

Spirit and Flesh

The divisions and hierarchies that concerned us in Chapter 1 related to the speaker and addressee as teacher and pupils within the pedagogical environment of a community. In this chapter, our focus shifts to divisions among humanity. The separation of “spirit” and “flesh” at the point of creation has been viewed by some as dividing humanity into two distinct groups. One consequence of this interpretation is that revelation, expressed as both רז נהיה and Hagu, is only accessible to the elect, chosen, and pre-determined few. This dualistic view of humankind, as elect and non-elect, also results in a hierarchical and exclusionary understanding of revelation and access to wisdom.

The speaker-sage discussed in Chapter 1 addresses a community of students who desire to grow in knowledge and diligently pursue the mystery of existence. Ideally, practitioners of wisdom may themselves become a *maškil* and indeed multiple *maškilîm* are referred to in 4QInstruction. This composition envisages a spectrum of pupils at varying levels.¹ Not everyone addressed will necessarily become a sage, but the pinnacle of learning and living out wisdom is expressed as becoming like your teacher. Merit plays a role within the hierarchy of the community, namely one’s place within it is dependent upon acquisition of wisdom (“*hokma* of the hands”).² The urgent exhortations to seek understanding, and warnings to the lazy about their foolishness, indicate that not all pupils are equally disciplined and faithful. The relationship of speaker to addressee is inclusive with emphasis on humility and awareness of the challenges present in the perpetual and yet arduous pursuit to actualize wisdom. The sage was not, from the beginning, a firstborn and most holy one, but is only placed as such through constant care and piety. In light of these divisions and hierarchies within the community, an exclusionary and deterministic view of humankind, if that is an accurate view, would stand in sharp contrast.

1 In our own time, “differentiated teaching and learning” is an approach that accounts for a variety of skill and knowledge levels within a single classroom environment and, in this regard, 4QInstruction has commonalities. However, differentiated teaching and learning places emphasis on instructional *strategies* whereas 4QInstruction is sparse, at least in the extant fragments, in providing details about how precisely a student actualizes wisdom.

2 Cf. 1En 99:10 where righteousness is determined not by election but by understanding and observing wisdom.

In this chapter I am interested in asking about who among humanity has, or had, access to wisdom. An integral aspect of this question is how the separation between the just and unjust, the righteous and wicked, is conceived in 4QInstruction.³ The path to revelation, according to some interpreters of 4QInstruction, is paved only for an elect group while the non-elect are barred from it. In this view only the predetermined “spiritual people,” found in the Vision of Hagu passage, were bestowed meditation on revelation while the “fleshly spirit” were not. That a dualistic anthropology frames deterministic ideas in the composition is challenged here; in this chapter it is argued that all of humanity shares in the same creation and from the beginning “meditation” (i.e., on revealed wisdom) was given to all.⁴ However, it is also recognized that free will and determinism in the Scrolls, and beyond, are not incompatible.⁵ The driving question is how faithful and unfaithful pursuit and adherence to “revealed wisdom”—a merit based system—serve to categorize groups in 4QInstruction.⁶ Indeed, if one’s place within the hierarchy of the community is by virtue of an individ-

3 The significance of 4QInstruction for assessing the compositional history of the hypothetical source Q is only in its infancy; indeed, how one sets the Saying Source within early Jewish literature is the subject of the recent collection: Markus Tiwald (ed.), *Q in Context 1: The Separation between the Just and Unjust in Early Judaism and in the Saying Source* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015).

4 Cf. Benjamin Wold, “The Universality of Creation in 4QInstruction,” *RevQ* 102/1 (2013): 211–226.

5 Jonathan Klawans, “Josephus on Fate, Free Will, and Ancient Jewish Types of Compatibilism,” *Numen* 56 (2009): 44–90, at 45, writes that “[f]or philosophers, the term ‘compatibilism’ refers to the varied efforts to maintain that determinism and free will are not contradictory, but compatible. In particular, the term often refers to the position that holds that a strict determinism can still allow for the possibility that individuals make free and unrestrained decisions, and are therefore responsible for their actions, despite the fact that the decisions and their consequences are determined in advance.” Even the highly deterministic Treatise on the Two Spirits intertwines determinism and free will, see Miryam T. Brand, “Belial, Free Will, and Identity-Building in the Community Rule,” in *Evil, the Devil, and Demons: Dualistic Characteristics in the Religion of Israel, Ancient Judaism, and Christianity*, ed. Benjamin Wold, Jan Doehorn & Susanne Rudnig-Zelt, *WUNT* 2.412 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 77–92.

6 Florentino García Martínez, “Wisdom at Qumran: Worldly or Heavenly?” in *Qumranica Minora 11: Thematic Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, *STDJ* 64 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 171–186, at 185 “I do not know whether we can use the term ‘apocalyptic wisdom’ in the case of 4QInstruction ... in my opinion, it’s author tries to present the knowledge he wants to communicate not as simple human knowledge (as in biblical wisdom tradition) but as ‘revealed’ knowledge, as heavenly wisdom. Therefore, I think we can answer the question posed in a different way to how Goff answered it. Qumran wisdom is not worldly *and* heavenly wisdom, it is revealed wisdom, and thus thoroughly heavenly.”