

A REEXAMINATION OF THE 'SONS OF THE DAWN' IN CD 13:14-15A

INTRO/ISSUE

(slide 1) The level of exclusivity within the Essenes, generally, and the Qumran community, specifically, remains debated.¹ Scholars have long portrayed the Essenes as an exclusive, nearly utopian community characterized by the mutual exchange of goods and services between sectarian members and the avoidance of financial interaction with outsiders.² This depiction is perpetuated through an equation of the Essenes with the Qumran community, thus highlighting an isolationist tendency, and the privileging of the Community Rule (1QS) as an interpretive frame by which other Essene documents are read. Though I cannot address such broad themes in this paper, I hope to nuance the discussion of such topics by exploring an enigmatic rule from the Damascus Document. (slide 2) In the midst of the rules for introducing new members to the community, the authors inform us that “everyone who joins his congregation, [the Inspector] he should examine, concerning his actions, his intelligence, his strength, his courage and his wealth; and they shall inscribe him in his place according to his inheritance in the lot of light. None of the members of the camp should have authority to introduce anyone into the congregation without the permission of the Inspector of the camp. *And none of the ones entering the covenant of God should lend to or give to the sons of the dawn/pit (השחר/ת) except from hand to hand.* And no-one should make a deed of purchase or of sale without informing the Inspector of the camp.”

Determining what is prohibited by the emphasized regulation of transactions and to whom the rule even applies is problematic. This is compounded by the difficulty of deciphering one stroke of one letter because of the deteriorated state of the manuscript. How one interprets this stroke, however, has bearing on reconstructions of the practices and trade relations depicted in the Damascus Document. (slide 3) If one reads *resh* (‘dawn’), then the prohibition limits the

exchange of goods between members of the community. If one reads *taw* ('pit'), however, the statement allows a (limited) form of exchange with outsiders.

Opposing the recent trend in both Hebrew editions and English translations of the Damascus Document, this paper argues that a reexamination of the manuscript evidence supports the reading *šahath* ('pit') rather than *šahar* ('dawn'). In light of this, I contend that (click 1) CD 13:14-15a addresses the trade relationship between existing members of the community and a specific group of Israelite outsiders designated as 'the sons of the pit.' That is, the Israelite leaders, priests, and others who exploit the poor. The members of the community are prohibited from lending or giving items to this group but are allowed the mutual exchange of goods with them "from hand to hand." As I hope to show, this allows the community to interact commercially with a detested group of outsiders but protects them from contributing directly to financial exploitation or extortion of the poor. This thesis is adduced through an examination of the manuscript evidence and a comparison of similar passages in the Damascus Document.

Before proceeding, it might be helpful to note two methodological assumptions used in this paper. First, the primary means for determining the "correct" reading of the text in question is the physical evidence. This evidence supersedes any ideological presuppositions about CD, Qumran, or the Essenes. Second, I understand the Damascus Document to be a text which is not exclusive to the Qumran community. Therefore, it can be interpreted in its own right rather than through other sectarian documents found near Qumran.³ This is not to say that CD should not be viewed in its (reconstructed) social and ideological context as revealed by other documents found at Qumran but is done in an attempt to mitigate the overemphasis often placed on the unity of the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) which has caused some scholars to harmonize CD with Qumran documents, especially the Community Rule (1QS). This methodology is supported by the growing consensus that CD represents, at least in the legal code, an early strand of the Essene

movement of which the Qumran documents and, by extension, Qumran community is one example.⁴

TEXTUAL ARGUMENT

The primary issue in determining the meaning of the passage lies in deciphering the original reading of the last three words at the end of line 14. Though the text at the end of the line is broken, scholars have settled on two viable options: בני השחר and בני השחת.⁵ The latter option was proposed by Rabin,⁶ and the former has gained widespread support since Baumgarten argued for it in 1983.⁷

To my knowledge Baumgarten is the first recent scholar to attempt an argument supporting the reading of *shahar* in CD 13:14 based on the physical evidence.⁸ He contends that a new image of CD 13 (quote) “indicates without a doubt” (end quote) that the letter in question is a *resh*.⁹ He supports this interpretation in two ways. First, he points to the “symbolic significance” associated with the sunrise at Qumran.¹⁰ Second, Baumgarten points to the use of *bene shahar* in a reference to members of the community found in the fragment now identified as 4Q298.¹¹ From this he argues that the Qumran community used *bene shahar* as a variant of the common expression *bene or* (sons of light).¹² (slide 4) In light of this, Baumgarten concludes that the rule is about internal economic relations characterized by mutual exchange.¹³

Many scholars have supported Baumgarten’s reading¹⁴ and a few have examined its meaning in the context of CD more thoroughly. In an article on “The Words of the Maskil to the Sons of Dawn” (4Q298), Stephen Pfann augments Baumgarten’s thought that the “sons of dawn” and “sons of light” are synonymous in view of 4Q298.¹⁵ Pfann concludes that:

Since this composition seems to be an introductory address, it is probable that [the *Maskil*] is speaking to novices and that the term ‘Sons of Dawn’ implies that these individuals are ‘dawning’ out of the darkness and into the light, and are thus on the verge of becoming ‘Sons of Light’.¹⁶

In a footnote Pfann addresses the implications of this understanding of ‘sons of dawn’ on the interpretation of CD 13:14 and 15.¹⁷ His findings imply that (quote) “certain limitations are placed upon full members of the community concerning business procedures with novices who still hold a probationary status.” (end quote)¹⁸ According to Pfann, these limitations on prospective members of the community are similar to those found in 1QS (6:17-20).¹⁹

(click) Catherine Murphy takes up Pfann’s position in her (relatively) extensive treatment of the passage in her work on wealth in the DSS. She argues that *shahar* is preferable to *shahath* because the stance and curve of the letter is more consistent with *resh*.²⁰ She understands the “sons of dawn” as incoming members of the community. The prohibition in 13:14 and 15 is, therefore, a limitation of the trade between initiates. They are prohibited from buying and selling with other ‘sons of dawn’ but are able to exchange goods.²¹ For Murphy, this passage reflects the Qumran practices of bartering between members and limiting transactions with outsiders.²²

These theories concerning the reading ‘sons of dawn’ in CD 13:14 are problematic for a few reasons, however. First, though Baumgarten is correct to point to an emphasis in the Essenes/Qumran community on solar imagery, it is difficult to account for the unique use of ‘sons of dawn’ in CD without a closer relationship between CD and 4Q298. Because 4Q298 is a relatively late document and the Damascus Document is considered a foundational document for the Qumran community, it is difficult to see how the phrase ‘sons of dawn’ came to be synonymous with ‘sons of light.’ Because ‘sons of light’ does not appear in CD ‘sons of dawn’ would therefore be the precursor to ‘sons of light’ according to this theory. Since ‘sons of dawn’ only appears in one, later text (4Q298) and ‘sons of light’ appears frequently in the DSS, Menahem Kister’s thesis for the origin of the phrase seems more likely. That is, the phrase was developed after the widespread use of ‘sons of light’ and ‘sons of darkness.’ Neither of these phrases occurs in the Damascus Document, however. In addition, the Damascus Document only

requires an oath of the covenant for initiation into the group (15:6) so the idea of initiates as a distinguishable group is questionable.²³

Thus far a few proposals for the interpretation of *shahar* have been challenged from the perspective of internal and external consistency with the Damascus Document. We can now turn to the manuscript. (slide 7) Before making an argument for the reading *shahath*, I must note that I am working with an image provided by the Cambridge University Library. (slide 8) I have cropped the image and adjusted the contrast, brightness, and color (slide 9).

Two general comments about the surrounding lines must be noted before turning to a discussion of the text. (click) First, the text in question is part of one of the more fragmentary pages of CD. Lines 14-16 of Page 13 are nearly illegible because of fading and 17-23 contain only a few words each.²⁴ (click) This makes it difficult, though not impossible, to determine the exact context of the passage. (click) Second, there is a hole and what appears to be a diagonal crease beginning directly below the letter in question.²⁵ (click) This hole apparently led to the deterioration of the word following *shahar/shahath*²⁶ and could have contributed to the deterioration of the letter in question. In spite of these challenges, I believe, a reliable reading can be determined.

(click) At first glance the reading of the final letter as a *resh* appears to be the clear reading since the letter in question does not appear to have the vertical stroke needed for *taw*. (slide 10) This reading is supported, according to Murphy, by the fact that the curve in the right corner and the vertical stance are similar to that of *reš*.²⁷ (click) To assess this statement it may be helpful to see the letter in question more closely.

As the image shows, the vertical stance of the letter cannot be determined conclusively from the state of the MS. Moreover, when this letter is compared to other *reš*'s and *taw*'s on the page, the difficulty of this conclusion becomes acute. (slide 11) From a sample of the letters on

page 13 of the *Damascus Document*, it is clear that the vertical stance of *reš* and *taw* are indistinguishable. Sometimes the vertical line of *reš* is completely straight, sometimes it is slightly curved at the base and other times the vertical line is slightly convex. Though the vertical line of *taw* is more consistently straight, the same range of possibilities exists for *taw* as for *reš*. An examination of the curve in the upper right corner reveals little more. *Reš* sometimes is rounded and sometimes more square in shape. (slide 12) Again, the same range of possibilities occurs for *taw*. (click) There is one characteristic that appears to reliably distinguish between *reš* and *taw* in the absence of the second vertical stroke, namely, the upper left conclusion of the horizontal stroke. In *reš* the mark is pointed and sometimes angles slightly to the right, while in *taw* the mark is more rounded and either vertical or angles slightly left. In many instances the *taw* stroke curls slightly to the left as well.

A close look at the letter in question reveals the slight curl in the upper left corner consistent with *taw*. (slide 13) This conclusion is also supported by the darker spot where the termination of the second vertical stroke of a *taw* would be expected. (click) Older images of the text support the reading of *taw* more clearly. (click) Baumgarten's image actually reveals a more complete second vertical stroke than the Cambridge image and confirms the curled left corner of the letter. An image from 1952 (Zeitlin's image) reveals that the letter in question is a *taw*. (slide 14) Finally, it must be stated that the phenomenon that caused this, that is, the fading of one stroke in a multi-stroke letter, does occur elsewhere on CD 13.²⁸ (slide 15) This belabored issue of jots and tittles can now be laid to rest and in the remaining time I will offer a proposal of who sons of the pit are and what the members of the community are allowed to do with them.

SOCIAL CONTEXT

(slide 16) Since it has been determined from the physical evidence that the most likely reading is בני השחת, the remainder of this paper will focus on how this phrase fits within the context of the Damascus Document.²⁹ The sons of the pit are mentioned one other time in CD

(6:15).³⁰ A negative connotation is clear from the context. The members of the covenant are told that they “should not enter the temple to kindle the altar in vain” (6:11-12). Whether this means that the community does not (or should not) participate in the temple cult is not entirely clear,³¹ but it makes sense of what follows to take this phrase as the introduction to the way “not enter the temple to kindle the altar in vain.” Thus, in order to not kindle the altar in vain, members are to “act in accordance with the exact interpretation of the law” (לעשות כפרוש התורה) and “keep apart from the sons of the pit” (להבדל מבני השחת; 6:14-15a). What follows in 6:15b-7:4a is a list of prohibitions focused on the allocation and use of wealth, purity issues, and provision for the weak. The passage makes clear that members of the community are to abstain from defiling wealth, the wealth of the temple, exploitation of the poor, widows and orphans. They are commanded to “distinguish unclean from clean,” “distinguish between holy and common,” keep the Sabbath and festivals, set apart holy things according to the correct interpretation, love one’s brother, support the poor, needy and foreigners and be at peace with one’s brothers. The result of which is that (quote) “God’s covenant is a guarantee for them that they shall live a thousand generations”³² (CD 7:4-6) (end quote).³³

These passages constitute our only concrete knowledge about the sons of the pit. They reveal little certain data. If, however, the assumption that the sons of the pit somehow represent a group that is characterized by the negative qualities listed in 6:15b-19 is valid, a few things do become clear.³⁴ First, the sons of the pit are not only outsiders, but fellow Israelites who are outside the new covenant community. This becomes clear from the reference to the temple in 6:11-14 and the wealth of the temple (6:16), the language of ritual purity and observance of sacred days (6:17-19a) and the reference to the new covenant (6:19b). These are all descriptive terms that would only matter to Israelites. Second, the sons of the pit are not necessarily all of the Israelites who have not entered the new covenant. This becomes clear from the reference to the

poor, needy, widows, orphans and foreigners in 6:16-18, 21. These are presumably Israelites, who are being exploited by the sons of the pit. This indicates a distinction between these groups. Another factor involved is the command to “seek peace of his brothers and not be unfaithful against his blood relations” (לדרוש איש את שלום אחיהו ולא ימעל איש בשאר בשרו; 6:21-7:1). Thus the members of the community are to keep apart from the sons of the pit, but remain at peace with their community and faithful to their family, not all of whom would necessarily be members of the new covenant.

Finally, the sons of the pit are a specific group of outsiders characterized by their unjust wealth (6:15), their association with the temple (6:16) and their differing interpretations of Sabbath regulations, festivals and days of fasting (6:19). This indicates that the sons of the pit are most likely not comprised of laborers or even merchants but those in control of financial and religious issues. The authors of CD are not so bold as to list specific groups, but they do appear to have a specific group in mind. They inveighs against the ones in control of wicked wealth, the donations to the poor, the issues which effect purity, cleanliness, and the holy days.

With this sketch of the description of the sons of the pit of column 6, we are able to return to 13:14-15a. (slide 17) Though column 6 places a limitation of interaction with the sons of the pit, the restriction placed on the members of the community is mitigated in 13:14. Thus the interaction allowed in 13:14 constitutes a way for them to remain separate from the sons of the pit and the exception to the restriction does not transgress this boundary. The sentence then clarifies how the members of the community are to be separate from the sons of the pit: they are to refrain from lending (נשא) or giving (נתן) to them. These terms could indicate a restriction a prohibition of usury or becoming a creditor³⁵ or the prohibition of offering goods to the sons of the pit to sell.³⁶ Unfortunately, the context is not entirely clear how specific one should take these terms.

Even more problematic is the elusive phrase כף לכף (“hand to hand”) found at the beginning of line 15. It is not clear what the phrase actually means, since no clear parallel is known.³⁷ A few possible options appear in the Hebrew Bible, but upon further analysis are unlikely.³⁸ Baumgarten takes the term literally, that is, as an exchange of goods from hand to hand between two parties.³⁹ On the proposed reading this would indicate that members of the community could exchange goods with outsiders. By exchanging goods from hand to hand, the community could avoid the charge of exploiting the poor, contributing to the wealth of the Temple, and attaching to “wicked wealth.” By exchanging “hand to hand,” transactions are limited to a momentary transaction rather than an extended deal. Once the transaction is completed, no member of the community will be obliged to a son of the pit and no son of the pit can accuse a member of exploitation.

CONCLUSION

A few conclusions have been drawn throughout the course of this paper that are worth restating. Primarily, it has been determined that based on the manuscript evidence, the best reading of CD 13:14 is בני השחת. Secondly, an interpretation of CD 13:14-15a has been proposed which, I believe, best accounts for the physical evidence, the context of CD, and the information from related documents. This indicates that the members of the community are prohibited from lending or giving to the sons of the pit, that is, the Israelite leaders, priests, and those who exploit the poor. They are, however, allowed the mutual exchange of goods with this group of people because it does not bind them to the sons of the pit in any lasting way. Once the exchange is completed, the contact with the outsider ceases. This interpretation does not support the ideal communal life characterized by mutual exchange of goods and services between sectarian members as the scholarship often proposes. It does, however, offer a glimpse of one

phase of the complex social relations between the community that adhered to the *Damascus Document* and a specific group of outsiders.

¹ Gudrun Holtz. "Inclusivism in Qumran." *DSD* 16.1 (2009). 22-54.

²² Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (New York: Doubleday, 1995).

³ A helpful approach for making a similar distinction with regard to moral and ritual purity in the various texts at Qumran is found in Jonathan Klawans' *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: OUP, 2000), 67-91.

⁴ See John J. Collins, "The Yahad and 'the Qumran Community'," in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission*. (ed. C. Hempel; Boston: Brill, 2006), 82-83, James C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1994), 57 and Joseph Baumgarten, "Damascus Document," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Vol. 2. (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 169. See also Sarianna Metso's ("The Damascus Document and the Community Rule," in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery* [ed. J. Baumgarten et al.; Boston: Brill, 2000], 85-93.) nuance of this theory.

⁵ Solomon Schechter (*Documents of the Jewish Sectaries: Vol. I. Fragments of a Zadokite Work* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910; repr., KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1970], 85 n. 16.) proposed a third option when he amended the word in question to הַנְּבֹר because he could not make sense of what appeared to him to be הַשְּׁחָר. This emendation has been rejected as unnecessary by subsequent scholars.

⁶ Chaim Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents: I. The Admonition; II. The Laws* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954), 66-67. Charlotte Hempel has been convinced by this interpretation as well. She remarks that it is possible that the down stroke has faded. See Hempel, "The Community and Its Rivals according to the Community Rule from Caves 1 and 4." *RevQ* 81 (2003) 64-66. Many translations support this reading as well, e.g., Geza Vermes, (*The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* [London: Penguin, 2004]), Florentino García Martínez (*The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Text in English*. 2nd ed. [Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1996]), and Michael Wise et al. (*The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* [San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996]). Leonhard Rost (*Die Damaskusschrift* [Berlin: De Gruyter, 1933], 24) mentions R. Leszynsky ("Observations sur les 'Fragments of a Zadokite Work' edites par Schechter." *REJ* 62 [1911]: 190-96.), M.-J. Lagrange ("La secte juive de la nouvelle alliance au pays de Damas." *RB* 9 [1912], 213-240), and R. H. Charles ("Fragments of a Zadokite Work," *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1913], 2:785-834) as also supporting שְׁחָר.

⁷ Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The 'Sons of Dawn' in *CDC* 13:14-15 and the Ban on Commerce among the Essenes" (*IEJ* 33 [1983]): 82-83.

⁸ Many have followed his suggestion and some have augmented his interpretation of the meaning of שְׁחָר. Cf. Menahem Kister ("Commentary to 4Q298" [*JQR* 85 (1994): 237-249]), who states that Baumgarten's reading "seems materially preferable" (238). Cf. also the discussion of Catherine Murphy's work below. For a different interpretation see Hempel, "Community," 64-66.

⁹ Baumgarten: 82. For Baumgarten (82), this is an improvement of "the rather hazy facsimile provided by Zeitlin." See S. Zeitlin, *The Zadokite Fragments: Facsimile of the Manuscript in the Cairo Genizah Collection in the Possession of the University Library, Cambridge, England* (Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1952). Unfortunately, Zeitlin offers images and (understandably) dated opinions of the origin of the document in his introduction, but he unfortunately offers no transcription of the text.

¹⁰ Baumgarten: 82. He argues this point further in "The Heavenly Tribunal and the Personification of *Sedeq* in Jewish Apocalyptic" (*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Vol. 19.1. [Berlin: De Gruyter, 1979]: 219-239, esp. 225-229). There he concludes that "the Qumran sect was markedly conscious of the light of the dawn as a symbol of theophany" (229).

¹¹ Baumgarten mistakenly thought the fragment to be from Cave 9. He cites J. T. Milik ("Le travail d'édition des manuscrits de Qumrân," *RB* 63 [1953], 61) who rightly places the fragment in cave 4. The fragment is now identified as 4Q298.

¹² Baumgarten originally proposes this theory, though without much explanation, in "Heavenly Tribunal" (229). Murphy (58) wrongly understood Baumgarten as equating the sons of dawn with initiates in the sons of light.

¹³ “This rule... concerns not avoidance of contacts with outsiders, but the internal economic relations among members of the community. These relations are to be predicated not on the commercial basis of buying and selling (ישא...יתן), but the fraternal concept of mutual help and exchange of services (כר לכה)” (Baumgarten, 83).

¹⁴ It is notable that the three recent critical editions of CD edited by Broshi (1992), Joseph M. Baumgarten and Daniel R. Schwartz, “Damascus Document (CD)” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 2: Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (ed. James Charlesworth. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), and Martínez, Florentino García and Eibert Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition. vol. 2* (Boston: Brill, 2000) support Baumgarten’s reading. This is also the reading supported by Ben Zion Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document: The Midrash on the Eschatological Torah of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Reconstruction, Translation and Commentary* (Boston: Brill, 2007), 94; 347.

¹⁵ Stephen Pfann, “4Q298: The Maskil’s Address to All Sons of Dawn” (*JQR* 85 [1994]: 203-235).

¹⁶ Pfann, 225.

¹⁷ It is noteworthy that neither Baumgarten nor Pfann address the implications, if any, of the use of the article in CD 13:14 and the anarthrous form in 4Q298.

¹⁸ Pfann, 225, n. 24

¹⁹ Menahem Kister (238), in his “Commentary on 4Q298,” supports Pfann’s interpretation of both 4Q298 and CD 13:14. The term refers to people who are not yet members of the community. In distinction from Pfann, Kister (238) believes that in both works, the phrase a technical term for candidates for admission to the sect.” From this Kister contends that the phrase arose after the typological division of the ‘sons of light’ from the ‘sons of darkness’ and therefore reflects an “advanced stage of the sect’s terminology.” The sons of the Dawn are those members who are between light and darkness.

²⁰ Murphy, 58. Unfortunately, she does not cite either which images she observed these data or how she determined the standard writing of *reš*.

²¹ Murphy, 41.

²² Murphy, 60.

²³ Finally, Murphy’s analysis brings up another difficulty for the use of the proposal of *bene shahar* as initiates in CD, namely the relation between the two groups mentioned in line 14: ‘all (the ones) entering the covenant of God’ (כל באי ברית אל) and ‘sons of dawn.’ Murphy equates the two groups and thus interprets the text as referring to the trade between community initiates. This interpretation makes the ones entering the covenant into a defined group of initiates. This fits well with long, complex the initiation process in IQS (6:13b-23) but is problematic in CD since only an oath of the covenant is required for initiation into the group (15:6). In light of this, it seems likely that “all the ones entering the covenant” just means “all the ones in the covenant.”

²⁴ See Appendix A.

²⁵ See Appendix A.

²⁶ Schechter (86) proposed this possibility and I am aware of no scholar who has challenged it.

²⁷ Murphy, 58.

²⁸ CD 13:13. The final stroke of *he* in העדה is severely faded.

²⁹ In the Hebrew Bible, שחת broadly means “pit” or “trap” but does take the meaning of a pit used for a grave and by extension, the place of the dead. The general meaning is reflected in Psalms (7:16, 9:16, 16:10, 30:10, 35:7, 49:10, 55:24, 94:13, 103:4), Proverbs (26:27) and Ezekiel (19:4, 8, 28:8). The word also occurs often in Job (17:14, 33:18, 22, 24, 28, 30). Rabin (24, n. 15) and others interpret שחת variously as “corruption,” “destruction,” and “perdition.” Rabin bases this in part a mistranslation of LXX and compares it to τέκνα ἀπωλείας in Isa 57:4. His argument is unconvincing and it seems more likely that the attested meaning of the Hebrew Bible is most probable in this situation.

³⁰ Schechter (102) interprets this phrase to mean “sons of destruction” and compares it to Jubilees 15:26 and possibly Isaiah 1:4. Rabin (24) notes that the phrase might be playing on multiple meanings of שחת.

³¹ For Jerome Murphy-O’Connor (“A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document VI, 2-VIII, 3.” *RB* 78 [1971], 218) the community is defined by “opposition to the Temple.” Catherine Murphy (76) seems to overstate the data when she says, “In this passage, the covenant community is cast as an explicit alternative to the Temple.”

³² ברית אל נאמנות להם לחיותם אלף דור

³³ This passage seems to be in dialogue with the proclamation by God to Ezekiel found in Ezekiel 22:24-31. There, the princes of Israel have taken treasures and precious things, the priests “made no distinction between the holy and common, did not make known the difference between pure and impure” (22:26) and they disregarded the Sabbath. The people of Israel have “oppressed the poor and needy, and have extorted from the alien without redress.” Because of this God sought someone to bridge the gap between God and the land so that it not be destroyed (שָׁחַתָּה), but no one was to be found (22:30). Murphy, in her monumental work on wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls, observes that the language of boundaries and purity found in CD 6 is religious language. The community is to be distinguished from the men of the pit as well as to distinguish between the clean and unclean.

³⁴ This assumption is justified in my mind by the association of the sons of the pit with similar vices in each context they are mentioned.

³⁵ Not “buying” as Martínez and Tigchelaar translate. See *HALOT* and *BDB*, s.v.

³⁶ Cf. the use of נתן in Prov 31:24: סָדִין עֲשָׂתָה וְתִמְכֹר וְחָגוּר נְהַנֶּה לְכַנְעֵנִי

³⁷ Schechter (85, n. 17) lists Prov 16:5 as an example of a similar construction (יד ליד) and also remarks that “the *תקיעת כף* is one of the various ways of affirming a money transaction.” Rabin (67, n. 14) indicates that the phrase is a Mishnaic idiom meaning “cash” but does not list any sources. Baumgarten (“Sons of Dawn,” 83), followed by Hempel (*Laws*, 124) and Murphy (41), takes the term literally and understands it as representative of “the fraternal concept of mutual help and exchange of services.”

³⁸ The closest parallel of the wording of the phrase occurs in Ezek 21:19 and 22 (NRSV: 21:14 and 17). At first glance this use appears completely unrelated, but since CD alludes to Ezekiel 22 in the other place where the sons of the pit occurs and refers to Ezekiel often elsewhere (Ezek 39:23 in CD 1:3; 11:5 in CD 13:18; 44:15 in CD 4:2; and 9:4 in CD 19:12-13), it is at least possible, though unlikely, that a connection could be made. Cf. also the language of pledges in Proverbs (6:1, 3; 17:18; 22:26).

³⁹ “Sons of Dawn,” 83.