the Septuagint or other ancient versions, or the common reference works for Hebrew grammar. The same holds true for some of the deviations (Is the mention of the "angel" really as outstanding as to allow for a longer bibliography on this subject?).

In any case, Kalimi (as it seems from the preface: in a certain cooperation with the editors) has given us a useful research tool.

Michael Mach


This collection of papers read at the second international colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls at Mogilany near Cracow in 1989, begins with an article by Lea N. Gluskina, the widow of Prof. Joseph Davidovich Amussin, on The Teacher of Righteousness in Amussin’s Studies (pp. 7-21). Amussin rejected the identification of the Wicked Priest with Jonathan or Simon since in his opinion the founder of the Qumran community made his public appearance in the first cent. BC.

Ruth Moskow tries in her article (The Dialectics of Biblical Exegesis, Parable and Typology: From Genesis to the Revelation of John, From Qumran: Revelation and the Teacher of Righteousness [sic], pp. 23-46) “to define and demonstrate the principles that govern the composition and exposition of the poetic-prophetic forms translated "Enigma" and "Parable" in the Bible and Jewish Apocalypse”. Her general thesis is that “Enigma and Parable are arrangements of imagery designed to portray historical events and political personalities”. The present reviewer regrets to say that the paper is full of strange and untenable remarks. Let me quote one instance: “The Title, Moreh Sedeq, Teacher of Righteousness, is an explication of Mordecai: Mar = Master; Dakkai = Righteousness, dialectic equivalent of Hebrew Zakkai, righteous.”

Ilja Schiffmann’s paper (The Teacher of Righteousness in the Soviet Qumran Studies, pp. 47-52) provides an overview of J. D. Amussin’s and Mrs. K. B. Starkova’s conflicting views about the Teacher of Righteousness.

F. M. Schweitzer (The Teacher of Righteousness, pp. 53-97) tries to reconstruct the life and achievements of the Teacher of Righteousness. Although he seems too much dependent on Ph. R. Davies and J. Murphy-O’Connor, this article is a fine piece of work which unfortunately cannot be summarized here because of the many facts and aspects treated by the author.

Journal for the Study of Judaism, Vol. XXIV, no. 1
Barbara Thiering (Can the Hasmonean Dating of the Teacher of Righteousness Be Sustained?, pp. 99-117) considers the Hasmonean dating of the Teacher as one of the great errors of modern scholarship: "since the publication of the Temple Scroll it has become indefensible" (p. 100). The author again challenges the current paleographical dating of CD and 1QS (meanwhile this paleographical dating of the DSS has largely been corroborated by radiocarbon dating, cf. 'Atiqot 20 (1991) 27-32), maintains on the basis of 1QpHab VIII 9 that the Wicked Priest once must have been an initiated member of the Qumran community, which was of course not the case with a Hasmonean high priest (she does not take into consideration Brownlee's remark that the passage speaks about a time antedating the rift between the Wicked Priest and the sect [cf. W. H. Brownlee, The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk, Missoula 1979, 136]; s. also my comments in JJS 33 (1982) 353-354), and persists in identifying the Man of Lie with the Wicked Priest and the Young Lion of Wrath of 4QpNah with a Roman ruler (most likely Pontius Pilate) in Jerusalem. ‘Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon’ (CD I 6) is according to T. a pseudonym for the ruler of Rome and the period of wrath (CD I 5) started in her opinion in 6 CE. The Teacher of Righteousness (in T. 's view John the Baptist) must therefore be dated 20 years later (cf. CD I 10). The Temple Scroll fits into the period of Herod the Great, ‘who gave an Essene or Essene related group the opportunity to offer their plan’ for the rebuilding of the temple. Herod did not accept it because their principles on sexual morality and kingship were so obviously directed against him. On these shaky grounds T. puts forward her hypothesis that the Christian church is the product of a schism from Essenism. One of the issues between John the Baptist and Jesus was the relationship of Messiah of Israel and Messiah of Aaron. Jesus held that the roles could be combined, to the extent of doing away with a separate priesthood. At an Atonement-Tabernacles feast he dramatised his belief by putting on the vestments of the high priest and performing the ceremony of atonement (cf. 1QpHab XI 4-8; John 7: 37-39). For this reason, he was called the Wicked Priest by his opponents. Jesus belonged to the community of lay zealots who hated the Romans. Jesus, however, taught that the Romans should be loved. This made him, among his fervent nationalist companions, a traitor to the nationalist cause: he had ‘betrayed his people to the gentiles’. The emergence of his new party, lay but pro-Roman, drove together the priestly Essenes and the lay zealots, and they combined to hand him over to Pilate. T. 's article is as fantastic as her books on the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospels.

W. Tyloch (Le maître de justice dans les documents de Qumrân, pp. 119-120) complains that slavica non leguntur in Western countries and that Western scholars therefore are unaware of the results of Eastern, in particular Polish, research into the Dead Sea Scrolls. However, he does not indicate