Zeitschrift: Theologische Zeitschrift
Herausgeber: Theologische Fakultät der Universität Basel
Band: 37 (1981)
Heft: 5

Artikel: The Messianic Departure from Judah : 4Q Patriarchal Blessings
Autor: Schwartz, Daniel R.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-878415

Nutzungsbedingungen
Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Mehr erfahren

Conditions d'utilisation
L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. En savoir plus

Terms of use
The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. Find out more

Download PDF: 26.11.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, https://www.e-periodica.ch

Theologische Zeitschrift

Jahrgang 37 Heft 5 September/Oktober

The Messianic Departure from Judah (4Q Patriarchal Blessings)

In 1956, J.M. Allegro published a fragment of a document which he entitled 4Q Patriarchal Blessings (4Q patr); this seven-line interpretation of Gen 49.10 is badly damaged, especially in its lines 5–7.[1] Although Yadin was able to correct a reading in line 2[2], the other readings he offered (on the basis of Allegro's photograph), as also the additional fragment of 4Q patr described and in part published by Stegemann in 1967[3], relate to other verses in Genesis. Thus, although these subsequent publications allow greater certainty as to the nature of the document of which Allegro's fragment was originally a part[4], they do not contribute to the reconstruction of its lacunae or clarify the document's (and so the sect's?[5]) understanding of this notoriously difficult but historically momentous verse.[6] For these tasks we must turn to the document itself, in the light of other Qumran texts. In this study, therefore, I propose to (1) reassess the usual interpretation of Allegro's

[1] J.M. Allegro, Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature, JBL 75 (1956), 174–176.

[2] Y. Yadin, Some Notes on Commentaries on Genesis xlix and Isaiah, from Qumran Cave 4, IEJ 7 (1957), 66–67. Yadin's suggestion to read *ywšb ks'* instead of Allegro's *ywšb bw'* – a suggestion offered apparently independently, but without argument, by N. Wieder, Notes on the New Documents from the Fourth Cave of Qumran, JJS 7 (1956), 73 n. 4 – has won general acceptance, for example by J. Liver, The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs in Sectarian Literature in the Time of the Second Commonwealth, HThR 52 (1959), 157 and J. Carmignac, in: Les textes de Qumran 2 (1963), 87 n. 3. For other texts referring to the Davidic "chair", see n. 16 below. (Yadin's other suggestion, *hdglym* instead of *hrglym* in line 3, has little to recommend it; cf. Liver, loc. cit., n. 27.)

[3] H. Stegemann, Weitere Stücke von 4Qp Psalm 37, von 4Q Patriarchal Blessings, und Hinweis auf eine unedierte Handschrift aus Höhle 4Q mit Exzerpten aus dem Deuteronomium, RdQ 6 (1967–9), 211–213.

[4] See Stegemann (n. 3), 213–214.

[5] On this question, see, most recently, M.P. Horgan, Pesharim – Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books (1979), 3–4.

[6] In general, see A. Posnanski, Schiloh. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Messiaslehre (1904).

fragment, (2) offer another in its stead, and (3) on that basis suggest restorations for the lacunae in the fragment's latter half.

1.

It is usually assumed that 4Q patr takes Gen 49.10 as speaking only of the messianic age, "when Israel will have dominion" (line 1).[7] From then on, the line of Davidic monarchy will not be cut off (line 2), for – as the text proceeds to say after proving the above via interpretations of *mḥqq* and *rglym* (lines 2–3) – the messianic shoot of David and his heirs have been given the covenant of eternal kingship (lines 3–4). From this point on the text becomes more fragmentary, but it is usually agreed that line 5 notes that the men of the community *(yḥd)* had remained faithful to that covenant; several scholars suggest, in my opinion correctly (see below), that the lacuna in line 5 is to be filled with *dwrš,* in which case the Interpreter of the Law is mentioned separately, alongside the men of the community, as having been faithful to the covenant of Davidic kingship.

This interpretation[8] involves several difficulties:

a) It ignores, or supposes the Qumran exegete ignored, the plain meaning of *l' yswr... 'd,* which implies that when the Messiah comes something will change; that is, the verse is speaking of both before and

[7] This assumption is apparently implied by those who translate *bhywt* with a verb in the future tense, such as Allegro (n. 1), 174; Carmignac (n. 2), 287; A. Dupont-Sommer, Les écrits esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte ([3]1964), 328. It is explicit in the freer translation by F. F. Bruce, Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts (1959), 47 ("when dominion comes for Israel") and in the interpretation by van der Woude (below, n. 10).

[8] I know of two other interpretations of our text, neither likely: a) Building on a suggestion by Liver (n. 2), 157 n. 27, B. Gärtner (The Temple and the Community in Qumran and in the New Testament [1965], 38–39) suggested that the sect saw *itself* as the sprout of David, alongside of the Interpreter of the Law; for a sufficient rebuttal, see G. Klinzing, Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im NT (1971), 176–177; b) Wieder (n. 2), 73 has proposed translating "whenever Israel will have dominion", explaining that the text means that "'the sceptre will not depart from Judah' into the hands of another tribe, but it may well depart altogether". But this interpretation – already offered by Nachmanides in his commentary on Gen 49.10 – ignores 4Q patr's explicit statement that the Davidic monarchic line will not be cut off, and it also ignores the specific sectarian content of our passage (references to the *yḥd* and, probably, to the Interpreter of the Law).

after, not only after.[9] Van der Woude seems to be the only scholar to have noticed this problem, but his solution – translating *'d* here as "sobald, wenn" – is unparalleled and unconvincing.[10]

b) Similarly, it requires a future reference for the introductory *bhywt* in line 1, "when Israel *will* have dominion", although its only parallels (Manual of Discipline [= 1QS] 8.4,12, 9.3) all refer to the pre-messianic present, when the sect lives apart from the evil majority.

c) It offers no explanation[11] for the use of *mmšl* in line 1, instead of some more specific term denoting a monarchy. As it stands, *mmšl* seems rather to contrast with the Davidic *mlkwt* of lines 2 and 4. Note that the Qumran pesharim at times use *mšl* to denote a specifically non-monarchic regime, that of the Romans (cf. 1 Macc 8.14), as opposed to the "kings of Greece" (Pesher Nah 1.3; Pesher Hab 2.13–14, 4.5,10,12).[12]

d) It does not explain why the text speaks of "Israel" having dominion, although the biblical lemma mentions "Judah" alone. Note that the scrolls at times use "Israel" (or its components "Manasseh" and "Ephraim") to denote the non-sectarians, i.e. the wicked, as opposed to "Judah", the code word for the sect.[13]

[9] J. Skinner's comment on Gen 49.10 applies to our fragment as well: "The logical relation of the two halves of the v. is clear: the state of things described by 10[a] shall endure *until* – something happens which shall inaugurate a still more glorious future" (ICC [2]1930, 520–521).

[10] A. S. van der Woude, Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran (1957), 170 n. 8: 'd «bedeutet in diesem Zusammenhang gewiss nicht *'bis dass'*, sondern vielmehr *'sobald, wenn'* (vgl. Jud 16,2 und C. Brockelmann, Hebräische Syntax, 1956, 163c, S. 155). Erst recht, wenn der Messias kommt, wird David keiner fehlen, der auf dem Throne sitzt.» First of all, however, note that Brockelmann himself, a page earlier, translates our Gen 49.10 with «bis er... kommt». As for Judges 16.2, it seems rather that an elliptical verb is implied ("*wait* until morning dawns"), instead of the construction "*when* the morning dawns..."; see the LXX (Alexandrinus) and Revised Standard Version ad loc., also C. F. Burney, The Book of Judges (1918), 376. For a large collection of "'d... l'..." passages meaning «nicht... bis...», see K. Beyer, Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament, Bd. 1: Satzlehre Teil 1 (1962), 132–133 n. 1.

[11] Apart from references to parallel phrases in the War Scroll 1.5 and 17.7–8 (Yadin [n. 2], 67). Carmignac (n. 2), 287 n. 2 suggests the phrase reflects Obad 21, quoted (perhaps) in the War Scroll 6.6 and 12.16; but the latter passage is quite fragmentary while the first two clearly refer to God's kingdom *(mlwkh)*, not Israel's rule.

[12] See especially Dupont-Sommer (n. 7), 355–356, and the discussion and references by G. Jeremias, Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit (1963), 22.

[13] See J. Amoussine, Éphraïm et Manassé dans le Péshèr de Nahum (4Q pNahum), RdQ 4 (1963–4), 389–396; D. Flusser, Pharisäer, Sadduzäer und Essener im Pescher

These difficulties, it is true, are not at all insurmountable. The latter three may answered by the suggestion that *bhywt, mšl,* and *yśr'l* do not have here the meaning they have elsewhere; in the latter two cases especially this may easily be paralleled.[14] As for the first difficulty, regarding *l'... 'd,* one could simply reply that this is not the first time a Qumran commentator has been caught ignoring the plain sense of a biblical verse.[15] On balance, however, the above considerations seem to point in the direction of a new interpretation.

2.

From the sectarians' point of view, there was no current king of Israel, for these must be Davidic[16]. Even if a Hasmonean or Herod[17] called himself "king", he was really only a ruler. However, the Bible repeatedly promises, in words echoed in line 2, that the line of the Davidic monarchy will never be cut off (1 Kings 2.4, 8.25, 9.5), so it

Nahum: Qumran, ed. K. E. Grözinger et al., 1981, 137–142; (s. English summary in Immanuel 1 [Summer 1972], 39). In my note, The Three Temples of 4Q Florilegium, RdQ 10 (1979–1981), 90 n. 27, I have suggested that 4Q Florilegium's reference to "Israel's desolate Temple" may reflect the same usage, and in another study, "To Join Oneself to the House of Judah" (Damascus Document IV. 11), forthcoming in RdQ, I have argued that this passage too should be added to the list.

[14] For *mšl,* see for example 1QSb (Blessings) 5.28, where *mwšlym* are rulers in general; for "Israel", note that our own text, line 3, use the term in a positive sense. Cf. Stegemann (n. 3), 205 n. 47.

[15] W. H. Brownlee (Biblical Interpretation Among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls, BA 14 [1951], 60) thus formulates the second hermeneutical supposition of Pesher Habakkuk: "Since the ancient prophet wrote cryptically, his meaning is often to be ascertained through a forced, or abnormal construction of the Biblical text"; cf. his examples, ibid., 63, 65–66, 68. A passage we will cite below, the Zadokite Document 7.14–20, which interprets Amos 5.26–27, is, according to G. Vermes, the "classic example" of the manner in which the biblical text could be rewritten at Qumran in order to allow "fanciful exegesis" (Post-Biblical Jewish Studies [1975], 44–45).

[16] For belief in the Davidic messiah, see also 4Q Paroles Lumineuses 4.6–8 (RB 68 [1961], 204), which also refers to David sitting on the throne forever, as well as 4Q pesher Isa[a] 8–10.17–19 (Qumran Cave 4, ed. J. M. Allegro [1968], 14), which likewise refers to the Davidic messiah's "chair".

[17] Stegemann (n. 3), 214–217 argues for composition in the Herodian period, but only conjectures are possible.

must be that the line lives on, even "while 'Israel' rules" (line 1).[18] Only in the future, when the messianic "sprout of David" appears, will he take over the birthright promised him and his descendants, eternal kingship over his people Israel (lines 3–4).

Where does the line live on in the meantime? Since its representatives do not rule, they must be among the people, loosely called the "thousands of Israel" in line 3. More specifically, however, he – just as the Messiah of Aaron[19] – will have to come from the best part of Israel, the sect itself ("Judah"), for only its members will survive in the end.[20] As the Messianic Rule (1QSa) 2.11–12 specifically says, the Messiah of Israel will be born within the community *(yḥd)*.[21] And, in fact, lines 4–5 point out that the members of the community remained faithful to this covenant, i.e., they did not despair of its fulfillment.[22] For they knew that when that descendant of David who is the messianic sprout will be born, he will finally "depart" from sectarian isolation in order to take over the national throne.

That "'depart' from Judah" in Gen 49.10 was thus understood is supported by reference to 1QS 9.9–10: "They shall not leave the entire community of the Torah so as to walk wholly in the stubbornness of their hearts, but[23] they shall rather be governed by the first ordinances according to which the men of the community were first disciplined, until the coming of a prophet and the messiahs of Aaron and Israel." The use of *'d bw'* in a messianic context strongly suggests that here too

[18] Cf. the translations by E. Lohse, Die Texte aus Qumran (1964), 247 («Solange Israel die Herrschaft hat...») and M. Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls (1958), 401 ("...while Israel has dominion...").

[19] Bruce (n. 7), 39; D. Flusser, Two Notes on the Midrash on 2 Sam vii: IEJ 9 (1959), 106–107; J. T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea (1959), p. 127. (The latter two scholars, as others, identify the Interpretor of the Law with the priestly messiah; this does not concern us here.)

[20] See Stegemann (n. 3), 205 n. 47.

[21] See E. F. Sutcliffe, The Rule of the Congregation (I Q Sa) II, 11–12: Text and Meaning, RdQ 2 (1959–60), 541–547, where further literature on this oft-discussed passage is noted.

[22] The sectarians apparently assigned this same meaning to *šmrw* in Ezek 44.15, cited in the Zadokite Document 4.1, as I have argued in the second study cited in n. 13 above.

[23] While most translators begin here a new sentence with "and", I believe it is more natural to translate as above; cf. Lohse (n. 18), 32–33, and A. R. C. Leaney, The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning (1966), 210. J. Licht as well begins and ends the sentence as I have (The Rule Scroll [1965], 190 [Hebrew]); cf. the end of the next note.

we have a reflection of Gen 49.10. And here we most clearly read that one is not to leave the community[24], but rather be governed by the "first ordinances", *until the messiahs come.* As many have noted, the term "first ordinances" implies that there are other ordinances as well, which will apply in the messianic age[25]; by the same token, we see that the confines of the community are expected to be broken up in the end, and the members of the community are expected to depart then from the narrow framework to which they had previously restricted themselves.[26] So too the Zadokite Document (Z.D.) 19.32–20.1, which assumes that those who had previously been members of the sect but left it *(wyswrw)* did so due to the stubbornness of their heart *(bšryrwt lbm* – as in 1QS 9.10), limits this assumption to the period prior to the appearance *(ʿdʿmwd)* of the messiah(s) (Z.D. 20.1)[27]. As the War Scroll 1.3 puts it, the exiled children of light will then return from the desert. If this is so of the community as a whole, then it is so of the Davidic messiah who will come from its midst.

[24] Although most translate *ʿṣt htwrh* as "counsel of the Torah", it is difficult to speak of "leaving" these; moreover, the similarity of our passage with 1QS 7.23–24, which deals with departure from the community, indicates that this is the case here as well. (So P. Wernberg-Møller, The Manual of Discipline [1957], 135 n.22.) Note too the term *byt htwrh,* used of the sect in the Zadokite Document 20.10,12; cf. Brownlee (n.15), 58. It must be admitted, however, that the use of *wmkwl* in line 10, most naturally translated as "and from any", argues in favor of "counsel". In any case, it is clear, as Licht (n.23), 187 puts it, that 1QS 9.9–10 offers a negative definition of the sect, which is complemented by the positive definition in lines 10–11.

[25] Dupont-Sommer (n.7), 109–110 n.3; S.E. Johnson and W.D. Davies: The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl (1957), 139 and 281 n.86, respectively; Licht (n.23), 188; J.M. Baumgarten, Studies in Qumran Law (1977), 31–32 n.77.

[26] This interpretation is apparently behind G. Vermès' comment on 1QS 9.5–11 in his Les Manuscrits du Désert de Juda ([2]1954), 151.

[27] The syntax of Z.D. is difficult here, but I believe that I. Levi has correctly construed the passage: «L'auteur veut dire probablement que pareil sort est réservé à ceux qui ont trahi la bonne cause depuis la mort du Docteur unique et à ceux qui la trahiront par la suite jusqu'à l'arrivée du Messie» (Un écrit sadducéen antérieur à la destruction du Temple, REJ 61 [1911], 191 n.2). That is, the words "from... until..." refer to the period within which sinners leave the sect, not to the period in which those who sinned will not be "inscribed" in the sect's book. The latter alternative, which lies behind most translations, implies a) that those who sinned before the death of the "unique teacher" will be reinstated in the book when the messiahs come, and b) that those who sinned after the teacher's death will go unpunished. Both conclusions, however, are improbable, and therefore tell against the translation upon which they are based.

We suggest, then, that the Qumran exegete took Gen 49.10 as prophesying the exile of the legitimate Davidic monarchic line among the sect itself, while Israel (usurpers) ruled, until the birth of the Davidic messiah, who will "depart" from his exile and establish his monarchy.[28]

3.

As already mentioned, a number of scholars, beginning with Allegro himself, have suggested that lines 4–5 be restored as follows: "the covenant... which was kept by [the Interpreter of] the Law along with the men of the Community[29]. This seems to be a most reasonable suggestion, both grammatically[30] and contextually, for it establishes a parallel with Z.D. 7.18–20 where, via another biblical "scepter" (*šbṭ*, Num 24.17), the Interpreter of the Law is linked with the Davidic messiah, as he is in 4Q Florilegium 1.11 as well (see below).

It appears remarkable, however, that the Interpreter of the Law is specifically mentioned in our text. Why does he rate special mention in this context? Investigation of this question will, I believe, enhance our understanding of this fragment of 4Q patr and point the way to the restoration of the lacunae in lines 6–7.

First, however, we will pose a similar question regarding another passage often compared to our own: 4Q Florilegium 1.11–12. Here, after

[28] It is noteworthy that several medieval Jewish commentators, referring to earlier (lost?) midrashim, suggested translating *yswr* in Gen 49.10 as "bloom forth", referring to Jer 2.21 for support (see Posnanski [n.6], 131, 142, 178, 204; M.M. Kasher, Torah Shelemah: Genesis, part 7 [= vol.8, 1938], 1807, no.146). Such a translation would be particularly apt in connection with the "*sprout* of David", so there is a possibility that our commentator had such an association in mind.

[29] Allegro (n.1), 175 n.11; Liver (n.2), 157; Gärtner (n.8), 39–40; A.M. Habermann, Megillot Midbar Yehudah (1959), 149 (cf. 209 n.6).

[30] Assuming a *mapiq* in the *he* of *šmrh*, as in Lohse's edition (n.18), 246. The use of a singular verb preceding a subject composed of coordinated nouns poses no problem, especially when the nouns are linked by "with", for it occurs frequently in the Bible, even when the nouns are coordinated by a simple "and" (see W. Gesenius, Hebräische Grammatik, 28th ed., by E. Kautzsch [reprinted 1962], 490–491 §146, f–g). It is noteworthy that in many cases, as in our passage, the more important component of the subject is mentioned first, and it may thus be that not only the order of the components but also the use of the singular verb implies his principal role; see Gen 7.7, 8.18, 14.5, 21.32, 24.61, 33.7, 34.20; Ex 15.1; 2 Sam 5.21.

citing 2 Sam 7.11–14a's references to David's posterity, the expositor informs us that "He is the sprout of David who shall stand with the Interpreter of the Law, who shall (stand? arise?) in Zion in the end of days".[31] Here too, as in 4Q patr, the Interpreter of the Law is mentioned in the explanation, although the lemma offers no apparent reason. It is nevertheless true, however, that 4Q Florilegium closely follows the biblical text[32]; why does it mention the Interpreter of the Law?

I would suggest that it was the continuation of 2 Sam 7.14 which the author had in mind: "I will chasten him with the rod (*šbṭ*!) of men."[33] The verse thus promises that a *šbṭ* will appear alongside the future Davidic king, and the Qumran exegete quite naturally explained the term as referring to the Interpreter of the Law, just as in Z.D. 7.18–19 the two figures appear together as well.[34]

Returning to 4Q patr, we note that here too the text under consideration (Gen 49.10) mentions a *šbṭ* in connection with the Davidic messiah: could this be what lies behind the seemingly unmotivated reference to the Interpreter of the Law? That this is indeed the case appears from another consideration as well: whatever the larger context of 4Q patr[35], our fragment is exegesis of Gen 49.10. On the one hand, however, neither the word "Judah" nor the word *šbṭ* has yet been explained; and, on the other hand, our deduction, from general principles, that the Davidic messiah – accompanied by the Interpreter of the

[31] For the text see Allegro (n.16), 53.

[32] See the first of my papers mentioned in n.13 above, 86–87.

[33] Partial citation of a verse followed by an explanation relating to the continuation as well is apparent in the first lines of 4Q patr, where *mḥqq* and *rglym* are explained although they were not included in the opening lemma. So too in Z.D. 7.18 the "star" of Amos 5–26 is interpreted, although the citation of that verse in lines 14–15 omits this word and others. The phenomenon is common in rabbinic literature as well; see N. Cohen, The Theological Stratum of the Martha b. Boethus Tradition. An Explanation of the Text in *Gittin* 56a, HThR 69 (1976), 189 n.6.

[34] For the Interpreter of the Law's function of guiding the messianic prince, which, I suggest, corresponds to the "chastening" of 2 Sam 7.14, see O. Betz, Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte (1960), 44–45. Note too that 4Q Testimonia, line 12 (Allegro [n.16], 58) reads in Num 24.17 *drk... wyqwm...*; this may be a deliberate attenuation of the parallelism of the massoretic text *(drk... wqm),* in order to support the assumption that the verse alludes to two characters. – In Z.D. 7.18–20 the Interpreter of the Law is not identified as the *šbṭ,* but rather as the "star"; this indicates a certain flexibility of images. Note, however, the affinity of *šbṭ* and *šbyṭ* (= comet; cf. *kwkb' dšbyṭ* in Babyl. Tal. Berakhot 58b), an affinity which encourages such flexibility.

[35] See n.4 above.

Law – will come from the midst of the sect has yet to be grounded in the verse. Fortunately, each deficiency can be used to solve the other. What the exegete owes us is certainly to be sought in the current lacunae in lines 6–7, which told us, I suggest, that "[(the house of?) Judah] is the assembly of the men of [the community and the *šbṭ* is the Interpreter of the Law]".[36]

After the second lacuna only the word *ntn* survives, usually translated "has given". It is of course very speculative to make suggestions about its context. However, following our restoration of the two lacunae, we would expect some proof-text to be offered in support of the equations Judah = men of the community *('nšy hyḥd), šbṭ* = Interpreter of the Law. That proof-text, as our discussion of 4Q Florilegium indicates, would be 2 Sam 7.14, "I will chasten him with the rod of men", which juxtaposes both *šbṭ* and *'nšym* with the heir to Davidic kingship. Now this verse is part of the speech by *Nathan,* and the word *ntn,* I submit, may be the remnant of the reference to this prophet. Whether or not the actual passage from 2 Sam 7.14 was cited we cannot know, at present; while most scholars suppose the passage ended with *ntn* – in which case it is especially difficult to translate it as "has given" – Habermann[37] posits one more line.

Following the above suggestions, I propose the following restoration and translation of Allegro's fragment of 4Q patr, using square brackets for restoration and parentheses for explanation:

"A ruler will [not] depart from the tribe of Judah": (this means that) while Israel rules, there will [not] be cut off a Davidic (heir to) the throne. For the "staff" is the covenant of kingship (and) the thousands

[36] The warping of the fragment makes it difficult to calculate how many letters are lost; my suggestion aims at supplying the sense of the lost words. I have seen only two other suggestions regarding the lacunae in lines 6–7: a) Allegro (n. 1), 175 n. 12 suggested that "assembly of the men of" is a commentary on Gen 49.10's *yqht 'mym,* a suggestion seconded by van der Woude (n. 10), 170–171 n. 11, who notes that the rabbis at times interpreted the word as *ytqht,* «es versammelt sich». But it is not clear how this can be turned into the nominal "die Versammelten", as van der Woude does on 172. b) Dupont-Sommer (n. 7), 328 n. 5 and, more cautiously, Carmignac (n. 2) 288 n. 11, suggest something like *knst 'nsy hlṣwn,* "assembly of the men of mockery". But this is supported only by the coincidence that *knst* is used of the sect's enemies in Pesher Nahum 3.7; neither scholar suggests how reference to such enemies might be fitted into the context of 4Q patr.

[37] See n. 29 above.

of Israel are the "feet". "Until the coming" of the righteous messiah, the sprout of David, for "to him"[38] and his posterity has been given the covenant of kingship over his people unto everlasting generations, which (covenant) was preserved by the [Interpreter of] the Law together with the men of the community. For [(the house of?) "Judah"] is the assembly of the men of [the community and "scepter" is the Interpreter of the Law], as Nathan [said[39]: "I will chasten him with the scepter of men"] (2 Sam 7.14, perhaps only alluded to without citation).

Daniel R. Schwartz, Jerusalem

[38] Apparently a paraphrase of "Shiloh", using a common interpretation of the word, supported by most ancient versions (see Posnanski [n. 6], 20–31; J. Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel [1956], 29).

[39] Or: "As Good said through *(byd)* Nathan"; on these and similar formulae, see J. A. Fitzmyer, The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament, NTS 7 (1960–61), 301–302.