware of trying to interpret every set of opposites as dualistic (in the sense usually intended by those who treat this question).

We can summarize the dualism of DSD as follows: The members are to do good and avoid evil (1:4-5), to turn to the truth and away from perversity (6:15; cf. 1:5-6; 1:15-17; 5:1). This simple contrast of good-evil, truth-perversity soon appears more complex; for the

⁸⁸ Cf. Cullmann, "Die neuentdeckten Qumrantexte und das Judentum der Pseudoklementinen" [see n. 4] p. 42; unless otherwise noted, henceforth all references to Cullmann will be to this article.

⁸⁹ The following abbreviations will be used for the Qumrân material: DSD, The Sect's Manual of Discipline; DSH, The *Pešer* on Habakkuk; DST, The Thanksgiving Psalms; DSW, The War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness; CDC, The Damascus Document. Cf. Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery* (New Haven, American Schools of Oriental Research) 1 (The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary, 1950); 2, fasc. 2 (The Manual of Discipline, 1951); E. L. Sukenik, *'ôšâr hamm'gillôt hagg'nûzôt šebbidê hâ'untversîšâ hâ'ivrtî* (Jerusalem, Bialik Foundation and the Hebrew University, 1954; contains DSW and DST).

members are to love the sons of light and hate the sons of darkness (1:10), to bless the men of God's lot and curse the men of Belial's lot (2:2,5). These two groups of men are divided according to the divine appointment of two spirits (truth and perversity) which are to guide men until the period of visitation (3:17-19). These spirits are the "prince of light" and the "angel of darkness" (3:20-21). Truth is derived from the spring of light and perversity from the fountain of darkness (3:19-23). The angel of truth is on the side of the God of Israel (3:24), whose enemy is Belial (1:21-23; 7:1-3). For God loves the spirit of truth and hates the spirit of perversity (4:1). These two spirits are the source of all good and evil works of man in this world (3:26; 4:2 ff.). God has set them up to reign in equal parts with eternal, mutual enmity until the time of His visitation (4:17-19). Then God will destroy the spirit of perversity and the Truth will prevail (4:19). The spirits of truth and perversity both strive within the heart of man (4:23).

Dualism is found as well in DSW, but the system does not appear to be as developed as that in DSD. This is slightly surprising, because DSW is a manual for the conduct of God's war, in which the sons of light are to battle against the sons of darkness. The opposition of light and darkness is frequent; likewise that of God's lot and Belial's lot. But we find little mention of the opposition between truth and perversity. Columns 1 and 13 in particular contain dualistic concepts. A war is to be waged against the "sons of darkness" (1:1,7,10,16; 13:16; 14:17) by the "sons of light" (1:1,3,9,11,13), against the "lot of darkness" (1:1,5,11; 13:5) by the "lot of light" (13:5,9) or "God's lot" (1:5; 13:6,12; 15:1). We read of the "army of Belial" (1:13; 11:8; 15:2-3; 18:3), the "lot of Belial" (1:5; 4:2; 13:2,4,12; 14:10); the "prince of light" (13:10), "spirits of truth" (13:10); "prince of the dominion of impiety" (17:5-6). It is God's war (11:1) that the sons of light are waging. The period of darkness reigns now, but in God's time the sons of light will prevail (1:8). For God has determined of old the day for the war to wipe out the sons of darkness (1:10).

In DST we read that both the just man and the evil man proceed from God the Creator (4:38).

It is noteworthy that this dualism is lacking in DSH and CDC. Like

the passage in DSD 3:6, the contrast between clean and unclean might possibly be considered a manifestation of dualism (CDC 8:14; 14:1 ff.; 15:1). But this is obviously an opposition known from the Levitical laws of the Bible.⁴⁰

In the PsC there is also a dualism which can be compared with that of Qumrân. God, the sole Creator of all, has differentiated all principles into pairs of opposites from the beginning—heaven, earth; day, night; light, fire; sun, moon; life, death (*Hom* 2:15 *KP*). This is the system that is known as the syzygies or combinations, according to which all things come in pairs (*Hom* 2:15,33 *KP*). The smaller precedes the larger, the female the male, the inferior the superior, and evil precedes good (*Rec* 3:59 *KP*). Outside the passages thought to belong to the original *KP* we also find a dualism, the doctrine of the “two paths,” presided over by Belief and Unbelief (*Hom* 7:6–7).

Another way of expressing this dualism is the contrast of two kingdoms. “The prophet of truth who appeared [on earth] taught us that the Maker and God of all gave two kingdoms to two, good and evil: granting to the evil the sovereignty over the present world along with the law, so that he [it] should have the right to punish those who act unjustly; but to the good He gave the eternal age to come. But He made each man free with the power to give himself up to whatsoever he prefers, either to the present evil or to the future good” (*Hom* 15:7 *KP*; cf. also 20:23 *KP*; 8:55 not *KP*). Elsewhere we learn that Christ is the ruler of the future age as the King of righteousness, whereas the Tempter is the ruler of the present; that is why he tempted Christ saying, “All the kingdoms of the present world are subject to me” (*Hom* 8:21 *KP* [according to Schoeps]). Truth and error are contrasted in *Rec* 6:4 *KP*. We will recall that Epiphanius recorded this opposition or dualism (*Pan* 30,16).

From the summaries given above it should be obvious that there is a definite similarity in the dualisms of Qumrân and of the PsC. Cullmann has pointed out that in both cases there is a subordination of the dualistic system to Jewish monotheistic ideas. God set up the kings of the two domains in the PsC just as He set up the spirits of truth and

⁴⁰ Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913) 2, 184, compares CDC 8:14 with Ez 22:26.

perversity of DSD.⁴¹ Both Karl Georg Kuhn⁴² and A. Dupont-Sommer⁴³ have related this Qumrân dualism to Iranian sources. The latter maintains that precisely this subordination of the two spirits to the supreme God is found in the Iranian source.⁴⁴

There seems to be some difference of opinion among the scholars. Quite recently H. Michaud has suggested an even more specific source of the Qumrân dualism, i.e., Zervanism. Zervanism was a particular branch of Zoroastrianism, in which the protagonist, Ahura Mazda, and the antagonist in the dualistic system are both born of a superior deity, *Zurvan* or *chronos*, time. It dates from the time of the Achaemenian empire and was regarded as heretical only in the time of the Sassanids. Michaud is of the opinion that the author of the Qumrân theological system either knew the Zervanite myth of creation or was influenced by a system of thought that has been infected with it.⁴⁵ This Iranian source cannot be disregarded, but it is obvious that the full implication of this source has not yet been explored. There is certainly no obstacle, theologically speaking, which would prevent such a dualism subordinated to a Supreme Being from being adopted either into the Jewish or Jewish-Christian way of thinking.

Cullmann has, however, pointed out a difference between the Qumrân dualism and that of the PsC, i.e., that the opposition—light-darkness, truth, perversity—in DSD is never brought into line with the opposition—male-female, light-fire—as it is in the PsC.⁴⁶ This is true, but it seems that the difference is much more fundamental. Kuhn has already described the Qumrân dualism as ethical and eschatologi-

⁴¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 38–39.

⁴² "Die Sektenschrift und die iranische Religion," *Zeitsch. f. Theologie u. Kirche* 49 (1952) 296–316.

⁴³ *Nouveaux aperçus sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1953) pp. 157–72.

⁴⁴ "Ce qui frappe dans l'instruction du *Manuel*, c'est que les deux Esprits, comme dans les Gâthâ, restent subordonnés à Dieu: l'Esprit du bien n'est pas confondu avec Dieu, tandis qu'il est identifié avec Ahoura Mazda dans les spéculations ultérieures du Mazdéisme" (p. 170). Cf. Engl. tr., p. 128.

⁴⁵ Kuhn (*op. cit.*, pp. 311–12) asserts that the subordination to God in the Qumrân literature is a feature not found in the Iranian source. That an Iranian source had influenced as well as the PsC seems indicated by the interest shown in these writings in Nimrod-Zoroaster. Cullmann (*op. cit.*, p. 38, n. 14) pointed out the passages, *Hom* 9:4; *Rec* 1:30; to these we may add *Rec* 4:27–29 (all KP). For the ideas of Michaud, cf. "Un mythe zervanite dans un des manuscrits de Qumrân", *Velus Testamentum* 5 (1955) 137–47.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

cal, akin to the Iranian source.⁴⁷ This is true, for no pair of opposites can be found which are not to be understood in an ethical sense.⁴⁸ Light and darkness are only symbols for the other pair, truth and perversity, good and evil, God and Belial. But in the PsC there are passages where the dualism is definitely physical. *All* principles have been divided into opposites (*Hom* 2:15 *KP*); the *syzygies* dominate everything (*Hom* 2:15–16, 33; *Rec* 3:59 *KP*): heaven, earth; day, night; light, fire; sun, moon—as well as good, evil. The opposition in the ethical sphere is expressed in the PsC in terms of two kingdoms, two paths, two beings, whereas in DSD it is a question of two spirits. This, of course, may be a mere manner of expression. But we can safely say that the dualism of Qumrân, though similar in its general conception to that of the Ebionites, is of a simpler type. An ethical dualism, like that of Qumrân, could have developed—especially under other influences—into a dualism that was both physical and ethical, like that of the PsC.

Before leaving this question of dualism, we must say a word about its possible Gnostic character. In the first article that Kuhn wrote on the ideas of the Qumrân sect, he labelled its dualism as “Gnostic.”⁴⁹ Later, in discussing its connection with Iranian religion, he showed how the ideas of DSD confirmed the thesis once put forth by Bousset–Gressmann that the Jewish apocalyptic ideas of the last centuries B.C. had been affected by Persian thought. He emphasized the fact that the ethical character of the Qumrân dualism definitely connected it with Old Iranian ideas and clearly separated it from Gnosticism.⁵⁰ Schoeps constantly rejected throughout his book the idea that the Ebionites were Gnostics.⁵¹ He accused Epiphanius of confusing them with the Elchēsaites, and of erroneously ascribing to them the Gnostic ideas of

⁴⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 305.

⁴⁸ This we maintain against W. Baumgartner, “Die Bedeutung der Höhlenfunde aus Palästina für die Theologie,” *Schweizerische theologische Umschau* 24 (1954) 62, who thinks that the opposition between the sons of light and the sons of darkness is physical. What the basis of this physical interpretation is, Baumgartner does not tell us.

⁴⁹ “Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament,” *Zeitschrift f. Theologie u. Kirche* 57 (1950) 210: “eine palästinische-jüdische Sektenfrömmigkeit gnostischer Struktur”; p. 207: “die dualistischgnostische Denkstruktur.”

⁵⁰ “Die Sektenschrift und die iranische Religion,” *op. cit.*, p. 315.

⁵¹ Cf. Schoeps 1,305–6: “In Wirklichkeit sind die Ebioniten niemals Gnostiker gewesen, sondern im Gegenteil ihre allerschärfsten Gegner” [emphasis supplied by Schoeps]. Cf. Bultmann’s review, p. 138.

the latter. For him the PsC dualism is nothing but a development of a trend, which has "a legitimate Jewish root . . . for the *zûgôt*-principle is very ancient [*uralt*] in Judaism."⁶² Yet in an article written last year Schoeps has apparently abandoned this fundamental position; for he claims that he has finally realized that the Gnostic syzygy-system of Book 6 of *KP* is derived from the DSD teaching of the two spirits.⁶³ This is a complete *volte-face*, the denial of a main contention in his book. Though the Qumrân dualism could be the source of the Ebionite dualism of the PsC, we still have no real evidence for labelling either of them as Gnostic. It is to be hoped that the publication of the Gnostic Codices of Chenoboskion, mentioned earlier in this paper, will shed light on the dualism of the PsC and give us a better understanding of early Gnosticism. But there is certainly no reason to call the Qumrân dualism Gnostic.⁶⁴

Teacher of Righteousness

The *môrêh ha . . . edeq* of DSH (1:13; 2:2; 5:10; 7:4; 8:3; 9:9), of CDC (1:11; 8:13; 9:40,53,68,71), and of the *Pešer* on Ps 37 (2:15) has certain characteristics which resemble those of the *prophētēs alētheias* or *ho alēthēs prophētēs* of *KP* (*Hom* 1:18–19; 2:6 and *passim*). The latter is sometimes called merely "the Prophet" (*Hom* 2:6) or "the Teacher" (*Hom* 11:20,28). This last description is also found for the Teacher of Righteousness in CDC 9:68. But it should be noted immediately that, whereas the identity of the Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumrân documents is unknown (or at least has not yet been correctly and certainly established), there can be no doubt that Christ is the True Prophet of the PsC (cf. Epiphanius, *Pan.* 30,18; *Hom* 3:52–56 *KP*).

The function of the Teacher of Righteousness is to lead men in the

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 161. To be fair, we must indicate that he does admit in a footnote the possibility of the Persian source. The proof advanced for the *uralt* Jewish root is Rabbinic literature, whose antiquity is very hard to determine.

⁶³ "Die Lehre [von den beiden Geistern] ist vielmehr Eigenbau, beste 'Ain-Feshkha Theologie. Jetzt weiss ich es endlich, *woher* die ebionitischen *Kerygmata Petrou* (K. P.), deren sechstes Buch die hochgnostische Syzygienlehre von den Gegensatzpaaren behandelt, ihre Lehre von den beiden Geistern bezogen haben" (Schoeps 2,2).

⁶⁴ Cf. Heinrich Schlier, "Das Denken der frühchristlichen Gnosis," *Neutestamentliche Studien für R. Bultmann*, *op. cit.*, pp. 67–82, for an example of how different early Christian Gnosticism was from Qumrân ideas. Bo Reicke has also recently pointed out another difference in that the God of Qumrân is a *personal* God; cf. "Traces of Gnosticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls?", *New Testament Studies* 1 (1954) 140.

way of God's heart (CDC 1:11); his words come from the mouth of God (DSH 2:2), for God has revealed to him all the mysteries of the words of His servants the prophets (7:4). The men of the community are to listen to him (CDC 9:68,71), and God will deliver from the house of condemnation all those who suffer for him and believe in him (DSH 8:23). He also seems to have been a priest (DSH 2:7),⁵⁵ "persecuted" by the "Man of the Lie," who rejected the Law (5:10; 11:5; CDC 9:53). According to CDC 8:13, he is still to come at the end of the days; but he precedes the Messiah awaited from Aaron and Israel (CDC 9:40).

The function of the True Prophet in *KP* is similar to that of the Teacher of Righteousness at least in that he too is looked upon as the leader of the group, and the helper of a mankind which is enshrouded in darkness and ignorance, communicating to it knowledge.⁵⁶ "He alone is able to enlighten the souls of men, so that with our own eyes we may be able to see the way of eternal salvation" (*Hom* 1:19 *KP*; cf. *Rec* 1:15-16 *KP*). "This is peculiar to the Prophet, to reveal the truth, even as it is peculiar to the sun to bring the day" (*Hom* 2:6 *KP*).

In this connection Cullmann speaks of an *Erlösergestalt* found in both sets of documents, whose specific role is to reveal the truth.⁵⁷ One may question whether the Teacher of Righteousness is aptly described as an *Erlösergestalt*. DSH 8:2-3 is apparently the only passage (doubtful at that) that would lend itself to such an interpretation. For, though "deliverance from the house of condemnation (*or* judgment)" might conceivably be understood in the sense of redemption, yet this may refer as well to some contemporary political situation, described by this vague expression, as do others in the DSH. As for the PsC, the

⁵⁵ This point seems to be confirmed by the recently published *Pešer* on Ps 37, where we read (2:15): *psrw* *l kwlm mwrh h[šdq]*; God has "established him to build for Him the Congregation of [His Elect]." Cf. J. M. Allegro, *op. cit.*, pp. 71-72. J. L. Teicher denies, of course, that the Teacher of Righteousness was a priest; cf. *JJS* 3 (1952) 54; 5 (1954) 96: "But he [the Teacher of Righteousness] was a teacher, not a sacrificing priest, and the term 'priest' applied to him in the Fragments is merely a metaphor." "The term *kohen* (priest) is thus equivalent to the term *doresh hatorah* (he who searches the scripture)."

⁵⁶ K. Elliger, *op. cit.*, p. 285, and J. L. Teicher, *JJS* 2 (1951) 97, point out that the words *šdq* and *'mt* are really synonymous, so that we could well speak of the "Teacher of Truth" or the "True Teacher." The other expression, however, has become customary already, so that it is retained here.

⁵⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 39.

True Prophet could be called an *Erlöser*; but Bultmann is undoubtedly right in stressing that the Pseudoclementine Christology is anything but soteriological in the Pauline sense, adopted by the early Church.⁵⁸

As a revealer of truth, then, the Teacher of Righteousness and the True Prophet can be favorably compared, for their functions are definitely similar.⁵⁹ Nothing, however, warrants more than a possible connection between these two figures, when we are trying to trace the influence of Qumrân on the Ebionites.

The Man of the Lie

The antagonist of the Teacher of Righteousness is described as the "Man of the Lie" (cf. DSH 2:1-2; 5:11; CDC 9:53-54) or the "Preacher of the Lie" (DSH 10:9; CDC 9:29): 'iš hakkāzāb; mattīp hakkāzāb. In the PsC, however, the antagonist of Christ, the True Prophet, is Satan, the prince of evil (*Hom* 8:21 *KP*). Peter, too, has an adversary throughout, Simon Magus. But there is an unnamed figure referred to as *inimicus homo*, *ho echthros anthrōpos*, *planos tis* (*Rec* 1:70,71,73; *Hom* 2:17; 11:35; *Ep. Petri* 2,3), who is identified as the Apostle Paul on the basis of *Rec* 1:71, alluding to Acts 22:5. But it should be noted that he is definitely considered to be the adversary of the Bishop of Jerusalem, St. James. It is, therefore, a gratuitous assertion to equate the *inimicus homo* of PsC with the 'iš hakkāzāb, and to maintain on this basis that Paul is the antagonist referred to in the Qumrân literature. Both the Qumrân scrolls and the PsC speak of a figure who is an adversary, but the differing details prevent any further identification or comparison.⁶⁰

Attitude toward the Old Testament

Under this heading we will discuss the attitude of both groups toward the prophets, the Pentateuch, the sacrifice of the Temple, and the priesthood.

⁵⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 183-86.

⁵⁹ Cullmann (*op. cit.*, p. 40) points out a dissimilarity in that the Teacher of Righteousness is a priest, whereas the True Prophet is not. See footnote 55 and compare DSH 2:7 with 7:4. As for the PsC, the situation is not clear. From the general context we would not expect the True Prophet to be a priest, yet *Rec* 1:46-48 (*KP*) are certainly difficult to understand, if he were not one.

⁶⁰ Cullmann (*op. cit.*, p. 40) speaks of a *Lügenprophet* in DSH 7:9. I can find no such character in the DSH, unless that is the translation he is using for *mīyp hkzāb* in 10:9.

a) *The prophets*. The Qumrân sect not only held to the strict observance of the Torah, but also regarded the prophets of the Old Testament with great esteem. This is evident not only from statements of DSD (e.g., 1:3) and DSH (e.g., 2:7; 7:4), but also from the way they quote the prophets (CDC 5:10; 9:5) and from the writings they composed to interpret the biblical prophets (e.g., the *pešārîm* on Habakkuk and Micah already published⁶¹).

As for the Ebionites, Irenaeus tells us that they had developed their own way of expounding the prophets, "quae autem sunt prophetica curiosius exponere nituntur" (*Adv. haer.* 1,26,2). What does *curiosius* mean? It has been explained (Schoeps 1,159) in terms of the information supplied by the *Panarion* of Epiphanius (30,17), where we learn that the Ebionites admitted Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, and Joshua, but rejected all the prophets, David, Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Ezekiel, Elijah, and Elisha together with their oracles.

This explanation, however, is not certain. *Curiosius* is the Latin translation of a lost Greek word. Since we have no reason to assume that it is not an accurate translation, we may legitimately ask what Irenaeus, writing ca. 175, could have meant by it. Epiphanius' statement about the rejection of the prophets remains, of course, a possible interpretation, but it represents more likely the attitude of a later stage of Ebionism. Between Irenaeus and Epiphanius (310–403), the Ebionites could have been subjected to other influences (Samaritan, for instance) with regard to the prophets. Certainly there is no foundation for the opinion of J. Thomas⁶² that *curiosius* shows that some Ebionites were Gnostics. *Curiosus* means "bestowing care or pains upon a thing, applying one's self assiduously," as well as "curious, inquisitive."⁶³ It is just as likely that the Ebionites of Irenaeus' time had something like *pešārîm*, and that *curiosius* is his way of describing this detailed, careful exegesis of the prophets.

In the PsC Christ is the only true prophet. Owing to their peculiar Christology, the Holy Spirit, who was believed to be in Christ, was

⁶¹ The DSH and the article of J. Milik, "Fragments d'un Midrasch de Michée dans les manuscrits de Qumrân," *RB* 59 (1952). 412–18.

⁶² *Op. cit.*, p. 169.

⁶³ *Harper's Latin Dictionary* (N.Y.: American Book Co., 1907) p. 502; cf. also *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* 4,1493.

also present in Adam, so that he too is called the "only true prophet." "The only true prophet gave names to each animal" (*Hom* 3:21 not *KP*). Moreover, "the true prophet appeared to Moses" in Egypt (*Rec* 1:34 *KP*). This probably refers, not to Christ as such, but to the spirit which made Him the True Prophet. "Know then that Christ, who was from the beginning, and always, was ever present with the pious, though secretly, through all their generations; especially with those who waited for Him to whom He frequently appeared" (*Rec* 1:52 *KP*). This attitude toward Christ is responsible for the Ebionite rejection of the prophets of the Old Testament.⁶⁴ But an even stranger reason is found in the view of the Old Testament prophets as representatives of female prophecy, having been born of women. The True Prophet, being the Son of *Man*, represents male prophecy, and so is accepted on the principle of the syzygies (*Hom* 3:32-33).

There are a few references to the Old Testament prophets in the PsC.⁶⁵ But it is hard to deduce anything from these, because they may have passed into Ebionite literature via works that were more acceptable to them. One clear case is found in *Rec* 1:37, where Hos 6:6 is cited: "For I delight in piety, not sacrifice." This text of Hosea, however, is used by St. Matthew (9:13; 12:7).

The attitude of the Qumrân sect toward the Old Testament prophets, then, is entirely different from that of the Ebionites, at least as they are known to us from Epiphanius and the PsC. Consequently, we cannot look to the tenets of Qumrân as a source for the Ebionite attitude.

b) *The "False Pericopes."* Epiphanius (*Pan.* 30,18) tells us that the Ebionites did not accept the whole Pentateuch, but rejected certain passages of it (*oute gar dechontai tēn Pentateuchon Mōūseōs holēn, alla tina rēmata apoballousin*). The PsC, too, know of falsehoods that have been added to the Law of Moses. "The Scriptures have had joined to them many falsehoods against God" (*Hom* 2:38 *KP*). By labelling certain passages of the Pentateuch as false chapters, the Ebionites managed to eliminate those that seemed in conflict with their beliefs about God. Peter cites as examples the following: "Neither was Adam a transgressor, who was fashioned by the hands of God; nor was Noah drunken, who was found righteous above all the world; nor did Abraham live with three wives at once, who, on account of his sobriety,

⁶⁴ *Rec* 1:59; 68-69 *KP*.

⁶⁵ Cf. Schoeps 1,160.

was thought worthy of a numerous posterity; nor did Jacob associate with four—of whom two were sisters—who was the father of the twelve tribes, and who intimated the coming of the presence of our Master; nor was Moses a murderer, nor did he learn to judge from an idolatrous priest. . . ." (*Hom* 1:52 *KP*).

There is not the slightest trace of such an attitude in the writings of the sect of Qumrân.⁶⁶

c) Sacrifice. Though there was formerly some hesitation about the attitude of the Qumrân sect with regard to sacrifice, it seems clear from the recently published War-Scroll that they did not reject it. In DSW 2:5-6 we read: "These shall be posted at the burnt-offerings and the sacrifices, to prepare an offering of incense, agreeable to the good pleasure of God, to make atonement on behalf of all His community, to burn flesh continually before Him on the table of glory." According to J. Baumgarten, "We do not find in DSD any law concerning animal sacrifice. There are only figurative references to sacrificial offerings."⁶⁷ But "DSH and CDC tell us of a sect which looked with disfavor upon the priests of the Temple of Jerusalem. They accused them of violating the sanctity of the Temple and the Holy City by failure to observe the laws of ritual purity and appropriating sacred property. The sectarians, who were themselves identified with the Zadokite priestly tradition, held that it was preferable, under such conditions, not to bring sacrifices to the altar. Consequently they entered a covenant to avoid the Sanctuary. In support of their position, they turned to Prophetic denunciations of sinful offerings. The Halakah of CDC, however, preserved several laws relating to the Temple and the sacrifices."⁶⁸ This supports Josephus' testimony about the Essenes, who "do not offer sacrifices, because they profess to have more pure lustrations" (*Ant.* 18,1,5).

⁶⁶ Cf. G. Vermès, *op. cit.*, pp. 109-112. Bultmann (*op. cit.*, p. 187) maintains that this rejection of the false pericopes by the Ebionites presupposes a Gnostic rejection of the Old Testament, and is merely another example of the compromise made by the Ebionites between Gnosticism and Jewish-Christian tradition. The theory of the false pericopes represents a "mysterion" transmitted by Peter to the Ebionite community. This is sheer speculation.

⁶⁷ "Sacrifice and Worship among the Jewish Sectarians of the Dead Sea (Qumrân) Scrolls," *Harvard Theol. Rev.* 46 (1953) 149.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 153-54. Cf. also p. 155 for a discussion of the following text of Josephus.

But the Ebionites did reject sacrifice without a doubt. "It is Jesus who has put out, by the grace of baptism, that fire which the priest kindled for sins" (*Rec* 1:48 *KP*; cf. also 1:36,37,39,55,62; *Hom* 3:45 all *KP*). Peter even preaches that the destruction of the Temple is due to the continuance of sacrifice at a time when it had been officially abolished (*Rec* 1:64 *KP*). This evidence from PsC agrees with the testimony of Epiphanius (*Pan.* 30,16).

The radical difference of outlook here between the two sects prevents us from saying that the Ebionite attitude developed out of that of Qumrân.⁶⁹

d) Priesthood. The priesthood was a recognized group in the Qumrân sect. Baumgarten has given a good summary of their attitude, as it was known from the scrolls published by the American Schools.

To the priests, DSD assigns an exalted position within the community. As in CDC, the sect is conceived as joining Aaron and Israel (DSD 5:6), but while the Israelite sectaries formed a 'holy house' (*bêt qōdeš*), the priests were to be established as a 'most holy institution' (*sôd qōdeš qōdāštm*) [DSD 8:5-6; cf. 8:8-9; 9:6]. Legal decisions were made 'according to the sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the Covenant, and according to the majority of the men of the community.' [DSD 5:2-3; 5:9, 21-22; 6:19; 8:9] DSD 9:7 provides that 'only the sons of Aaron shall have authority in matters of law and property.' In the council of the community there were twelve lay men and three priests (DSD 8:1). A priest was required to be present in every place where ten men formed a unit of the community. At the sessions of the sectarians, the priests were given preference in seating and procedure. A priest invoked the blessing over the bread and wine before communal meals (DSD 6:5-6). The priests also played a significant role in the annual covenant ceremony, which was one of the important institutions of the sect.⁷⁰

In DSW we learn that there are priests (7:10-15; 8:2-7,13 f.), but also "leaders of the priests" (2.1), a "chief priest" (2:1; 15:4; 16:13; 18:5),⁷¹ and "the priest appointed for the time of vengeance according

⁶⁹ Bultmann (*op. cit.*, p. 187) would derive the Ebionite outlook from the attitude found in the Primitive community of the Christian Church itself, not as dependent on passages in Mk 12:33, Mt 9:13; 12:7, but rather as coming from the attitude of the Jews among whom Christ lived. Jesus was not the opponent of the priests, as the prophets of the Old Law had been, but of the Scribes. As far as Jewish piety was concerned, the Synagogue had pressed the cult of the Temple into the background, and so sacrifice had lost its meaning for early Christianity.

⁷⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 152; cf. G. Vermès, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

⁷¹ Cf. H. L. Ginsberg, "The Hebrew University Scrolls from the Sectarian Cache," *BASOR* 112 (1948) 20-21.

to the vote of his brethren" (15,6). The robes of the priests in battle are described (7:9-11), and the rôle the priests are to perform in the course of the battle is detailed (7:12-18). They are to blow the trumpets (7:15), encourage the soldiers (7:12), bless God and curse Belial (13:1-6), etc.⁷²

Such passages leave no doubt as to the status of the priests in the sect of Qumrân. Levites, too, are often mentioned as a specific class. This is in sharp contrast to the attitude of the Ebionites as manifested by PsC. Their rejection of the priesthood logically follows the substitution of baptism for sacrifice. The priesthood had its function and meaning in history in the days when God *permitted* sacrifice, but that time has passed (*Rec* 1:48 *KP*). Cullmann looks upon this attitude as an extension of the attitude of the Qumrân sect, adopted with reference to the official priesthood in the Temple.⁷³ DSH 8:8 ff. speaks of a "wicked priest," who rebelled against the statutes of God, and 9.4 ff. of the "priests of Jerusalem," who gather wealth and loot. Consequently, Cullmann may well be right in relating the Ebionite rejection of the priesthood to such a movement in Palestine as the Qumrân disapproval of the official priesthood in Jerusalem.

The general conclusion to be drawn from the treatment of the attitudes of these two sects with regard to the Old Testament and its institutions is that they differ considerably. It is only in the last point that there is a possible kinship of ideas. For the rest the difference is radical.

Baths and Baptism

Several passages in the Qumrân literature have been interpreted as referring to the bathing practices of the sect. Cullmann⁷⁴ cites DSD 3:4,9; 5:13 f. It will be profitable to examine these and other texts.

⁷² This brief description shows that the function of the priest or *kôhên* can hardly be that as described by Teicher in his recent article in *JJS* 5 (1954) 96; see footnote 55 above. According to DSW 7:11 at the end of the description of the robes of the priests in battle it is prescribed that this battledress shall not be worn in the sanctuary. This same word, *miqdās*, is used in DSW 2:3 in a context where *'ôlôt* and *z'vâhîm* are also mentioned; so there is no reason to maintain that the priests of Qumrân had nothing to do with sacrifice.

⁷³ *Op. cit.*, p. 41.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 44. Are we sure that DSD 6:13 ff. refer to baths? M. H. Gottstein has gone to an opposite extreme in maintaining that the Qumrân sect was not a baptist sect, whereas the Essenes are known to have been definitely such; cf. "Anti-Essene traits in the DSS,"

He cannot be justified while he conceals his stubbornness of heart
 And with darkened mind looks upon ways of light.
 While in iniquity, he cannot be reckoned perfect.
 He cannot purify himself by atonement,
 Nor cleanse himself with water-for-impurity,
 Nor sanctify himself with seas or rivers
 Nor cleanse himself with any water for washing!
 Unclean! Unclean! shall he be as long as he rejects God's laws
 So as not to be instructed by the Community of His counsel (DSD 3:3-6).

It is not impossible that we have here a veiled reference to some bathing practice of the Qumrân sect, to a purificatory bath perhaps. But it is just as possible that this is a rhetorical way of stressing the uncleanness and guilt of the man who rejects God's laws. The same could be said of DSD 3:9. Similarly in DSD 4:21, "Then God will purge by His truth all the deeds of man . . . to cleanse him through a holy spirit from all wicked practices, sprinkling upon him a spirit of truth as purifying water to cleanse him from all untrue abominations. . . ." However, the passage in DSD 5:13 may well allude to some bathing practice: "These [the perverse] may not enter into water to [be permitted to] touch the Purity of the holy men, for they will not be cleansed unless they have turned from their wickedness. . . ." Two passages in CDC (12:1-2; 14:2) seem to be a mere repetition of the Levitical purity laws prescribed in *Lev* 11:40; 15:10. There is also one passage in DSW 14:2-3 which may or may not refer to a purificatory bath. "After they have gone up from among the slain to return to the camp, they will intone the hymn of Return. In the morning they will wash their garments and cleanse themselves of the blood of the sinners' corpses."

Perhaps no special meaning would be attached to references such as these, were it not for the fact that we know from other sources that the Essenes were a baptist sect (Josephus, *BJ* 2,129-32). Baumgarten has emphasized the adherence to stringent laws of purity and purification among the Essenes of Qumrân.⁷⁵ Contact with a member of lower

Vet. Test. 4 (1954) 141-47. Even Schoeps, who thinks that the identification of the "Sadoqiten von 'Ain Feshkha" with the Essenes of Philo and Josephus is highly problematical, admits that Gottstein has gone too far; cf. Schoeps 2,4); but cf. the recent study by R. North, S.J., "The Qumrân 'Sadducees,'" *CBQ* 17 (1955) 44-68.

⁷⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 155.

grade necessitates a purification (Josephus, *op. cit.* 2,8; 2,10). Excavations at Khirbet Qumrân uncovered large "reservoirs," the nature of which has not yet been definitely established. They have been considered as the bathing places of the Qumrân sect; A. Dupont-Sommer has called them "swimming-pools" in the Postscript (dated February 10, 1954) to the English translation of his *Nouveaux aperçus sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte*.⁷⁶ Partially roofed-over reservoirs, fitted with steps by which one could descend to reach the water-level, are not unknown in Roman Palestine.⁷⁷ We are not trying to exclude the possibility of these installations as bathing places; it is merely a question of reserving judgment until more convincing evidence is had.

The conclusion, then, regarding the sect of Qumrân is that it probably was baptist, even though the evidence is not conclusive. Several factors point in that direction with a high degree of probability. Against the background of a general baptist movement, which is known to have existed in Palestine and Syria between 150 B.C. and 300 A.D., the suggestion is even more plausible.⁷⁸

There is a great deal of evidence for the bathing practices of the Ebionites both in Epiphanius (*Pan.* 30,21) and the PsC. However, the one big difference in this regard is that they admitted Christian baptism as well. "This is the service He [God] has appointed: to worship Him only, and trust only in the Prophet of Truth, and to be baptized for the remission of sins, and thus by this pure baptism to be born again unto God by saving water . . ." (*Hom* 7:8 not *KP*; cf. *Rec* 1:39 *KP*). "Unless a man be baptized in water, in the name of the threefold blessedness, as the true Prophet taught, he can neither receive the remission of sins nor enter into the Kingdom of heaven" (*Rec* 1:69 *KP*; cf. *Hom* 11:27 *KP*). This baptism is necessary before Peter and his followers will partake of food with a man (*Hom* 1:22 not *KP*; cf. 13:4-5 not *KP*).

⁷⁶ The English title is *The Jewish sect of Qumrân and the Essenes* (London: Valentine Mitchell, 1954) pp. 167-68; Cullmann (*op. cit.*, p. 44) refers to these same excavated reservoirs or cisterns as proof that "das Kloster von Qumrân ein wirkliches Taufzentrum war."

⁷⁷ A stepped reservoir was found at Gezer; cf. R. A. S. Macalister, *Excavation of Gezer* (London: John Murray, 1912) 1, 274-76; 3, pl. LIV. Cf. also F. J. Bliss and R. A. S. Macalister, *Excavations in Palestine during the years 1898-1900* (London: Pal. Expl. Fund, 1902) p. 21. Mention is made here of a "vaulted cistern" at Tell Zakariyâ. "Similar stepped cisterns were excavated by me at Jerusalem" (p. 21). "It is quite possible that we have here an ancient cistern vaulted over during the brief Roman occupation" (*ibid.*).

⁷⁸ Cf. J. Thomas, *Le mouvement baptiste*, already referred to.

But in addition to baptism, which is definitely considered an initiation-rite to be conferred only once in the PsC, there are other baths of a purificatory ritualistic character that remind one of the Essene practices mentioned above. These take place before meals and before prayer (*Hom* 8:2; 9:23 *KP*; 10:1 not *KP*; etc.). "Peter rose early and went into the garden, where there was a great water-reservoir (*hydrochoeion*),⁷⁹ into which a full stream of water constantly flowed. There having bathed, and then having prayed, he sat down" (*Hom* 10:1 not *KP*; cf. 10:26 not *KP*: Peter bathes with others before a common meal; 11:1 not *KP*: Peter bathes before prayer; *Rec* 4:3 *KP*: Peter bathes in the sea before eating). Washing with water was prescribed after sexual intercourse (*Hom* 11:30,33 *KP*). These baths are highly recommended by Peter in his preaching (*Hom* 11:28 ff.; *Rec* 6:11 *KP*).⁸⁰ Such baths could well have been received into the Ebionite group from the Qumrân sect; but, in view of the fact of a general baptist movement in Palestine and Syria at that time, we cannot restrict the source of this practice to Qumrân alone.

As a matter of fact, there seems to be evidence of other influence. Epiphanius mentions the Elchesaites as the source of some of the baths in vogue among the Ebionites. "Whenever any one of them is sick or bitten by a snake, he goes down into the water. There he makes use of all the invocations which Helxai composed, calling upon the heavens and the earth, salt and water, winds and the angels of justice (as they say), likewise bread and oil; then he says, 'Come to my aid, and free me from this pain' " (*Pan.* 30,17). The similarity that exists between this practice and the "oath" to be taken by the neophyte before he is entrusted with the sacred books and traditions of the Ebionites, described in *Diam.* 2, support this contention of other than Essene influence on the Ebionites. There is certainly nothing like this oath,

⁷⁹ The Syriac MS, containing parts of the *Hom* and *Rec*, unfortunately has a paraphrase for the Greek word, *hydrochoeion*, so that we are not given any clue to the Semitic word in question; e.g., *Hom* 10:1 reads 'ir dmy' sgy'' 'myn'yi rdyn hww.

⁸⁰ The question of baths in the PsC is one that is involved in the discussion of sources. Most of the cases cited above of Peter's bath before meals and prayer are found in non-*KP* passages; the scene is in Tripoli. Cullmann maintains that these passages represent later Ebionite practices (*op. cit.*, p. 45). It is precisely because of the bathing practices that J. Thomas decided to revise the usual theory of PsC sources and present his own (cf. *op. cit.*, p. 175). This cannot be discussed at length here. But it indicates once again the tenuous character of this entire comparison.

taken by a stream of water with an invocation of elements, in the Qumrân literature. J. Thomas maintains that they were influenced by the Christian Church, the Essenes, and the Elchesaites.⁸¹

Communal Meal

In DSD 6:2 we learn about the Qumrân sect that "they shall eat communally." "When they arrange the table to eat or [arrange] the wine to drink, the priest shall first stretch out his hand to invoke a blessing with the first of the bread and/or the wine" (6:4-6). "He [the neophyte] shall not touch the drink of the Many until his completion of a second year among the men of the Community" (6:20; cf. 7:20). The room in which this communal meal was most likely taken has been found at Khirbet Qumrân.⁸² In the so-called "Two Column" Document we hear of a Messiah of Israel sharing in the banquet of the sect, but he remains subordinate to the priest, whom Abbé Milik has identified as the Messiah of Aaron.⁸³

As for the Ebionites of the PsC, we have already mentioned that they did not eat with the non-baptized (*Hom* 1:22; 3:4,9; *Rec* 2:71 not *KP*). But they too had a communal meal. References to it are vague at times, but there seem to have been fixed places at table ("unusquisque ex more recognoscens proprii ordinis locum," *Rec* 4:37 not *KP*). Though the expression used to indicate the meal is often merely "to partake of food" (*sitiôn metalabein*, *Hom* 8:2 *KP*; *trophês metalabein*, 10:26 not *KP*; *cibum sumere*, *Rec* 4:37; 5:36 not *KP*), we meet on occasion a peculiar expression, *halôn metalabein*, "to partake of salt" (*Hom* 4:6; 11:34; 19:25 not *KP*) or *meta tēn halôn koinōnian* (*Hom* 14:8 not *KP*; cf. *Ep. Clem.* 9,1). Salt and bread are mentioned together in *Diam.* 4:3, and we even find the verb, *sunalizesthai* (*Hom* 13:4 not *KP*).⁸⁴

There is another set of expressions, which indicate that the Ebionites of the PsC celebrated the Eucharist. These are *klasas eucharistian*

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 181.

⁸² Cf. R. de Vaux, "La seconde saison de fouilles à Khirbet Qumrân," *Comptes rendus de l'Acad. des Inscr. et Belles Lettres*, 1953, pp. 310-11.

⁸³ "Une lettre de Siméon bar Kokheba," *RB* 60 (1953) 291.

⁸⁴ This verb occurs in Acts 1:4, where it is variously interpreted; cf. W. Bauer, *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (4th ed.; Berlin, A. Töpelmann, 1952) col. 1425. Philo (*Vita Contemp.* 4,9) mentions the use of salt at the meals of the Therapeutae, who have been generally considered as related to the Essenes.

(*Hom* 11:36 not *KP*); *eucharistiam fragens cum eis* (*Rec* 6:15 not *KP*); *ion arton ep' eucharistia klasas kai epitheis halas* (*Hom* 14:1 not *KP*). Connection with the Christian Eucharist seems clear from the following passage: "For I showed them that in no way else could they be saved, unless through the grace of the Holy Spirit they hastened to be washed with the baptism of the threefold invocation, and received the eucharist of Christ the Lord . . ." (*Rec* 1:63 *KP*). Whether these were two separate types of communal meals is hard to say. The mention of bread and salt in *Hom* 14:1 recalls the passage in *Diam.* 4,3, where there is no mention of the Eucharist. The question is further complicated by the fact that Epiphanius (*Pan.* 30,16) mentions that the Ebionites celebrated the mysteries with unleavened bread and water.

The main fact, however, is certain, that a communal meal was found in both the Qumrân sect and the Ebionites of the PsC. Whereas bread and wine figure in the former, bread, salt, and water (?) are found associated with the latter. In both cases the meal was only for the initiated. Neither similarities nor dissimilarities in this case should be overlooked in drawing conclusions.

Sacred Books

Mention of an enigmatic book of *Hagû* is found in *CDC* 11:2; 15:5; and, possibly, in 17:5. As still unpublished fragments of the Manual of Discipline are said to prescribe that the members of the sect be instructed in this book from their youth, Dupont-Sommer thinks that this might refer to DSD itself.⁸⁶ This is by no means certain, and we have no indication that the Qumrân sect treated this book as secret.

In the PsC the sermons of Peter were treated as secret writings, which were to be entrusted only to the initiated; cf. *Ep. Petr.* 1,2; 3,1; *Diam.* 1-3. It is in connection with these books that the period of probation is mentioned, which lasts for six years (*Diam.* 1,2; 2,2). This is the only connection in which a probation is mentioned, whereas in the Qumrân sect an elaborate process of initiation is found. It has nothing to do with the receiving of sacred books, but leads up to the acceptance as a full member of the Community.

Consequently, both on the score of sacred books and the probation or

⁸⁶ *Nouveaux aperçus*, pp. 88-89; cf. Vermès, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

initiation connected with them, there is much more dissimilarity than similarity between the Qumrân sect and the Ebionites of the PsC.

Community of Goods

Even though details may not be very clear, it is quite certain that the sect of Qumrân practised some sort of communal poverty. "All who dedicate themselves to His Truth shall bring all their mind and their strength and their property into the Community of God . . . to direct all their property according to His righteous counsels" (DSD 1:11-13; cf. 5:2). After a year's probation the novice's property will be handed over to the Custodian of Property of the Many (6:20), but it will not be pooled with the rest until the second year of probation is completed (6:22). "If there be found among them a man who lies in the matter of wealth, and it become known, they shall exclude him from the Purity of the Many for one year, and he shall be fined one-fourth of his food-allowance" (6:25). No one may share in the property of those that transgress the laws of the community (7:25; 8:23; 9:22). The priests (sons of Aaron) will regulate the property (9:8).

Epiphanius (*Pan.* 30,17) tells us that the Ebionites practised poverty, selling their goods as was the custom in the days of the Apostles. In the PsC poverty is praised and possessions are regarded as sinful (*Hom* 15:7 KP). "To all of us possessions are sins" (*Hom* 15:9 KP). Yet, as Cullmann has pointed out,⁸⁶ the fact is that we find no practice of poverty in the PsC and do not see the members pooling their wealth as does the sect of Qumrân; it is thus an ideal rather than established practice. As previously mentioned, the Ebionites did not live a communal life (though they might have come together at times for communal meals). And though they might praise poverty, they could still judge as follows: "One is not unquestionably righteous because he happens to be poor" (*Hom* 15:10 KP). This may be a bit surprising, in view of the fact that the group was known as Ebionite, a name which has often been explained in connection with the Hebrew word for "the poor," as already discussed. Of course, Epiphanius' testimony stands as evidence to the contrary, but even here it is just possible that he or his sources have reasoned from the name to the practice,

⁸⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 47.

especially when the example of the Apostles could be cited in favor of early Church practices.

At any rate, this is another significant difference between the sect of Qumrân and the Ebionites, at least as they are known from the PsC.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, then, we can say that whereas there are many similarities between the sect of Qumrân and the Ebionites, there are also striking dissimilarities. The Qumrân dualism resembles the Ebionite in that it is subordinated to Jewish monotheism and both are ethical. But the Qumrân dualism is ethical alone, whereas the Ebionite is also physical; the Qumrân dualism is simpler (being a contrast merely of light-darkness, truth-perversity, good-evil, and two spirits), but the Ebionite is much more complex. In both groups we find two main figures, the Teacher of Righteousness and the Man of the Lie (or Prophet of Truth and the *inimicus homo*). In the Qumrân literature they are protagonist and antagonist. The Ebionite Prophet of Truth has a role similar to that of the Teacher of Righteousness, whereas the *inimicus homo* can be compared with the Man of the Lie only in that he is an adversary. However, we find a radical difference of outlook when we consider the attitude of the two groups toward the Old Testament and its institutions. Qumrân esteems the Torah, the Prophets, their priests, and sacrifice (when their own rigid ideas of purity are observed by the priests and in sacrifice). But the Ebionites reject the "false pericopes" of the Pentateuch, reject the prophets of the Old Testament, reject priesthood, and claim that baptism has replaced sacrificial cult. Whereas the Ebionites admitted Christian baptism and had purificatory baths of different sorts, we find at Qumrân only simple purificatory baths (at least most probably). Though both had some sort of a communal meal, bread and wine were used at Qumrân, while the Ebionites used bread, salt, and water (?), and celebrated the Christian Eucharist. Some sort of sacred book (*Hagû*) was used at Qumrân, but we are not told that it was a secret writing, so that it can scarcely be compared with the Sermons of Peter, which were to be entrusted only to the initiated among the Ebionites, who had passed a long probation. Whereas communal poverty was definitely practised at Qumrân, there is no evidence of its practice in the PsC, where it is, however,

praised. Epiphanius tells us, however, that the Ebionites did practise poverty.

From the preceding survey of the main points,⁸⁷ which have served as the basis of our comparison between the sect of Qumrân and the Ebionites, several conclusions can be drawn. First, as already stated above, there is no real evidence for the identification of the sect of Qumrân as Ebionite. This opinion is contrary to that of J. L. Teicher of Cambridge, but finds itself in good company.⁸⁸ Secondly, it does not seem possible to admit that the Essenes of Qumrân became the Ebionites. Cullmann's conclusion is: "die Reste der Essener vom Toten Meer im Judenchristentum aufgingen."⁸⁹ Such an opinion demands that the strict-living Qumrân sect, adhering rigorously to the Torah, the teaching of the prophets, and their own ascetical rules of communal life, abandoned their main tenets and practices and became Christians. We have no evidence for this. As should be obvious to anyone reading this paper, we have utilized much of the material Cullmann has brought together in his enlightening article. Many of the similarities and dissimilarities here pointed out were indicated previously by him. Consequently, one is surprised to read at the end of his article that one group passed over into the other. It seems that the most we can say is that the sect of Qumrân influenced the Ebionites in many ways; Essene tenets and practices were undoubtedly adopted or adapted into the Ebionite way of life. To try to state more than this is to overstep the limits set by the evidence we have at our disposal.⁹⁰

⁸⁷ One main point has been purposely omitted; this is the question of "knowledge" in the Qumrân and Ebionite sects. To treat this point adequately would demand a separate paper in itself. From the standpoint of Qumrân, we already have a good treatment of the question in the scrolls previously published, written by W. D. Davies, "'Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11:25-30," *Harv. Theol. Rev.* 46 (1953) 113-39. See esp. pp. 129 ff., where he rejects the identification of Qumrân 'knowledge' with any of three ways of understanding 'gnosticism' or 'gnosis.' Strangely enough, Cullmann has not considered this point. Cf. W. Baumgartner, *op. cit.*, p. 62, where the Qumrân emphasis on wisdom and intelligence is labelled "gnostic." Cf. also Bo Reicke, *op. cit.*, pp. 137-41.

⁸⁸ Cullmann, *op. cit.*, p. 35; A. Dupont-Sommer, *Nouveaux aperçus*, pp. 201-6; K. Elliger, *op. cit.*, p. 242-5; Schoeps 3,322-28.

⁸⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 50.

⁹⁰ It seems, too, that Cullmann has overemphasized the importance of the destruction of Jerusalem to the Ebionites of the PsC and to the sect of Qumrân. We must await fuller publication of the details of the excavations of Khirbet Qumrân before we can judge adequately the effect of this destruction.

In our discussion of dualism we rejected the idea that either the Qumrân or the Pseudoclementine dualism was Gnostic. We do not intend to claim that there is no Gnosticism at all in the PsC. It is, moreover, quite conceivable that many of the ideas of the Qumrân writings would easily lend themselves to Gnostic adaptation. To admit this is not at all the same as to speak of a "gnostisches Judentum" at Qumrân, as Schoeps has done.

This discussion has tried to furnish a *mise au point* in the problem of the relationship between Qumrân and the Ebionites. It is obvious that the last word has not yet been said, and that much more will be written when adequate studies have been made of the recently published Hebrew University Scrolls, and the fragments of Qumrân Cave I, which have just appeared.⁹¹

⁹¹ D. Barthélemy, O.P. and J. T. Milik, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert I: Qumran Cave I* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955).