

University of Groningen

Anthropology, Pneumatology, and Demonology in Early Judaism: The Two Spirits Treatise (1QS 3:13–4:26) and Other Texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls

Popovic, Mladen

Published in:

Dust of the Ground and Breath of Life Dust of the Ground and Breath of Life (Gen 2:7): The Problem of a Dualistic Anthropology in Early Judaism and Christianity

DOI:

[10.1163/9789004334762_005](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004334762_005)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

2016

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Popovic, M. (2016). Anthropology, Pneumatology, and Demonology in Early Judaism: The Two Spirits Treatise (1QS 3:13–4:26) and Other Texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls. In J. van Ruiten, & G. van Kooten (Eds.), *Dust of the Ground and Breath of Life Dust of the Ground and Breath of Life (Gen 2:7): The Problem of a Dualistic Anthropology in Early Judaism and Christianity* (pp. 58-98). (Themes in Biblical Narrative; Vol. 20). Brill Academic Publisher. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004334762_005

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Anthropology, Pneumatology, and Demonology in Early Judaism: The *Two Spirits Treatise* (1QS III, 13–IV, 26) and Other Texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls

Mladen Popović

1 Introduction

When it comes to anthropological notions in early Judaism, and especially dualistic anthropological notions, virtually all scholarly discussions devote attention to the so-called *Two Spirits Treatise* from Qumran. The *Two Spirits Treatise* is recognized as a separate composition that was adopted and adapted into the *Rule of the Community* (*Serekh ha-Yahad*) at a certain stage of its development. It is only completely preserved in the *Rule of the Community* copy from Cave 1 (1QS III, 13–IV, 26), dated to 100–75 BCE. Known since the early days of the Dead Sea discoveries, the *Two Spirits Treatise* and what it is about, however, still presents somewhat of a conundrum. Levison concludes his overview by stating that the first fifty years of research have yielded a bewildering lack of consensus concerning the two issues of whether the two spirits represent cosmic beings or human dispositions and their relationship to Qumran thought.¹

The *Two Spirits Treatise* purports to be:

For the *maskil*,² to instruct and to teach all the sons of light about the nature of all the sons of man, concerning all the types of their spirits with

1 J.R. Levison, “The Two Spirits in Qumran Theology,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; vol. 2 of *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Waco, Tex., 2006), 169–194.

2 For the leadership figure of the *maskil* in the so-called sectarian texts from Qumran, see, e.g., A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden 1995), 144–148; C. Hempel, “The Qumran Sapiential Texts and the Rule Books,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven 2002), 277–295, esp. 286–294; C.A. Newsom, *The Self As Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden 2004), 165–174.

their signs, concerning their deeds in their generations, and concerning the visitation of their punishments as well as the times of their reward.

1QS III, 13–15

Thus, from the outset the *Two Spirits Treatise* states that it is about the nature of humankind, one element of which is all their kinds of spirits. However, the text's opening is far from clear as to how human nature must be understood in relation to its spirits, and the exposition that follows on the two spirits complicates matters further, at least for modern readers.

A basic question is how the different references to “spirit” (רוח) in the *Two Spirits Treatise* should be understood. Shaked argued in 1972 that the term רוח is similar to the Iranian term *mēnōg* and “is used in Qumran in at least three senses: (a) it indicates the two spiritual entities which represent the two poles of the ethical dualism, in a ‘cosmic’ manner; (b) it designates the two opposing qualities inherent in man, corresponding to the cosmic dualism of a; and (c) it is applied to the numerous qualities and faculties in Man. These qualities and faculties are again conceived of as being inherent in man, i.e. ‘psychological,’ and at the same time also existing on an independent level, i.e. as being ‘cosmic.’ In addition, the term *ruah* is also used to indicate ‘angel.’”³ In other words, according to Shaked the notion of רוח is “applied in a triple manner, to designate a psychological faculty, a metaphysical entity, and a divine being (angel or demon).”⁴

Unfortunately, Shaked's approach to the *Two Spirits Treatise* seems not to have received the attention it deserves, although it is an important perspective for understanding early Jewish and Christian pneumatology and demonology such as that found in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. While scholars have come to interpret the *Two Spirits Treatise* as a combination of cosmic and anthropological elements, there is no consensus about which particular references are to human spirits and which are to cosmic spirits.⁵ Scholars acknowledge that the *Two Spirits Treatise* expresses dualistic or oppositional notions on different levels—cosmological, ethical, and anthropological⁶—

3 S. Shaked, “Qumran and Iran: Further Considerations,” *IOS* 2 (1972): 433–446, esp. 436. Cf. also Levison, “Two Spirits,” 191–192.

4 Shaked, “Qumran and Iran,” 436.

5 Levison, “Two Spirits,” 185.

6 See, e.g., J. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Cambridge 1995: Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten* (ed. M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden 1997), 275–335, esp. 289–295; E. Puech, “L'Esprit Saint à Qumrân,” *LASBF* 49 (1999): 283–298, esp. 286n10; Levison, “Two Spirits,” 185;

but it is less clear how exactly these interrelate with regard to the use of רוּחַ in the text.

Shaked's suggestion that the distinctions between the different senses of רוּחַ can be somewhat blurred—i.e., qualities and faculties existing as distinct entities and at the same time being inherent in man—seems in particular to have had little impact.⁷ García Martínez, for example, acknowledges the polyvalent sense of רוּחַ in the *Two Spirits Treatise* but is not convinced that the term has a triple meaning as proposed by Shaked.⁸

Now that all of the texts from Qumran have been published we are in a better position to assess Shaked's proposal with regard to the *Two Spirits Treatise*, and especially since the publication and first phase of study of “magical” texts or texts with “magical” elements.⁹ Taking into account other texts from the Qumran corpus, somewhat disregarding sectarian and nonsectarian labels, is not meant to imply a generic connection between the texts, nor to suggest a unified notion of רוּחַ. Rather, this may sharpen our view of the different ways in which the relationship between human nature, character traits, the human spirit, and spirits or demons was conceptualized—anthropologically, ethically, and cosmologically—in various early Jewish texts.

In this regard, I will argue that the vocabulary and imagery (of the body) in the various texts suggest, from a systemic point of view, a general framework

M. Popović, *Reading the Human Body: Physiognomics and Astrology in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Hellenistic-Early Roman Period Judaism* (STDJ 67; Leiden 2007), 179–184; M. Kister, “On Good and Evil: The Theological Foundation of the Qumran Community,” in *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World* (ed. M. Kister; 2 vols.; Jerusalem 2009), 2:497–528 (Hebrew); L.T. Stuckenbruck, “The Interiorization of Dualism within the Human Being in Second Temple Judaism: The *Treatise of the Two Spirits* (1QS 111: 13–1V: 26) in Its Tradition-Historical Context,” in *Light against Darkness: Dualism in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and the Contemporary World* (ed. A. Lange et al.; JAJSup 2; Göttingen 2011), 145–168, esp. 162–166.

7 See Puech, “L'Esprit Saint,” 286n10; E. Tigchelaar, “The Evil Inclination in the Dead Sea Scrolls, with a Re-Edition of 4Q468i (4QSectorian Text?),” in *Empsychoi Logoi—Religious Innovations in Antiquity: Studies in Honour of Pieter Willem van der Horst* (ed. A. Houtman, A. de Jong, and M. Misset-van de Weg; AJEC 73; Leiden 2008), 347–357, esp. 352–353; A. de Jong, “Iranian Connections in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. T.H. Lim and J.J. Collins; OHR; Oxford 2010), 479–500, esp. 491, 494.

8 F. García Martínez, “Iranian Influences in Qumran?,” in *Qumranica minora 1: Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism* (F. García Martínez, ed. E.J.C. Tigchelaar; STDJ 63; Leiden 2007), 227–241, esp. 237. Published previously in *Apocalyptic and Eschatological Heritage: The Middle East and Celtic Realms* (ed. M. McNamara; Dublin 2003), 37–49.

9 This also means that the material from Qumran can now be meaningfully studied in a wider context. See G. Bohak, *Ancient Jewish Magic: A History* (Cambridge 2008).

of thought that is shared by the different texts, and also that the *Two Spirits Treatise* should be understood within this context. The *Two Spirits Treatise* is not the first or only text to speak of more than one spirit “within” human beings.¹⁰ Other “sectarian” (*Hodayot*, *Songs of the Sage*) and “nonsectarian” texts, such as the Hebrew *Barkhi Nafshi* and *Incantation* or the Aramaic *Visions of Amram* texts from Cave 4 provide meaningful parallels.¹¹

The term רוח takes on different senses: at times it is understood as a distinct and external entity that affects the human self and at other times it is less easily distinguished as a character trait expressing the human self. Following Shaked’s suggestion, I will argue that the distinctions are often blurred: spirits exist as independent, created beings and at the same time also relate to human beings. This, however, should not lead us to think that distinctions are never to be made. Sometimes human beings and spirits are clearly distinct from each other (see below on 1QS IV, 12).

Considering the theme of this volume, the development of a dualistic anthropology in early Judaism and Christianity and their *Umwelt*, the *Two Spirits Treatise* is usually interpreted as a unique expression of dualistic anthropology in early Judaism. Scholars often synthesize 1QS III, 18–19 and IV, 15–16, 23–25 to argue that there is both good and evil in every human being as God appointed for man two spirits that struggle with each other within human beings. Whether or not one assumes a literary growth in different phases of the *Two Spirits Treatise*,¹² this scholarly synthesis is not without problems.

There is no doubt that the two spirits in the *Two Spirits Treatise* are two opposing spirits, but this, I will argue, does not turn the *Two Spirits Treatise*

10 Klein (A. Klein, “From the ‘Right Spirit’ to the ‘Spirit of Truth’: Observations on Psalm 51 and 1QS,” in *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran* [ed. D. Dimant and R.G. Kratz; FAT 2/35; Tübingen 2009], 171–191, esp. 181) suggests that the *Two Spirits Treatise* presents a completely new understanding of the spirit, one of the characteristics being that not one but two spirits struggle within man’s heart.

11 In earlier research a distinction was made between *Geistlehre* and *Geisterlehre*. See Levison, “Two Spirits,” 186. Now that all texts have become available, I do not think this distinction is as helpful in understanding the conceptualization of רוח in all of the texts. At the same time, this is not meant to imply the existence of a uniform notion of רוח in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

12 See P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran* (Göttingen 1969), 17–27, 116–189; E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44; Leiden 2001), 201–203. Cf. Popović, *Reading the Human Body*, 178.

into an early Jewish example of a dualistic anthropology.¹³ The one passage that seems most clear on a dualistic anthropology (1QS IV, 23) should not be understood as a reference to two opposing spirits that are inherent to humanity's essence and these spirits should not be understood as part of humanity's created nature.

2 The *Two Spirits Treatise* at Qumran and Beyond

Scholarly evaluation of the position of the *Two Spirits Treatise* at Qumran has a certain ambivalence to it. The *Two Spirits Treatise* is seen both as unique in its particular expression of theological concepts and as central to Qumran theology—a nonsectarian composition in a core sectarian document. This assessment is partly due to the chronology of the modern discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the order in which the texts became available for study. The *Rule of the Community* from Cave 1 was available early on and has determined to an important degree and for a long time the direction of research.¹⁴

Acknowledging the unique character of the *Two Spirits Treatise*, some scholars recognize it to be a presectarian composition antedating the establishment of the Qumran community.¹⁵ Opinions are divided on whether there is evidence for Persian influence on the notion of dualism in the text or whether it should be explained as a development from Jewish traditions with no outside influence, referring to 1 Sam 16:14.¹⁶

13 Cf. also the argument by Ed Noort in this volume that there is no dualistic anthropology in the Hebrew Bible.

14 See, e.g., M.A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge 1987), 77, 93.

15 See H. Stegemann, "Zu Textbestand und Grundgedanken von 1QS III, 13–IV, 26," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 95–131, esp. 128; Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 127–130; Frey, "Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought," 295–300.

16 See, e.g., K.G. Kuhn, "Die Sektenschrift und die iranische Religion," *ZTK* 49 (1952): 296–316; A. Dupont-Sommer, "L' instruction sur les deux esprits dans le *Manuel de Discipline*," *RHR* 142 (1952): 5–35; A. Dupont-Sommer, "Le problème des influences étrangères sur la secte juive de Qoumrân," *RHPR* 35 (1955): 75–94; H. Michaud, "Un mythe zervanite dans un des manuscrits de Qumrân," *VT* 5 (1955): 137–147; E. Kamlah, *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament* (WUNT 7; Tübingen 1964), 49–71, 163–168; Shaked, "Qumran and Iran"; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 95–96; M. Philonenko, "La doctrine qoumrânienne des deux esprits: Ses origines iraniennes et ses prolongements dans le judaïsme essénien et le christianisme antique," in *Apocalyphtique iranienne et dualisme qoumrânien* (ed. G. Widengren, A. Hultgård, and M. Philonenko; Paris 1995), 163–211; Puech, "L'Esprit Saint," 286n10; García Martínez, "Iranian Influences"; Seitz (O.J.F. Seitz, "Two Spirits in Man: An Essay

From the very beginning of Dead Sea Scrolls research the *Two Spirits Treatise* took central place in reconstructions of Qumran theology, predestination and dualism, and especially dualistic anthropology. For example, more recently Newsom analysed the *Two Spirits Treatise's* teaching about human nature to enquire about certain ways in which knowledge as a symbolic form is related to specific conditions of history within which the sectarian community existed.¹⁷ While Newsom does not argue for the *Two Spirits Treatise's* centrality to Qumran thought, her choice of this text suggests a more than ephemeral importance of it for an understanding of the Qumran community.

However, in light of all the material now available after the full publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls, one wonders whether the *Two Spirits Treatise* in 1QS III, 13–IV, 26 was less of a central, core text of the Qumran community and more of a special, quite unique text. The publication of the Cave 4 *Rule of the Community* manuscripts has shed new light on the place of the *Two Spirits Treatise* within this composition. Also, the notion of the Qumran community and its relationship to the collection of manuscripts in the caves surrounding Qumran is changing. Recent research on the *Damascus Document* and the *Rule of the Community* proposes related, but different groups behind these texts.¹⁸ Furthermore, the publication of all of the available *Rule of the Community* manuscripts may suggest that multiple *Yahad* communities elsewhere in Judea may also be behind the different versions of the *Rule of the Community*.¹⁹ The relevance of the Qumran texts not only extends to a community at Qumran, but also to broader strands of Jewish society and culture in the Second Temple period in

in Biblical Exegesis,” *NTS* 6 [1959]: 82–95) argues for an Old Testament background concerning the notion of two opposing spirits; Wernberg-Møller (P. Wernberg-Møller, “A Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the *Rule of the Community* [1QSeek III,13–IV,26],” *RevQ* 3 [1961]: 413–441) understands the *Two Spirits Treatise* as a purely Jewish document, although he earlier admitted Persian influence, see P. Wernberg-Møller, trans., annot., and introd., *The Manual of Discipline* (STDJ 1; Leiden 1957), 70n56. The most recent discussions of this issue are P. Heger, “Another Look at Dualism in Qumran Writings,” in *Dualism in Qumran* (ed. G. Xeravits; LSTS 76; London 2010), 39–101; de Jong, “Iranian Connections,” 490–495. See also Tigchelaar, “Evil Inclination,” 352–353.

17 Newsom, *The Self*, 77–90.

18 See, e.g., C. Hempel, *The Damascus Texts* (Sheffield 2000), 54–70; J.J. Collins, “Sectarian Communities in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. T.H. Lim and J.J. Collins; OHRF; Oxford 2010), 151–172, esp. 152–156.

19 See A. Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for the Community Rule* (STDJ 77; Leiden 2008); A. Schofield, “Between Center and Periphery: The *Yahad* in Context,” *DSD* 16 (2009): 330–350; Collins, “Sectarian Communities,” 159–160.

Palestine. These insights may contribute to a new perspective on the position of the *Two Spirits Treatise* at Qumran and beyond.

The *Rule of the Community* manuscripts from Cave 4 demonstrate that the *Rule of the Community* was available in different textual forms, and that, importantly, some *Rule of the Community* manuscripts circulated without the equivalent of 1QS III, 13–IV, 26. The *Rule of the Community* manuscripts thus show that textual developments occurred during the transmission of the *Two Spirits Treatise* within the *Rule of the Community*, but they do not provide enough evidence to assess this growth in detail.²⁰ Nonetheless, what is clear is that, as Hempel puts it, the *Two Spirits Treatise*'s “particular dualistic frame of reference is confined to a limited portion of the corpus, and what is more the portion has proportionally shrunk with the publication of the remainder of the Cave 4 fragments.”²¹

Of course, scholars have referred to parallels in other texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls, such as 4QBeatitudes (4Q525 11–12, 1–4) and the *Damascus Document* (CD II, 2–13), and argued that the *Two Spirits Treatise* influenced other texts, such as the *Hodayot* (1QH^a v) and *Instruction*,²² or, wrongly in my opinion, 4Q186, a text mistakenly named *Horoscope*.²³ However, such parallels seem

20 For some of the details concerning the manuscript evidence for the *Two Spirits Treatise*, see Popović, *Reading the Human Body*, 177n14.

21 C. Hempel, “The *Treatise on the Two Spirits* and the Literary History of the *Rule of the Community*,” in *Dualism in Qumran* (ed. G. Xeravits; LSTS 76; London 2010), 102–120, esp. 102–103. See also already Stegemann, “Zu Textbestand und Grundgedanken,” 125–130. In addition to distinctive features, Hempel (Hempel, “The *Treatise on the Two Spirits*”) has also drawn attention to intriguing elements of continuity between the *Two Spirits Treatise* and other parts of the *Serekh ha-Yahad*, especially 1QS v–ix. She suggests that this continuity should be attributed to the redactor or compiler of the *Endredaktion*, both of the *Two Spirits Treatise* and 1QS in its present form. These elements of continuity, however, do not encompass notions of dualism. Thus, the comparison made by Hempel sets into even sharper relief the distinctiveness of the dualism of the *Two Spirits Treatise* in relation to the *Serekh ha-Yahad* texts.

22 For parallels to the *Two Spirit Treatise* in 4Q525 and CD, see É. Puech, *Qumrân grotte 4.XVIII: Textes hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)* (DJD 25; Oxford 1998), 141–142; P.S. Alexander and G. Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.XIX: Serekh ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (DJD 26; Oxford 1998), 3. For the relationship between the *Two Spirits Treatise*, the *Instruction* text, and the *Hodayot* text 1QH^a v, see Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 194–207. Cf. also Puech, “L'Esprit Saint,” 287–288.

23 Popović, *Reading the Human Body*; M. Popović, “Light and Darkness in the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* (1QS III 13–IV 26) and in 4Q186,” in *Dualism in Qumran* (ed. G. Xeravits; LSTS 76; London 2010), 148–165.

above all to relate to expressions of predestination and dualism in a more general sense. None of these other texts, except perhaps *Instruction*, evinces the kind of dualistic anthropology of two spirits as the *Two Spirits Treatise* supposedly does.²⁴ This assessment calls into question the *Two Spirits Treatise*'s prominence within the collection of Dead Sea Scrolls as well as the thinking of the people behind the collection: it seems increasingly likely that the *Two Spirits Treatise* was less central and more a particular text. It can no longer simply be assumed that the *Two Spirits Treatise* reflects the ideology of the Qumran community.²⁵ However, in terms of the ways in which the notion of רוח was conceptualized in the *Two Spirits Treatise* the text remains less isolated.

3 The *Two Spirits Treatise* in 1QS III, 13–IV, 26

Dualism can be defined as a concept according to which two fundamentally opposed, causal principles underlie the existence of the world and its constitutive elements. Scholars duly observe that this notion can be further refined according to a typology of forms in which dualism is expressed. Thus, as mentioned above, scholars acknowledge that the *Two Spirits Treatise* seems to express dualistic notions on different levels: cosmic, ethical, eschatological, and psychological. It is also evident that dualism as an idea of two opposing

24 However, I do not think that *Instruction*'s description of two different types of humanity—the “spiritual people” and those characterized as “fleshly spirit”—really helps to shed much light on the *Two Spirits Treatise*, puzzling as that passage is. Some scholars see similarities between the two texts, but these are too vague or, upon closer scrutiny, do not hold water. On this issue in *Instruction*, see, e.g., J. Frey, “The Notion of ‘Flesh’ in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998: Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet* (ed. D.K. Falk, F. García Martínez, and E.M. Schuller; STDJ 35; Leiden 2000), 197–226; J. Frey, “Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven 2002), 367–404; Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 186–188; C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 42; Leiden 2002), 113–118; M.J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (STDJ 50; Leiden 2003), 94–99; B.G. Wold, *Women, Men and Angels: The Qumran Wisdom Text Musar leMevin and Its Allusions to Genesis Creation Traditions* (WUNT 2/201; Tübingen 2005), 124–149; J.-S. Rey, *4QInstruction: Sagesse et eschatologie* (STDJ 81; Leiden 2009), 298–303.

25 See also Stuckenbruck, “Interiorization of Dualism,” 161.

principles that constitute all existence does not appear in such a radical form in the *Two Spirits Treatise*. The two spirits and their ways are presented as subordinate to God, who is the one determining everything.²⁶ Yet, in terms of a dualistic anthropology, does the *Two Spirits Treatise* understand humans to be made up of two opposing principles? In order to answer this question we need to consider the *Two Spirits Treatise* more closely. The main interest will be in what manner the spirits are presented and how they relate to human beings.

3.1 1QS III, 13–15: On Human Spirit Only?

The *Two Spirits Treatise* can be divided into five sections, preceded by a heading.²⁷ Quoted earlier in the introduction above, the heading indicates that the text is about humankind's nature,²⁸ concerning people's types of spirits, their deeds, and their punishments and rewards. The focus of the heading is first of all on the types of spirit. The use of the word מין ("kind, type") recalls the language of creation from Gen 1 (1:11, 12, 21, 24, 25), even more so in light of other creational language in the *Two Spirits Treatise*. Newsom suggests that on the one hand the *Two Spirits Treatise* presupposes Gen 1 as already read, but on the other manages to open up a space behind Gen 1, to insert itself into that space, and to establish itself as the pre-text for Gen 1.²⁹

However, the first occurrence of the word רוּח in the *Two Spirits Treatise* immediately divides scholars as to what is exactly meant here. This division is exemplary for the scholarly interpretations of the *Two Spirits Treatise*. The question is whether רוּח, here in the feminine plural form רוּחוֹת, refers to the human spirit or to some kind of external spirit. For example, after first

26 See J.H. Charlesworth, "A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in 1QS III, 13–IV, 26 and the 'Dualism' Contained in the Gospel of John," in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; COL; New York 1991), 76–106 (originally published in *NTS* 15 [1968–1969]: 389–418); J.J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London 1997), 43–44; Frey, "Different Patterns," 289–295; J. Duhaime, "Dualism," *EDSS* 1:215–220, esp. 215–217; García Martínez, "Iranian Influences," 44; U. Bianchi and Y. Stoyanov, "Dualism," *ER* 2 4:2504–2517.

27 I follow the structural division of Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 141–143. Cf. J. Licht, "An Analysis of the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* in *DSD*," in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. Rabin and Y. Yadin; ScrHier 4; Jerusalem 1958), 88–100; J. Duhaime, "Cohérence structurelle et tensions internes dans l'*Instruction sur les deux esprits* (1QS III 13–IV 26)," in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (ed. F. García Martínez; BETL 168; Leuven 2003), 103–131.

28 For this understanding of תולדות, see Popović, *Reading the Human Body*, 180n29.

29 See Newsom, *The Self*, 86–87. See also O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (Tübingen 1960), 145.

arguing for a metaphysical sense of רוח here and of only two kinds of spirits,³⁰ Wernberg-Møller changed his mind and suggested that the human spirit was being referred to and its variety of spiritual states.³¹ May, however, favoured a cosmological sense and contended that this statement in 1QS III, 14 was set in a context concerned with the two spirits of truth and of deceit and the Prince of Lights and the Angel of Darkness.³² Unfortunately, there is no simple indication by means of the gender or number to determine whether the human spirit or an external spirit, such as an angel or demon, is meant in 1QS III, 14.³³

Should the use of רוח in 1QS III, 14 be understood in light of III, 18 and III, 25 as a reference to the two spirits of light and darkness created by God and set before humankind? Or should its meaning be elucidated within the immediate context of the heading? The suffix attached to רוחותם seems best taken as referring back to the sons of man in 1QS III, 13. The object of teaching of the *maskil* is to instruct the sons of light about the nature of the sons of man, the content of which is further explicated in 1QS III, 14–15.³⁴ The מיני רוחותם in 1QS III, 14 then refer to the variety of human spirits.³⁵ Not just to some of them, but to all of them. Typically, the *Two Spirits Treatise* here claims to be exhaustive, by the use of כול; it claims to be about *all* the types of spirits; it is addressed to *all* the sons of light and purports to teach about *all* the sons of man and *all* the types of their spirits.³⁶ Furthermore, recalling the creational language of Gen 1, the use of מין in 1QS III, 14 suggests not only two types of spirits but many.³⁷ Indeed, against the background of the creation narrative in

30 Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 67n43.

31 Wernberg-Møller, "Reconsideration of the Two Spirits," 419–420.

32 H.G. May, "Cosmological Reference in the Qumran Doctrine of the Two Spirits and in Old Testament Imagery," *JBL* 82 (1963): 1–14, esp. 2.

33 In his research into the meaning of רוח in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Sekki concluded that רוח as human spirit has a consistently feminine gender, whereas רוח as demon or angel has a consistently masculine gender. However, Sekki also lists numerous examples where רוח in the feminine plural form is used to refer to angels and demons. See A.E. Sekki, *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran* (SBLDS 110; Atlanta 1989), 99, 145, 145–147, 155–163. See also the Aramaic examples in 1Q20 XX, 16–20, 26, 28; 4Q197 4 I, 13; 4Q560 1 II, 5–6. Cf. Puech, "L'Esprit Saint," 286no.

34 The closest parallel to רוחותם in 1QS III, 14 is in 1QS II, 20 where לפי רוחותם refers to the order in which the priests enter according to their spirits. Cf. Sekki, *Meaning of Ruah*, 195.

35 See also Sekki, *Meaning of Ruah*, 194–195.

36 Cf., e.g., Newsom, *The Self*, 81.

37 CD IV, 15–17 refers to three types of righteousness in relation to three traps of Belial, but the restriction is explicitly signalled by the use of the numeral. Other instances of מין used in the Hebrew Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls are silent about the exact number of kinds.

Genesis the totality of all the types of human spirits referred to in the *Two Spirits Treatise* is readily understandable. Be that as it may, at this point in the text the variety of human spirits in no way hints at a dualistic anthropology.

However, if the subject is human spirit, what exactly is it? The *Two Spirits Treatise* does not explain this here; it does not explicate what the signs (אותות) of all the kinds of spirits are, nor whether these signs, whatever they are, also apply to other occurrences of the word רוח in the *Two Spirits Treatise*. These signs may consist of the different forms of human conduct as listed in the virtues and vices discussed in the third section (1QS IV, 2–14). According to the fourth section of the *Two Spirits Treatise* (1QS IV, 15–23), people are judged to belong to either the division of the spirit of light or to that of the spirit of darkness, according to the path they walk and the deeds they do. The deeds, however, are also mentioned in the heading, but as a separate element from the types of spirits. This may or may not lead us to decide against understanding the signs as referring to deeds and behaviour.³⁸

Did the presumed audience of the *Two Spirits Treatise* understand the human spirit in light of scriptural exemplars? In the Hebrew Bible רוח can denote, among other things, the inner self of humans, an element of life that is dependent on God and which is in this respect synonymous to נשמה. Somewhat parallel to the heart (לב, לִבָּב), רוח can also refer to the seat of what we would call psychological activity, and in the construct chain it can refer to moral dispositions or states of mind, which is interesting in light of the catalogue of virtues and vices in 1QS IV, 2–14.³⁹

It is clear that by the time of the compositions found in the Qumran manuscripts, the meaning of רוח had undergone semantic development and expanded to include different concepts of reference, including spirit, demon, and angel. For example, with regard to the human spirit, Fabry notes that although there is continuity in the Qumran corpus regarding the sense of רוח in relation to earlier traditions in the Hebrew Bible, “die Verwendung von *rûah* als Bezeichnung für das geistige Personenzentrum des Menschen, in dem die ethisch relevanten Entscheidungen getroffen werden, zurück [tritt].”⁴⁰ And Sekki argues that the semantic range of the occurrences of רוח as humanity’s spirit seem “to reflect biblical categories but with a more negative emphasis and with a tendency to describe man as not only having a spirit but also as *being* one.”⁴¹ It

38 See also the discussion in Popović, *Reading the Human Body*, 189.

39 See, e.g., S. Tengström, “רוח *rûah*,” *ThWAT* 7:386–418.

40 H.-J. Fabry, “רוח *rûah*,” *ThWAT* 7:419–425, esp. 419.

41 Sekki, *Meaning of Ruah*, 95.

seems, however, that it is not always possible to make clear and neat distinctions between the different connotations of רוח.

The first occurrence of רוח in the *Two Spirits Treatise* then is a reference to the human spirit, but at the same time it is possibly ambiguous. The human spirit should not be understood as a secluded entity in itself—the isolated core of the human self—but as an element of human nature that is open to and influenced by other spirits. The boundary between the human spirit and these other spirits, in terms of their ontological status and their effects on human beings, was not fixed, but permeable.

The distinction between either psychological dispositions of the human spirit or external spirits might not be as clear-cut as we wish it to be. Our framing of external and internal spirits has an artificiality to it, perhaps necessary for our own understanding, to be sure, but possibly less apt to understand ancient frames of thought. Even the Hebrew Bible acknowledges the “Einwirkung äußerer Kräfte, sei es von Seiten der göttlichen *rûah*, sei es von Seiten böser Geister.” In addition, the texts often do not make a clear distinction between “dem, was man als Äußerung der eigenen Lebenskraft betrachtete und was als von außen überkommend gedacht wurde.”⁴² Psalm 51 is a fascinating example of this and a text that is immediately relevant for understanding early Jewish texts about the interplay between “external” and “internal” spirits.⁴³

3.2 1QS III, 15–18: *Humanity and Two Spirits*

Following the heading there is an introductory key passage expressing the text’s deterministic worldview:

From the God of knowledge comes all there is and there shall be. Before they existed he determined all their plans and when they come into existence at their ordained time they will fulfil all their work in accordance with his glorious plan and without alteration. In his hand are the laws of all things and he supports them in all their affairs. He created man to rule the world and placed before him two spirits to walk by them until the moment of his visitation.

1QS III, 15–18

42 Tengström, *ThWAT* 7:410–411.

43 See D. Flusser, “Qumrân and Jewish ‘Apotropaic’ Prayers,” *IEJ* 16 (1966):194–205; Tigchelaar, “Evil Inclination”; Klein, “Right Spirit.”

The God of knowledge is presented as the ontological basis of everything and everyone. Everything happens in accordance with God's plan. Before human beings come into being, their deeds are fixed. Similar ideas are expressed in other texts from Qumran.⁴⁴ This passage demonstrates that the form of dualism that appears in the *Two Spirits Treatise* is moderate. The two spirits come from God and are not on the same ontological level. According to the theology of the *Two Spirits Treatise*, it is the God of knowledge who constitutes all existence.

Regarding humanity and spirits we again find reminiscences of creation language from Genesis: God created man to rule the world (1QS III, 17–18). Humanity's rule appears in a number of other Qumran texts. The use of מושל rather than רדה from Gen 1:26, 28 in the *Two Spirits Treatise* and these other texts from Qumran is perhaps due to Ps 8:7.⁴⁵

3.2.1 Humanity

Collins suggests that אנוש here refers not to humanity, but to Adam, the original human being created by God.⁴⁶ Wold and Fletcher-Louis, however, favour the more general understanding of “humanity” for אנוש.⁴⁷ Fletcher-Louis is right to say that elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls, except perhaps for the contested passage in 4QInstruction (4Q417 1 I, 13–18), when not referring to the son of Seth אנוש is intended as a generic reference to humanity. With regard to Collins's interpretation one might ask why the *Two Spirits Treatise* did not simply use Adam (אדם) if that is what it meant; apart from the disputed passage in *Instruction* there are no other uses of אנוש in the manner Collins proposes.

44 See 1QS XI, 10–11, 17–18; 1QH^a VII, 15–28; IX, 7–9, 19–20; CD II, 2–10; 4Q180 1, 2; 2–4 II, 10; 4Q215a 1 II, 9; 4Q402 4, 12–15 + MasShirShabb 1, 1–6.

45 1Q34bis 3 II, 3; 4Q381 1, 7 (this text alludes to both Gen 1:26, 28 and Gen 2:7); 4Q423 2, 2 (this alludes to Gen 1–3); cf. 4Q504 8 recto 1. See also Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 106.

46 J.J. Collins, “In the Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Humankind in a Wisdom Text from Qumran,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden 1999), 609–618, esp. 612; J.J. Collins, “The Mysteries of God: Creation and Eschatology in 4QInstruction and the Wisdom of Solomon,” in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (ed. F. García Martínez; BETL 168; Leuven 2003), 287–305; repr. in *Jewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture: Essays on the Jewish Encounter with Hellenism and Roman Rule* (JSJSup 100; Leiden 2005), 159–180, esp. 175–176. See also Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 96; M.J. Goff, “Adam, the Angels and Eternal Afterlife: Genesis 1–3 in the Wisdom of Solomon and 4QInstruction,” in *Studies in the Book of Wisdom* (ed. G.G. Xeravits and J. Zsengellér; JSJSup 142; Leiden 2010), 1–21, esp. 14.

47 Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 114; Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*, 139. Cf. also Rey, *4QInstruction*, 297.

The *Two Spirits Treatise* does use Adam in 1QS IV, 23 when referring to all the glory of Adam, although one might respond by saying that this part was added later to the *Two Spirits Treatise*.

The *Two Spirits Treatise* also uses other phrases to refer to man or humanity: *בני איש* in 1QS III, 13; IV, 15, 26, *איש* in 1QS IV, 2, 16, 20, 24, and *גבר* in 1QS IV, 20, 23. In col. 11 of 1QS, *אנוש* parallels *אדם* or *בני אדם* (see XI, 6, 10, 15) in the general sense of man or humanity. The use of *אנוש* in 1QS III, 17 may simply be another such reference to humanity, rather than more specifically to the original human being created by God.

This interpretation would be strengthened by the end of the sentence, which talks about the end of his visitation, something more applicable to humanity in general than to the original human being. However, it is not readily apparent whether the suffix attached to *פקודתו* has humanity (*נושא* from III, 17) or God as its referent.⁴⁸ There are not that many occurrences of *פקדה* with a suffix in the Qumran corpus. However, in 4Q286 7 II, 4 (*ופקודתמה*) and in 4Q417 1 I, 7 (*פקודתם*) clearly the plural suffixes do not have God as the referent, although of course God is the agent of the visitation.⁴⁹ These examples are not conclusive, but they may suggest that in 1QS III, 18, *פקודתו* has humanity as its object.

Humanity was not just created to rule the world. The *Two Spirits Treatise* immediately continues by stating that God gave two spirits to man with which to walk.

3.2.2 Two Spirits: External or Internal?

What are the two spirits in 1QS III, 18? Taken with the characterization of the two spirits in the following line as the spirits of truth and of iniquity, Wernberg-Møller saw in 1QS III, 18 an allusion to Gen 2:7—*וישם* of III, 18 paralleling *ויפח* of Gen 2:7. Thus, God created man with two spirits. Furthermore, Wernberg-Møller suggested that this distinction between two spirits in man should be understood as two psychological dispositions and, moreover, that the *Two Spirits Treatise* was the forerunner of the rabbinic distinction between the evil and the good *yetser*, the difference only being one of terminology.⁵⁰ This is not the place to discuss rabbinic references to the *yetser*. Suffice it to say that Rosen-Zvi has considerably nuanced the idea of the rabbinic distinction

48 Cf., e.g., Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 70n57; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 97.

49 In 4Q417 2 I, 8 *פקודתו* has a human being as referent (4Q417 2 I, 7: *וְאִישׁ עוֹל* or *אָנוּשׁ*) and God as the implied agent. The referent in 4Q417 1 I, 7 is less clear. See also 4Q416 1, 9.

50 Wernberg-Møller, "Reconsideration of the Two Spirits," 422–423.

between two *yetzers*, distinguishing both chronologically between earlier and later developments and geographically between Palestinian and Babylonian sources.⁵¹

This is the second time that the word רוח is used in the *Two Spirits Treatise*, but, it seems, in rather a different way from the first occurrence. In III, 14 it is a matter of all kinds of spirits, whereas in III, 18 it is a question of only two spirits.

Is the word רוח used in the same sense in these two cases? It does not seem so. It seems unlikely that “all kinds of spirits” can be reduced to only these “two spirits.” Nevertheless, there may be overlap. The two spirits are given by God so that man walks by them (להתהלך בם), that is, behaves accordingly. Even if the signs in 1QS III, 14 do not refer to deeds and conduct, it is clear from 1QS IV, 15–16 that people are judged to belong to either the division of the spirit of light or that of the spirit of darkness according to the path they walk (ובדרכיהן יתהלכו) and the deeds they do, as mentioned above.⁵² According to 1QS III, 20–21, the righteous people, under the authority of the Prince of Lights, walk in the paths of light (בדרכי אור יתהלכו), whereas the wicked people, under the authority of the Angel of Darkness, walk in the paths of darkness (ובדרכי חושך יתהלכו). Thus, to walk by the two spirits, as 1QS III, 18 puts it, means to behave according to their ways; and the heading in III, 13–15 focuses on humanity’s spirits, deeds, and visitation.⁵³

Are the two spirits in 1QS III, 18 to be understood as psychological dispositions of the human spirit or as external spirits? One might argue that the *Two Spirits Treatise* here has in mind spirits external to the human framework. A few lines later, in III, 25, the text states that God created the spirits of light and darkness. As created beings, they thus represent independent entities, distinct from other created beings such as humankind (1QS III, 17).

The phrase קדשו איה השם בקרבו (ואת רוח וישם לו שתי רוחות) seems to recall Isa 63:11 (ואת רוח וישם לו שתי רוחות), except that in Isaiah it is clearly “within him” (בקרבו) and it concerns God’s holy spirit.⁵⁴ The construction וישם לו in 1QS III, 18 does not seem to refer

51 I. Rosen-Zvi, “Two Rabbinic Inclinations?: Rethinking a Scholarly Dogma,” *JSJ* 39 (2008): 513–539; I. Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires: “Yetzer Hara” and the Problem of Evil in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia 2011); Tigchelaar, “Evil Inclination.”

52 Cf. also 1QS IV, 24 (יתהלכו בחכמה ואולת).

53 Other parallels for this, outside the *Two Spirits Treatise*, are found, e.g., in 1QS IX, 12 and CD XII, 20–21, 23 where the *maskil* must walk by the regulations set out for him. The *Instruction* text (4Q416 2 IV, 7) says that the wife must walk by the will of her husband. Regulations and the will of the husband are, of course, external elements.

54 See also Ezek 36:27 (ואת רוחי אתן בקרבכם), and cf. Ezek 11:19; 36:26; 37:14. And Job 34:14

so evidently to two spirits *within* man, and it is a matter of two spirits created by God, not his own holy spirit. Rather, 1QS 111, 18 seems to say that the two spirits were given *for* humankind to follow them.⁵⁵ However, can such significance be ascribed to the use of the construction שִׁים לְ (see below)? Moreover, the text does not make it clear whether these are external or internal spirits.

3.2.3 *Barkhi Nafshi* (4Q434–438) on Spirits, Humans, and the Body

Other texts from Qumran also demonstrate this ambivalence. For example, in addition to Ps 51:12–13,⁵⁶ the *Barkhi Nafshi* text also evokes Isa 63:11: ש[רוח קודש] [and the ho]ly [spirit] you have put in my heart"; 4Q436 1 II, 1 // 4Q435 2 I, 2; see also below on 4Q444 [*Incantation*]). Here, following scriptural exemplars, the text refers to God's holy spirit. However, a few lines below, the text says ותשם לי רוח ארוך אפים ("and you have given me a spirit of patience"; 4Q435 2 I, 4–5 // 4Q436 1 II, 2–3). How should this phrase be understood? The construction ארוך אפים refers to patience as a quality of character. In the Hebrew Bible it is mostly used for God,⁵⁷ but in the Qumran corpus it is used for both God and humans.⁵⁸

However, the addition of רוח to ארוך אפים is only found in *Barkhi Nafshi*. Should we think of "patience" as a particular and distinct spirit, just as the holy spirit? Or should we rather take it as a psychological disposition of the human spirit? If the latter, what then is the significance of רוח before ארוך אפים? Does רוח in 4Q435 2 I, 4–5 // 4Q436 1 II, 2–3 have a different sense than רוח in 4Q436 1 II, 1 // 4Q435 2 I, 2, or is it redundant? In both cases the subject of the verbs used is the same, namely God: God has put his holy spirit in the poet's heart; God has given him a spirit of patience. Thus, in both cases the spirits somehow come from God.

What about the reference to רוח שקר ("a spirit of deceit"; 4Q435 2 I, 5) in the same passage? What kind of spirit is this, and how does it relate to the holy spirit and the spirit of patience? It is not clear whether this spirit also comes from

where God can take his spirit back (אם ישים אליו לבו וחורר). Job 34:14–15 refers to the gift of the divine spirit and alludes to the creation narrative in Gen 2–3.

55 Cf. Charlesworth, "Critical Comparison," 83–84; Levison, "Two Spirits," 179n32.

56 Cf. M. Weinfeld and D. Seely, "Barkhi Nafshi," in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (E. Chazon et al.; DJD 29; Oxford 1999), 303; Tigchelaar, "Evil Inclination," 351n23.

57 Exod 34:6; Num 14:18; Jer 15:15; Joel 2:13; Jonah 4:2; Nah 1:3; Ps 86:15; 103:8; 145:8; Neh 9:17 For humans, see Prov 14:29; 15:18; 16:32.

58 See CD 11, 4; 1QH^a IV, 29; VIII, 34; IX, 8; 4Q299 9, 5; 4Q300 3a–b, 4; 4Q382 104, 9; 4Q420 1a 11–b, 2 // 4Q421 1a 11–b, 14; 4Q461 4, 3; 4Q471 2, 3; 4Q511 52 + 1; 4Q511 108, 1; 4Q525 21, 8.

God, but it is said that God destroyed the spirit of deceit and gave the poet a broken heart instead.⁵⁹ And when, in 4Q438 4 II, 5, God is said to have removed the spirit of destruction (רוח מחיתה) from him, he is said to have clothed the poet with the spirit of salvation (רוח ישועת), implying that this spirit also comes from God. In addition, the poet can also refer to his own spirit as רוחי (“my spirit”),⁶⁰ describing it as fainting away before him in his distress and referring to God’s revivification (חיית) of it (4Q437 2 I, 8, 13).⁶¹

The *Barkhi Nafshi* text uses body imagery (רום עינים), עורף קשה, לב, גבה, נות, נות, עינים) as well as references to the “inside” (מן כליותי, ממני, בלבבי) of the poet to conceptualize the poet’s self. References to different qualities of character and different spirits are an integral part of his conceptualization of the self. The construction וישם לו in 4Q435 2 I, 4–5 // 4Q436 1 II, 2–3 is similar to וישם לו in 1QS III, 18. Both use ל שים, whereas 4Q436 1 II, 1 // 4Q435 2 I, 2, following Isa 63:11, has שים ב. In *Barkhi Nafshi* this does not seem to be of any significance with respect to whether the different uses of רוח have to be understood as “within” or “for” man. However, 4Q436 1 II, 1 // 4Q435 2 I, 2 speaks of the holy spirit put into the heart (בלבבי) of the poet. This suggests that God somehow places the spirit within the human self.

The *Barkhi Nafshi* text uses a range of language to refer to the spirit, not all of which can easily be explained away as metaphorical or poetical. Rather, there is an interplay between different kinds of spirits that seem both distinct from and dependent on God and human beings. These spirits are both “external” and “internal” to the human self, which can be referred to by נפש and also by רוח. Moreover, they seem to represent a distinct category from angels.⁶² In 4Q434 1 I, God’s angel (מלאכו) encamps around the community with which the poet identifies. It is possible that at times a spirit is seen as a distinct and external entity that affects the human self and at other times is less easily distinguished as a character trait expressing the human self. In other words, the *Barkhi Nafshi* text does not clearly distinguish between, on the one hand, spirits as distinct and external entities that affect the human self and, on the other hand, character traits expressing the human self.⁶³

59 4Q436 1 II, 4. For this reconstruction and other possibilities see Weinfeld and Seely, “Barkhi Nafshi,” 304.

60 Cf. also 4Q437 1 I, 10–11 (רוחם [“their spirits”]).

61 Cf. also 1QH^a XVI, 37.

62 See also E. Eshel and D.C. Harlow, “Demons and Exorcism,” in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (ed. J.J. Collins and D.C. Harlow; Grand Rapids, Mich., 2010), 531–533, esp. 531.

63 The manuscript is too damaged to determine whether a distinction is made between “a man or a spirit” in 4Q438 4 II, 3.

3.2.4 Two Spirits, But Not in Humans

Returning to the *Two Spirits Treatise*, the two spirits in 1QS III, 18 should be understood as distinct, created beings that affect the behaviour and character of human beings. They were given to man so that he walks in their paths. The text is not clear about how the human self and these two spirits interact. There is no reference here to the “inside” as in *Barkhi Nafshi* (this changes from 1QS IV, 20 onwards). Thus, there is no clear basis to talk of a dualistic anthropology here, either in terms of two different types of human beings (in the sense of a double creation) or in terms of the internal disposition of man consisting of two opposing elements.

3.3 1QS III, 18–IV, 1: *Two Spirits, Two Angelic Beings, Hosts of Spirits, and the Sons of Light*

In the second section, matters become more complex, and some of this has already been referred to in the discussion above. The text first identifies the two spirits in ethical terms as the spirits of truth and iniquity, and then connects them with light and darkness in various ways, including in cosmological terms. In 1QS III, 25, the two spirits of light and darkness are said to have been created by God.

3.3.1 Spirits of Truth and Iniquity from Light and Darkness

What does the ethical characterization *והעול האמת* imply for the way in which *רוח* should be understood here? The sense of *רוח* here may be assumed to be basically the same as in the case of the two spirits earlier. No other text from Qumran has a similar reference to spirits of truth and iniquity together, although the opposition between truth and iniquity as such is attested elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls, but not often. Only in the final section of the *Two Spirits Treatise* (IV, 23) is there a reference to the spirits of truth and iniquity (*רוחי אמת ועול*) in the masculine plural form, not in the feminine plural as in III, 18 (see below). In any case, it is too crude a methodological assumption that the gender and number of *רוח* signal its exact sense (see also the note on CD XII, 2 below).

To be sure, there are individual references to a spirit or spirits of truth and of iniquity. For example, 4Q177 12–13 1, 5 (*Catena*^a) refers to *רוח אמת* in a context in which Belial figures as an evil adversary and reference is also made to the angel of God’s truth (*מלאך אמתו*). Is the latter to be distinguished from the spirit of truth mentioned a few lines above? Should a distinction be made between angels and spirits, as possibly in *Barkhi Nafshi*? The *Two Spirits Treatise* also refers to the angel of God’s truth as, along with God, assisting the sons of light (III, 24–25). The text is not explicit as to whether this reference is synonymous

with the spirit of truth and to the Prince of Lights.⁶⁴ 1QH^a XXV, 8 refers to the probable destruction of the spirits of iniquity (רוחות עולה). These spirits of iniquity parallel the spirits of wickedness (ורוחות רשעה) in 1QH^a XXV, 6. In both cases רווח is in the feminine plural form. The reference to spirits of truth (רוחי אמת) in 1QM XIII, 10 presents a strong parallel, as the text also mentions the Prince of Light (רשו מאור)—with “light” in the singular, not in the plural as in 1QS III, 20 (רש אורים)⁶⁵—under whose authority the spirits of truth lie. The *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* and *Incantation* (4Q444) also mention spirits of truth and other spirits of knowledge, understanding, and righteousness (see below).⁶⁶

Of particular interest are the references in the *Two Spirits Treatise* itself. The catalogue of virtues and vices refers once to a spirit of iniquity (IV, 9).⁶⁷ In the context of the *Two Spirits Treatise*, the sense of רווח in IV, 9 is determined by III, 25–26 and IV, 2, which refer to the creation of the spirits of light and darkness and their paths, and also describe their paths in the world, which follow in the catalogue. In IV, 20–22 reference is made to a spirit of iniquity and a spirit of truth in the context of colourful and difficult language that is far from easy to understand. The text seems to become very concrete, but it hardly elucidates how the spirit of iniquity and truth relate to the human self. It is said that God can destroy all spirit of iniquity from the innermost parts of man’s flesh. He can sprinkle over man the spirit of truth like water for purification. This action is effective against a spirit of impurity. All this purification activity involves a holy spirit. How exactly these activities must be imagined is difficult to determine. Is the language metaphorical (see further below)? Scholars have pointed to various scriptural exemplars, but these hardly shed light on the exact sense of רווח here. What is clear is that the spirits of truth and iniquity have opposite relationships with the human self. The former purifies and is thus good, whereas the latter is to be destroyed and is thus bad.

Returning to the second section of the *Two Spirits Treatise*, after identifying the two spirits as the spirits of truth and iniquity the text adds light and darkness terminology that strengthens the dualistic opposition between these two spirits: “From the spring of light comes the nature of truth, and from the source of darkness comes the nature of iniquity” (1QS III, 19). The opposition between

64 See also God’s truth (באמתו) in IV, 20.

65 But see also CD V, 18.

66 1QH^a VI, 36 refers to the spirit of knowledge and might perhaps also refer to the spirit of truth.

67 For previous discussions, see Sekki, *Meaning of Ruah*, 204–205.

light and darkness seems not to be intended as merely metaphorical.⁶⁸ The text makes an ontological statement in that the nature of truth and of iniquity originates from them. Newsom, who suggests that the *Two Spirits Treatise* understands itself as a pre-text to Gen 1, argues that where formerly the statement in Gen 1:4–5 about God's division of light from darkness "disclosed only God's organization of the created world, now it alludes as well to an antecedent spiritual reality that informs the structures of creation."⁶⁹

3.3.2 Prince of Lights, Angel of Darkness, and Hosts of Spirits under Their Authority

The text proceeds to draw a cosmic perspective, reinforcing the dualism of the categories of truth and iniquity. People are divided into two groups, each falling under the rule of an angelic leader: "And in the hand of the Prince of Lights is dominion over all the sons of justice who walk on paths of light. And in the hand of the Angel of Darkness is total dominion over the sons of iniquity who walk on paths of darkness" (1QS III, 20–21). The reference to the Prince of Lights and the Angel of Darkness signals the process of personification of abstract qualities.⁷⁰ Knibb suggests that the Prince of Lights was identified with Michael and the Angel of Darkness with Belial.⁷¹ Dimant agrees on the identification with Belial, but suggests that the Prince of Lights was identical with the angel of God's truth.⁷² As already mentioned above, the *Two Spirits Treatise* is not clear about whether the spirit of truth, the Prince of Lights, and the angel of God's truth are synonymous, not to mention the spirit of light (1QS III, 25). It is fair to assume that the spirits of light and darkness created by God (III, 25) are synonymous to the two spirits given to humankind, the spirits of truth and iniquity (III, 18–19). Thus, the qualifications truth, light, iniquity, and darkness are parallel and, we may assume, the spirits qualified in this manner are the same.

However, that still leaves open the issue of whether the Prince of Lights and the Angel of Darkness are also identical with the two spirits. God created (ברא) humankind (1QS III, 17) and he created (ברא) the spirits of light and darkness

68 Cf. Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 97.

69 Newsom, *The Self*, 86.

70 Cf. D. Dimant, "Between Qumran Sectarian and Non-Sectarian Texts: The Case of Belial and Mastema," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)* (ed. A.D. Roitman, L.H. Schiffman, and S. Tzoref; STDJ 93; Leiden 2010), 235–256, esp. 238–239, 245.

71 Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 40, 97. Cf. Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 71n60 for the possible identification of Uriel as the Prince of Lights.

72 Dimant, "Belial and Mastema," 241–242, 244.

(1QS III, 25). The spirits of light and darkness are just as much a part of God's creation as is humankind. Echoing Isa 45:7, the *Works of God* text states "he created darkness and light for himself" (4Q392 1, 4). Although not explicitly stated in the *Two Spirits Treatise*, it is reasonable to assume that the Prince of Lights and the Angel of Darkness are also God's creatures. 1QM XIII, 10–11 is more clear on this: "And you have made Belial." While it is possible that the Prince of Lights and the Angel of Darkness are identical with the two spirits,⁷³ it seems unnecessary to assume that these are all different epithets for just two figures. Why could there not be multiple good and evil protagonists at a certain stage in the development of such figures, as reflected in different texts?⁷⁴ The *Two Spirits Treatise* is not as clear on this as we might wish it to be. Should we distinguish between angels and spirits? Should we assume that the Prince of Lights is set above the spirit of truth/light and that the Angel of Darkness is set above the spirit of iniquity/darkness, in other words, that there is a hierarchical difference? Perhaps.

What is clear is that the Angel of Darkness has a host of spirits under his authority, and it seems a reasonable inference from this that the Prince of Lights also has spirits under his authority.⁷⁵ The *Two Spirits Treatise* explicitly refers to spirits under the authority of the Angel of Darkness (1QS III, 24).⁷⁶ All the spirits from the lot of the Angel of Darkness cause the sons of light to fall. A passage from the *War Scroll* resembles the *Two Spirits Treatise* in various ways (1QM XIII, 10–12).⁷⁷ Most importantly for our purposes, the spirits of truth are said to be under the authority of the Prince of Light (וכול רוחי אמת בממשלתו), while for Belial, being associated with darkness, the spirits of his lot⁷⁸ behave according to the rules of darkness (וכול רוחי גורלו מלאכי חבל בחוקי חושך יתהלכו).⁷⁹ The *War Scroll* and other texts thus provide additional evidence for the notion that the Angel of Darkness and the Prince of Light(s) have a host of spirits under their authority.

73 Cf. Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 97.

74 Cf. Dimant, "Belial and Mastema," on the distinction between Belial and Mastema.

75 See 11Q13 II, 8. Cf. Shaked, "Qumran and Iran," 437.

76 The suffix on גורלו refers to מלאך חושך in III, 21.

77 E.g., the Prince of Light is to assist the "us" of the text (לעזורנו), while in 1QS III, 24–25 God and the angel of his truth assist (עזר) all the sons of light.

78 See also 1QM XIII, 2, 4; 4Q177 1–4, 10; CD XII, 2 // 4Q271 5 I, 18; 11Q13 II, 12, 13.

79 Illustrating nicely how clear-cut category distinctions do not always work, the text refers to the spirits of Belial's lot as angels of destruction. Note also that 1QM XIII, 14 asks rhetorically which angel or prince (מלאך ושר) is like God. The dualism in the Scrolls is not absolute.

3.3.3 Humans, Angels, and Spirits

What about humans amidst all these spirits and angelic beings? Humankind is not mentioned specifically as one entity (בני איש or בני אנוש), but divided into two distinct groups: it is clear that the “sons of justice” (בני צדק) and the “sons of iniquity” (בני עול) refer to human beings.⁸⁰ These groups of people are under the authority (ממשלה) of the Prince of Lights and the Angel of Darkness respectively.

Other texts provide parallels. The *Damascus Document* refers to the spirits of Belial⁸¹ who rule over (ימשלי בו) a person (CD XII, 12 // 4Q271 5 I, 18). 1QM IV, 2 refers to all the men of Belial’s lot. 4Q174 1–2 I, 8–9 (*Florilegium*) mentions the sons of Belial, who execute his plan to make the sons of light stumble so that they become trapped by Belial due to their guilty error (במשגח אשמה).⁸² In 4Q177 10–11, 4, 7 (*Catena*^a) it may be the men of Belial⁸³ who make the sons of light stumble (המכשילים), and 4Q177 12–13 I, 11 mentions “Belial and all the men of his lot.”

The Aramaic *Visions of Amram*, discussed below, also illustrates the notion that humans fall under the authority of either of two angelic beings. At the same time, *Visions of Amram* demonstrates that the personification of these angelic beings was not limited to two distinct figures that were identical across the spectrum of early Jewish texts and traditions.⁸⁴

The *Berakhot*^a text mentions the punishment of the spirits in the lot of Belial, referring to demonic spirits (4Q286 7 II, 4), and a few lines further *Berakhot*^a (4Q286 7 II, 6) also mentions “all the sons of Belial,” referring to wicked humans. In this text then we have another fascinating example of how the conceptualization of evil human and demonic adversaries is interlocked.

The *Two Spirits Treatise*, the *War Scroll*, *Florilegium*, *Catena*^a, *Berakhot*^a, and *Visions of Amram* thus see the dualistic division between two groups inter-

80 This is also clear from 1QS III, 13, 24, 25 (בני אור); 1QS III, 22 (בני צדק); 1QS IV, 5, 6 (בני אמת).

81 Note רוחות, instead of רוחי as in other instances.

82 The terminological correspondence with 1QS III, 22 (ואשמתם ושעי) as to the effect of Belial’s action is also suggestive for the identification of the Angel of Darkness with Belial.

83 The phrase אנשי בליעל וכול האספסוף does not occur in the Hebrew Bible and seems therefore not part of the quoted text in line 3. But then again, the beginning of the phrase (ורפאתי את) also does not occur in the Hebrew Bible. Is a “nonbiblical” text quoted in 4Q177 10–11, 3?

84 Cf. Belial and Mastema. Belial and Mastema share certain characteristics, but also differ from each other in the early stages of development of the traditions concerning them. See Dimant, “Belial and Mastema.”

locked at different levels—cosmological, anthropological, and ethical. Both humans and spirits are under the authority of angelic beings such as the Prince of Light(s) and the Angel of Darkness/Belial, and their character and behaviour are framed in ethical terms.

3.3.4 Sons of Justice, Sons of Light, Spirits, Angels, and God

The *Two Spirits Treatise* says three things about how one group of people relates to the angelic beings and spirits.

First, according to III, 21–23, the sons of justice err because of the Angel of Darkness. Their sins, iniquities, guilt, and rebellious acts fall under his authority, which is later further qualified as “under the authority of his enmity.” The *Two Spirits Treatise* confesses not to know exactly how this works and why the sons of justice err. (Is authority over the two different groups of people [III, 20–21] not consistently demarcated?) It remains one of the mysteries of God.

Second, according to III, 24, the spirits of the Angel of Darkness cause the sons of light⁸⁵ to stumble (להכשיל).⁸⁶ How exactly these spirits cause them to stumble is not clear, but it probably entails something like not properly observing God’s laws. From 1QH^a IV, 34–36 it seems evident that stumbling over the words of God’s will equals sinning against God. The poet then asks for strength against certain spirits to be able to walk in all that God loves. In the lacuna at the beginning of line 36, רשעה (“wickedness”) has been reconstructed, so the reading may have been “spirits of wickedness.” Possibly it is these spirits of wickedness who are responsible for making the poet stumble.

Third, according to IQS III, 24–25, God and the angel of his truth help the sons of light.⁸⁷ According to 1QH^a XXVI, 15 // 4Q427 7 I, 19–20, those who stumble can be put on the right track again,⁸⁸ the attaining of knowledge being paramount in this.

How should we understand the spirits in IQS III, 24? Are these spirits distinct entities, or are they concrete manifestations of the Angel of Darkness and, by inference, of the Prince of Lights? Do they refer to the different spirits that are mentioned in the *Two Spirits Treatise* (IV, 3, 4, 10: רוח ענוה, רוח דעת, רוח זנות) and in other texts, such as the “spirit of deceit” in *Barkhi Nafshi* or the various spirits

85 The sons of light equal the sons of justice. Interestingly, in a text which scholars refer to as the hallmark of Qumran dualism the sons of light are referred to twice, while the sons of darkness are not mentioned at all.

86 Note that according to 4Q174 1–2 I, 8–9 (*Florilegium*) it is the sons of Belial who cause the sons of light to stumble (המכשילים, להכשיל).

87 See also 1QM XIII, 10; XVII, 6; 4Q177 12–13 I, 7.

88 See also 1QH^a XVI, 37; XXVI, 29 // 4Q427 7 II, 10.

in the *Catalogue of Spirits*^a (4Q230)?⁸⁹ The רוחי are from the lot of the Angel of Darkness. Does this imply separate spirit entities, just as men from the lot of Belial would imply distinct people, or not?

The activity of the spirits and of the Angel of Darkness are manifest in the sins, iniquities, guilt, rebellious acts, and stumbling of the sons of justice/light. The *Damascus Document* lists a law (CD XII, 2–3 // 4Q271 5 I, 18–19), awkwardly set in the context of Sabbath laws, according to which someone ruled by the spirits of Belial and who speaks apostasy should be judged according to the law of those who communicate with ghosts and spirits.⁹⁰ Apparently, the workings of someone ruled by the spirits of Belial were concretely visible in the person's actions, such as speaking apostasy.⁹¹ Interestingly, such a person is not just ruled by one spirit, but by many. However, the *Damascus Document* does not make clear what exactly these spirits are and how exactly they relate to people. The verb “to rule” (משל) is too vague in this respect.

3.3.5 Not Just Two, But Many Spirits

The wording at the end of section two strengthens the link between the ethical and the cosmic level of dualism:

He created the spirits of light and darkness, and established on them every deed, [o]n their [path]s every labour.⁹² God has loved one of them for all

89 On 4Q230, see E.J.C. Tigchelaar, “These Are the Names of the Spirits of ...’: A Preliminary Edition of 4QCatalogue of Spirits (4Q230) and New Manuscript Evidence for the *Two Spirits Treatise* (4Q257 and 1Q29a),” *RevQ* 21 (2004): 529–547; E.J.C. Tigchelaar, “Catalogue of Spirits, Liturgical Manuscript with Angelological Content, Incantation?: Reflections on the Character of a Fragment from Qumran (4Q230 1), with Appendix: Edition of the Fragments of 1AA #114,” in *A Kind of Magic: Understanding Magic in the New Testament and Its Religious Environment* (ed. M. Labahn and B.J. Lietaert Peerbolte; LNTS 306; London 2007), 133–146.

90 CD XII, 3 refers to Deut 18:9–14. Cf. also 11Q19 LX, 16–21. See Bohak, *Ancient Jewish Magic*, 83.

91 For a discussion of demonic possession in early Judaism and Christianity, see, e.g., E. Sorensen, *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity* (WUNT 2/157; Tübingen 2002); Eshel and Harlow, “Demons and Exorcism,” 532–533.

92 Along with W.H. Brownlee, trans. and notes, *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline* (BASOR-Sup 10–12; New Haven 1951), 15n41, I assume a dittography here. See Stegemann, “Zu Textbestand und Grundgedanken,” 101–103, for another suggestion based on the idea of the theme of divine judgement being central in this text. But in the following sentence the deeds and paths of the two spirits are referred to again, suggesting that no other element figures prominently here.

eternal [a]ges and with all his deeds he is pleased forever; the other he has abhorred very much⁹³ and all his paths he has hated forever.⁹⁴

1QS III, 25–IV, 1

Again, as in III, 18, it is made clear that both spirits come from God. 1QH^a XVIII, 10, for example, also makes this point clear by describing God as Prince of gods, King of the glorious ones, Lord of every spirit, and Ruler of every creature.

In the second section of the *Two Spirits Treatise* we have seen two spirits, two angelic beings, and hosts of spirits, all of which are not always clearly to be distinguished from one another. Although one can argue for a relative form of dualism in the text, there is no basis for assuming a dualistic anthropology in this part of the *Two Spirits Treatise*. It is not a matter of two opposing spirits as fundamental principles within the human framework or within the human self. Rather, many spirits seem to be involved, and it is difficult to determine exactly how they work and whether it is internally, externally, or both. This perspective is what makes the first reference in the *Two Spirits Treatise* to רוח in the text's heading possibly ambiguous (see above).

3.4 1QS IV, 2–14: *Spirits, Virtues, and Vices*

The third section is a list consisting of two parts in which the text enumerates the paths of the two spirits in the world and their characteristics. The localization of their activities in the world perhaps suggests a distinction between the manifestation of these spirits in the heavenly and the earthly realms.⁹⁵

Those who follow the first path will receive everlasting rewards, but those who walk on the other path will know eternal punishments. One might say that the third section of the *Two Spirits Treatise* translates the heavenly opposition of the second section into an earthly parallel. The dualism between the two spirits has its ethical realization in human conduct. The list of virtues and vices makes clear what the eschatological consequences of such conduct are for humankind.⁹⁶ While this section does not invoke imagery of light and darkness, a dualism between the spirits is expressed in ethical terms.

The catalogue of virtues and vices is directly connected with the two spirits. The spirit of truth is not referred to explicitly, but the reference simply to רוח

93 Cf. Stegemann, "Zu Textbestand und Grundgedanken," 104.

94 Cf. 1QH^a VI, 36.

95 In light of this, 1QH^a XXVI, 29 // 4Q427 7 II, 10 might be of interest, as it refers to those who stumble on earth (וכושלי ארץ) in a context that plays with references to earth (עפר) and the heavens (ועם אילים, שחקים).

96 Cf. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 157–158.

in IV, 6 should be taken as such. The reference is actually to the counsels (or foundations) of the spirit for the sons of truth in the world (אלה סודי רוח לבני אמת) (תבל).⁹⁷ Furthermore, similar to III, 18, which states that humankind is to walk by (דלהתהלל בם) the two spirits, IV, 6 addresses all those who walk by the spirit (כול הולכי בה). The referent of בה is רוח in that same line. This reference in the singular thus denotes the spirit of truth/light, and the counsels (or foundations) of this spirit may refer to the preceding list of virtues. As to the other spirit, in IV, 9 the spirit of iniquity (רוח עולה) is explicitly mentioned (cf. also IV, 20).

In addition, the catalogue also refers to distinct spirits three times. This is perhaps not unexpected in light of the previous section, although one might also have expected to read a catalogue of spirits (1QS III, 14, 24; cf. 4Q230 1, 4 [אלה שמות רוחות]), especially if character qualities also find expression in terms of spiritual entities (see the discussion above concerning *Barkhi Nafshi*, and also below).⁹⁸

3.4.1 Distinct Spirits or Manifestations of Human Character Traits?

The catalogue lists two spirits under the path of the spirit of light and one spirit under the path of the spirit of darkness. Similar to the discussion earlier concerning a “spirit of patience” in the *Barkhi Nafshi* text, should we think of the “spirit of humility” (רוח ענוה) in 1QS IV, 3, the “spirit of knowledge” (דעת) (רוח) in IV, 4, and the “spirit of fornication” (רוח זנות) in IV, 10 as particular and distinct spirits? Or should we rather think of them as psychological dispositions of the human spirit, more like character traits? Or is this antithesis inapt to understand the sense of רוח in relation to the human self?

3.4.2 A Spirit of Humility

First, 1QS IV, 3 refers to a “spirit of humility” (רוח ענוה). In the Hebrew Bible the few occurrences of ענוה are a reference to humility as a quality of character.⁹⁹ This is also the case in the Qumran corpus.¹⁰⁰ The addition of רוח to ענוה is not found in the Hebrew Bible, only in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The construction רוח ענוה occurs only in two other compositions: CD XIII, 18 // 4Q266 9 III, 7 and 1QS III, 8 // 4Q255 2, 2. These seem to support an understanding of רוח ענוה in 1QS IV, 3 as a character trait, but it is not clear then why רוח is used and not just ענוה.

97 See also 1QH^a v, 14.

98 Interestingly, negative qualities also find expression in terms of body imagery in 1QS IV, 11.

99 Zeph 2:3; Prov 15:33; 18:12; 22:4.

100 See 1QS II, 24; v, 3, 25; IX, 22 // 4Q285 VIII, 7; XI, 1; 1QH^a IV, 34; 4Q286 1 II, 8; 4Q298 3–4 II, 8; 4Q436 1 II, 2; 4Q525 2 II+3, 6; 10, 4; 14 II, 20.

3.4.3 A Spirit of Knowledge

Second, 1QS IV, 4 refers to a “spirit of knowledge” (רוח דעת). In the Hebrew Bible it occurs in Isa 11:2 in a longer list of spirits. Part of this list is picked up, in a slightly modified form, in 1QSb v, 25 in a passage that is part of a praising of the Prince (נשיא) of the congregation. There are some other references to רוח דעת in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* refers to “spirits of knowledge and understanding” (4Q405 17, 3) and to “spirits of knowledge, truth and righteousness” (4Q405 19, 4). In the context of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* it is likely that these spirits should be understood as distinct beings.

In 4Q444 (*Incantation*), there is a reference to רוח דעת ובינה: it says ורוח דעת ובינה וצדק אמת וצדק (‘‘a spirit of knowledge and understanding, truth and righteousness’’; 4Q444 1–4 + 5, 3). How should we understand this? Is it one spirit with all four qualities? Or should we understand the phrase as ‘‘a spirit of knowledge, a spirit of understanding, a spirit of ...,’’ etc., referring to four distinct spirits. Conceptually, it was possible to think that God gave more spirits to individual human beings. 1QH^a IV, 29 speaks of the spirits that God has given the poet. Unlike the examples from the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* רוח is in the singular form in 4Q444.¹⁰¹ Does this mean we have to understand it as one spirit, similar to the reference to ורוח הטמאה (‘‘a spirit of impurity’’; 4Q444 1–4 + 5, 8)? Not necessarily.

The ‘‘spirit of knowledge’’ in 1QS IV, 4 should probably be understood as a distinct spirit that affects the human character, possibly by residing within a part of the body that is seen as representative of the human self.

3.4.4 *Incantation* (4Q444) and the *Two Spirits Treatise*

The *Incantation* text is important for our purposes in various respects.¹⁰² Firstly, the text gives further insight into the relationship between the human self or framework and spirits. If the reconstruction is accepted, the *Incantation* text parallels the *Barkhi Nafshi* text (4Q436 1 II, 1 // 4Q435 2 I, 2; see the discussion above) when it says in 4Q444 1–4 + 5, 3 that ‘‘God put the spirit of knowledge, etc. within the speaker’s heart’’ (שם אל בלבבי). This is preceded in the same line by a reference to בתכמי בשר (‘‘in the innermost parts of man’s flesh’’), which presents the possibility of an intriguing localization (blood vessels?)—in addition to that of the heart—of a spirit or spirits in humans. Also, the reference to man’s

101 In other instances, the *Incantation* text refers to spirits in the plural form: רוחי ריב (‘‘spirits of controversy’’; 4Q444 1–4 + 5, 2), רוחי רשעה (‘‘spirits of wickedness’’; 4Q444 1–4 + 5, 4), and רוחי אמת (‘‘spirits of truth’’; 4Q444 6, 4).

102 See also E. Chazon, ‘‘Prayers,’’ in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (E. Chazon et al.; DJD 29; Oxford 1999), 367–378.

flesh in 4Q444 1-4 + 5, 3 presents a parallel to מתכמי בשרו in 1QS IV, 20-21 (see below). A third localization is provided in 4Q444 1-4 + 5, 2: במבניתי (“structure, framework”).¹⁰³

Secondly, in 4Q444 1-4 + 5, 2 the text refers to spirits (“they”) who became spirits of controversy within the speaker’s self: ויהיו לרוחי ריב במבניתי (“and they became spirits of controversy in my [bodily] structure”). This presents an intriguing parallel to 1QS IV, 23: עד הנה יריבו רוחי אמת ועול בלבב גבר (“until now the spirits of truth and iniquity strive in man’s heart”; see below).

Thirdly, changing from first-person to second-person speech, the text exhorts that the keeping of God’s laws strengthens oneself in the fight against the spirits of wickedness (4Q444 1-4 + 5, 4): ותתחזק בחוקי אל ולהלחם ברוחי רשעה.¹⁰⁴ The *Two Spirits Treatise* does not actually refer to God’s will, his laws, or the Law. However, as discussed above, the sons of justice/light do err and stumble due to the Angel of Darkness and the spirits of his lot. This results in the sins, iniquities, guilt, and rebellious acts of the sons of justice/light. One might infer from 1QS III, 21-24, and also from III, 26-IV, 1, that erring and stumbling is equivalent to not properly observing God’s will or his laws (see also below on CD II, 14-18).¹⁰⁵

Finally, the *Incantation* text represents important evidence for the process of personification of spirits. In 4Q444 1-4 + 5, 8, “bastards” are mentioned in connection with “a spirit of impurity” (ממזרים ורוח הטמאה). It seems that these ממזרים (“bastards”) are not to be identified in the usual manner, such as when they appear together with the Ammonites and the Moabites. Rather, it seems that ממזרים refer to a type of spirit, an evil type. For example, in 4Q510 1, 5 (*Songs of the Sage*) ממזרים רוחות occur in a list of evil spirits which includes Lilith.¹⁰⁶ Thus, in 4Q444, רוח הטמאה (“a spirit of impurity”) may attest to the notion of impurity personified as a spirit. Whether this also holds for all other occurrences of רוח in *Incantation* is not certain. In the same text, רוח may be used in different ways, but it is nonetheless suggestive that the boundaries between personified spirits and human character traits are blurry.

103 Cf. 1QH^a XV, 7, 12; XXII, 28; 4Q299 6 I, 13; 4Q511 III, 8 (?).

104 4Q444 1-4 + 5, 2 possibly has another reference to חוקי אל.

105 According to CD III, 2-3, Abraham is counted as God’s friend for observing his commandments (בשמרו מצות אל) and not choosing the will of his own spirit (ברצון רוחו). A few lines earlier, in CD II, 17, reference is made to those who erred and stumbled (see further below).

106 See also 1QH^a XXIV, 26; 4Q511 2 II, 3; 4Q511 35, 7; 4Q511 48-49 + 51, 3 (and also “impurity” [טמאה]).

3.4.5 A Spirit of Fornication

Returning to the *Two Spirits Treatise*, the third reference in the catalogue of virtues and vices is in 1QS IV, 10 to a “spirit of fornication.” A רוח זנות does not occur elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls, but זנות does. In CD IV, 17 it is one of the traps of Belial. In the Hebrew Bible the root זנה refers to various forms of illicit sexual conduct and in a metaphorical sense to the worship of other gods.¹⁰⁷ In the Dead Sea Scrolls the sense of illicit sexual conduct seems to predominate.¹⁰⁸ However, in many cases it is not so clear whether it has sexual or idolatrous connotations. It seems that the sense of זנה as the worship of other gods was modified, being directed not so much at other gods as such—early Jewish texts are not preoccupied with this—but at the incorrect way of worshipping God, in the sense of not following his ways. It was not a matter of God or other gods. The *Damascus Document* illustrates this nicely, making a contrast between following God’s ways or having plans based on a guilty inclination and adulteress eyes (see below). What light does this shed on the sense of a “spirit of fornication”?

3.4.6 Spirits, Character Traits, and the Body in *Barkhi Nafshi* (4Q434–438), the *Damascus Document*, *Communal Confession* (4Q393), and the *Two Spirits Treatise*

The *Barkhi Nafshi* text may again be of interest. In the passage discussed earlier, brief reference was made to the body imagery used by the poet. One of these is זנות עינים (“adulterousness of the eyes”; 4Q436 1 II, 1 // 4Q435 2 I, 2), which is removed by God after putting the holy spirit in the poet’s heart, such that his heart can gaze upon God’s ways.¹⁰⁹ Apparently, “adulterousness of the eyes” should not be associated with the eyes per se, but as a quality of the heart. We have observed that the text does not always clearly distinguish between spirits as distinct and external entities that affect the human self and character traits expressing the human self.

How are a “spirit of fornication” and “adulterousness of eyes” related to each other? Should רוח זנות in 1QS IV, 10 be understood as synonymous with זנות עינים, or as a distinct entity behind people’s זנות עינים? Is the removal of זנות עינים from the heart parallel to the removal of evil spirits, also from the heart or from the innermost parts of man (cf. 1QS IV, 20–21)?

107 See S. Erlandsson, “זָנָה, *zānāh*,” *ThWAT* 2:612–619.

108 The figurative sense is attested in mainly so-called Rewritten Bible texts: 4Q368 2, 7–8; 11Q19 II, 13–15; and possibly CD XIX, 17.

109 Cf., e.g., 1QS III, 3, 7; XI, 3, 5–6, 19.

Another reference in the Dead Sea Scrolls to זנות עינים, together with a יצר אשמה (“guilty inclination”),¹¹⁰ is found in CD II, 14–17 // 4Q270 1 I, 1 (ועני זנות).¹¹¹ In this passage the intended audience is told to listen so that their eyes are opened and they see and understand God’s deeds in order to choose what God pleases and walk perfectly on all his paths. It is said that they should not follow plans based on a guilty inclination and adulteress eyes, because many have erred (ותעו)¹¹² and brave heroes have stumbled (נכשלו)¹¹³ because of them. The text then starts its historical overview with the Watchers, who were infamous also because of their sexual transgressions, and about whom the *Damascus Document* says that they fell because of the stubbornness of their hearts (בשרירות לבם). This passage in the *Damascus Document* illustrates the shift in the meaning of זנה from worship of other gods to the incorrect worship of God and the violation of his rules.

Although stubbornness of heart is referred to elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and also in the *Rule of the Community*, it is only in the *Communal Confession* text (4Q393 3, 3, 5) that it is further explicated as stubbornness of a person’s evil heart (שרירות לבו הרע). Furthermore, using language from Ps 51,¹¹⁴ the speakers in *Communal Confession* ask God to create¹¹⁵ a new spirit (ורוח חדשה) within them and to establish within them (בקרבנו) a faithful inclination (יצר אמונות) (4Q393 1 II, 5–6). The faithful inclination contrasts with the guilty or evil inclination; the text explicitly asks God to hide his face from their sins and wipe out their iniquities. However, what is of interest for our purposes is the creational language combined with the localization of a new spirit within man. It is not a question of two spirits, or a dualistic anthropology, but clearly the human self can be renewed by God creating a new spirit within man. Whether this implies the removal of the old spirit (cf. 1QS IV, 20–21) or whether it is rather a matter of renewal of that same spirit is not clear.

Thus, the “spirit of fornication” in 1QS IV, 10 may be part of a discourse— together with “adulterousness of the eyes” and other expressions of body imagery such as “stubbornness of heart” or “stiffness of neck” (see, e.g., 1QS IV, 11)— in which the distinction between spirits as distinct entities, human character

110 See also 4Q286 7 II, 7–8 // 4Q287 6, 7. Cf. 4Q280 2, 2.

111 4Q287 8, 13 is too fragmentary.

112 Cf. 1QS III, 21 (תעות).

113 Cf. 1QS III, 24 (להכשיל).

114 See D. Falk, “Works of God and Communal Confession,” in *Qumran Cave 4.xx: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (E. Chazon et al.; DJD 29; Oxford 1999), 52–53; Klein, “‘Right Spirit,’” 185, 188.

115 Cf. 1QS III, 18, 25.

traits, different inclinations, and their relationship to the human self is often not clear-cut but in fact rather blurry.

3.4.7 Angels of Destruction

As to the relationship between men and spirits or angels, the catalogue of virtues and vices adds yet another perspective to the two spirits, the Prince of Lights, the Angel of Darkness, and a host of spirits in their lot: “angels of destruction” (מלאכי חבל). It is possible that these are a separate class of spirits in the lot of the Angel of Darkness (1QS III, 24).

From 4Q510 1, 5 (*Songs of the Sage*) it is clear that there were different types of evil spirits, including “all the spirits of the angels of destruction” (כול רוחי מלאכי חבל). These were probably all imagined as belonging to the lot of the Angel of Darkness or Belial.¹¹⁶ We observed above that men also belong to the lots of the Prince of Lights and the Angel of Darkness. It is interesting that those who walk in the path of the spirit of darkness await an abundance of affliction at the hands of the angels of destruction (1QS IV, 12).¹¹⁷ Rather than a dualistic anthropology, this scenario suggests distinct spirits, external to human beings.

3.5 1QS IV, 15–23 and IV, 23–26: Dualistic Anthropology?

Unlike the previous sections of the *Two Spirits Treatise*, the fourth (1QS IV, 15–23) and fifth (1QS IV, 23–26) sections contain intriguing passages that seem to hint at a dualistic anthropology, especially 1QS IV, 23.¹¹⁸

Scholars have assumed that the *Two Spirits Treatise* demonstrates a notion according to which the two spirits exist within human beings in different proportions. The share of the two spirits in the world, presumably the numerical strength of their divisions, is equal (1QS IV, 16, 25), but each individual human being has a greater or smaller share of either one of the two spirits that fight within man’s heart (1QS IV, 16, 23).¹¹⁹ This would, scholars suggest, add a psy-

¹¹⁶ Cf. 1QM XIII, 12.

¹¹⁷ But not only by them. In 1QS IV, 12 there is also mention of the wrath of God’s vengeance (עברת אל נקמת), a phrase that does not appear elsewhere. For other references to angels of destruction, see CD II, 5–7 and perhaps 4Q473 2, 7.

¹¹⁸ In the final section, in 1QS IV, 26, there is also one more reference to people’s own spirit: רוחו. This is the only clear use of רוח for the human spirit in the *Two Spirits Treatise*. 1QS III, 14 and IV, 6 are ambiguous.

¹¹⁹ Dupont-Sommer, “L’instruction sur les deux esprits,” 28–29; J. Daniélou, “Un source de la spiritualité chrétienne dans les manuscrits de la mer Morte: La doctrine des deux esprits,” *DV* 25 (1953): 127–136, esp. 128; Michaud, “Un mythe zervanite,” 146. For other

chological dimension to the notion of dualism in the *Two Spirits Treatise*. The result of this conflict within people's hearts is that they either walk in wisdom or in folly. The implication seems to be that both spirits exist within human beings, but that people act according to one or the other, depending on the outcome of the struggle.

Before discussing the possibility of a dualistic anthropology in 1QS IV, 23, another enigmatic passage in the fourth section merits some attention because of its different references to spirits and their relationship to the human self.

3.5.1 Spirits in Man's Innermost Parts

The passage 1QS IV, 20–23 is not easy to understand. Different references to spirits and purification rites are used to describe how God, with his truth, will exact judgement at the appointed time.¹²⁰ The conclusion is that all the glory of Adam shall belong to those whom God has chosen. Strikingly, what is lacking is a reference to the spirit of these chosen ones. At the very least, the *Two Spirits Treatise* does not put it in such unequivocal terms as the *Communal Confession* text, in which the “confessors” ask God to create a new spirit within them (4Q393 1 II, 5–6; see above).

1QS IV, 20–21 vividly describes how God will destroy all spirit of iniquity from the innermost parts of man's flesh (מתכמי בשרו) at the time of judgement. Is this language metaphorical or does it imply a notion of spirits dwelling internally in human beings? Other Qumran texts¹²¹ also localize the presence or activity of spirits in the innermost parts of man, if that is the correct interpretation of תכמים.¹²²

The reference to man's flesh (בתכמי בשר) in 4Q444 1–4 + 5, 3 (*Incantation*) has already been referred to above. Considering other references in 4Q444 (“heart” [לבב] and “structure” [מבנית]), as well as because of its combination with בשר (“flesh”), it seems evident that this refers to a localization within the human body.

Reference has also been made to 1QH^a IV, 34–36. 1QH^a IV, 37 speaks about “their authority” in the poet's innermost parts (ממשלתם בתכמי), the referent of “their” possibly being “spirits of wickedness” from lines 35–36.¹²³ The use of

explanations, Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 84; Licht, “Analysis of the *Treatise*,” 91013.

120 See Klein, “Right Spirit,” 182 for parallels with 1QS III, 6–9.

121 1Q36 14, 2 has בתכמי בשר, but the manuscript is too fragmentary.

122 See Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 86n7; E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS 29; Atlanta 1986), 115.

123 The passage is fragmentary and therefore difficult to understand. Following the reference

the word ממשלה is intriguing in light of the previous discussion above on the authority of the Prince of Lights and the Angel of Darkness, and also because it is a key issue in the *Visions of Amram* text (see below). This passage from the *Hodayot* seems to suggest that the rule of these spirits was localized in man's innermost parts.

From 1QH^a XIII, 30 // 4Q429 2, 12 it seems that pain and agony in the innermost parts can cause a man's spirit to stumble (להכשיל), and in 1QH^a XIII, 37–38 the poet says that his bread has changed into strife (לריב) and his drink into contention (לבעל מדינים). He says that they have entered his bones and caused his spirit to stumble: ויבוא בעצמי להכשיל רוח. Rather than taking this as purely metaphorical language, it may be understood in more “real” terms. In 4Q444 1–4 + 5, 2 spirits of controversy (לרוחי ריב) within the speaker's bodily structure (במבנית) are referred to, possibly paralleling the bones in 1QH^a XIII, 37.

Similar to 1QS IV, 20–21, 4Q511 28–29, 3–4 (*Songs of the Sage*) refers to the “iniquity in the innermost parts of my flesh” (ועולה בתכמי בשרי) and also to a foundation of dust (בסוד עפרי),¹²⁴ suggesting that indeed בשר תכמים should be understood in bodily terms. Iniquity is said to reside there even more. We have seen earlier (1QS IV, 9) that רוח עולה is one of the two spirits whose paths the catalogue of virtues and vices in the *Two Spirit Treatise* describes, and that the distinction between separate spirits and human dispositions is often not clearly made. That spirits were thought to reside in the human body also seems clear from 4Q511 48–49 + 51, 3, which is very fragmentary, but refers to “bastards” (ממזרים), the verb כנע (“subdue”),¹²⁵ and טמאה (“impurity”), followed by כיא בתכמי (“because in the innermost parts of ...”).

These other passages suggest that the statement in 1QS IV, 20–21 that God will destroy all spirit of iniquity from the innermost parts of man's flesh is not just figurative but also refers to a reality in which the human self, innate qualities, and the personification of these qualities in terms of distinct spirits are intricately related to each other, being an integral part of the cosmic order.

3.5.2 Spirits in Man's Heart

The passage in the *Two Spirits Treatise* that seems to contain the text's best hint at a dualistic anthropology is 1QS IV, 23: “until now the spirits of truth and

to their authority over his innermost parts, the poet gives as a reason that he is a “fleshly spirit” (כי רוח בשר עבדך). For the term רוח בשר, see 1QH^a V, 30; 4Q416 1, 12; 4Q417 1 I, 17; 4Q418 81 + 81a, 2; 4Q423 8, 1. See also the literature referred to in n. 24 above.

124 Cf. 4Q299 6 I, 13 (מעפר מבניתם).

125 According to 4Q511 35, 7, all spirits of the bastards are subdued by God's strength and fear.

iniquity strive in man's heart." The text has made clear earlier that humanity is divided into two groups according to the two spirits, but it did not present the inner person as the battleground of the two spirits. What does this mean? Does it imply a notion of two spirits inhabiting man's heart, or does it refer to two psychological dispositions? What does it mean to say that two spirits strive within man's heart? Should the heart be understood somehow as the essence of a human being or rather as the centre of human deeds and the path on which they walk? Is it possible to make a clear distinction between these two possibilities?

There are no other texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls in which the heart is specifically described as the location of strife between two (or more) spirits, but there are parallels to different locations in the human body, including the heart, into which spirits are put, or reside, or onto which their activities are registered. 4Q444 (*Incantation*) refers to spirits of controversy (לְרוּחֵי רִיב) within the speaker's bodily structure (בַּמְבִּנִיתִי) and 1QH^a XIII, 37 locates strife (בַּלְרִיב) and contention (לְבַעַל מַדְנִים) in the poet's bones (בַּעֲצָמַי). Furthermore, the *Incantation* text seems to use the "heart" (לֵב, לִבָּב), the "innermost parts of man's flesh" (תַּכְמִּים בָּשָׂר), and "structure, framework" (מְבִּנִית) interchangeably¹²⁶—or, if there are nuances, these are at least difficult for us to detect: both the heart and the structure can be locations of spirits.¹²⁷ We have also discussed 4Q436 1 II, 1 // 4Q435 2 I, 2, which speaks of the holy spirit put into the heart of the poet. These texts, together with 1QS IV, 20–21, 23, are clearer on the relationship of spirits to the human body and the human self than 1QS III, 17–18.

Should the statement in 1QS IV, 23 be understood as a statement of a dualistic anthropology? I am not so sure. While 1QS IV, 23 speaks of two spirits within the heart of man, as we have seen, other texts also refer to activities of spirits within man's heart (or use other terms to denote the human self). These texts are not dualistic, especially since sometimes many spirits are referred to.¹²⁸ This suggests that these spirits are not part of man's created framework. The *Two Spirits Treatise* is not really clear that the two spirits represent two opposing principles that ground reality and constitute human nature. The *Two Spirits Treatise* is clear that both humankind (1QS III, 17) and the two spirits of light/truth and darkness/iniquity (1QS III, 25) were created by God. However, what is less clear is that these are the only two spirits, or that all other spirits, such as those mentioned in the catalogue of virtues and vices

126 The first two of these also appear in the *Two Spirits Treatise*.

127 Cf. 4Q538 1–2, 2, 4 for the possibility of an evil spirit in the hearts of Joseph's brothers.

128 See, e.g., 1QH^a IV, 29, 4Q444 (*Incantation*), or the *Songs of the Sage* discussed earlier.

(see above), can be reduced to these two. One might say that these other spirits belong to the lot of the two spirits, but this only begs the question: Are these other spirits manifestations of the power of the two spirits, within which they materialize, or should they be seen as distinct entities of their own? The *Two Spirits Treatise* is not clear on this. It is therefore difficult to argue that according to the *Two Spirits Treatise* only two spirits, as opposing principles, constitute human nature. This in turn should lead us to be careful and approach the interpretation of the *Two Spirits Treatise* as an early Jewish statement of a dualistic anthropology not without reservations. The *Two Spirits Treatise* cannot be taken as a straightforward statement about human nature consisting of two opposing spirits.

4 The Visions of Amram, the *Two Spirits Treatise*, and Iranian Notions

In the Aramaic *Visions of Amram* text (4Q543–549)¹²⁹ there is a fascinating scene where Amram has a vision in which two figures are judging (דאגין) him and having a great dispute (תגר רב) about him, although the text does not explain exactly what the dispute is about.¹³⁰ When asked by Amram how they can have authority over him, they both answer that they rule over all of humanity.¹³¹ They then ask Amram to make a choice: “And they said to me, ‘Which of us do you seek to be ruled by?’”¹³² The text then proceeds with a vivid description of both figures. One possibly has the appearance of a serpent, his clothing multicoloured and very dark, whereas the other figure has a pleasant appearance. In another passage, where only one of the figures is speaking to Amram, he explains to him that the other figure is called *Melkhi Resha*, that all his deeds are darkness and that he rules over all darkness.¹³³ The figure who

129 For recent discussions of this composition, see, e.g., A.B. Perrin, “Another Look at Dualism in 4QVisions of Amram,” *Henoah* 36 (2014): 107–118; B.A. Jurgens, “Reassessing the Dream-Vision of Amram (4Q543–547),” *JSP* (2014): 3–42; A.D. Gross, “Visions of Amram,” in *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture* (ed. L.H. Feldman, J.L. Kugel, and L.H. Schiffman; Lincoln/Philadelphia: University of Nebraska Press/The Jewish Publication Society, 2013), 1507–1510; R.R. Duke, *The Social Location of the Visions of Amram (4Q543–547)* (New York: Peter Lang, 2012); L. Goldman, “Dualism in the *Visions of Amram*,” *RevQ* 24 (2010): 421–432.

130 4Q544 1, 10–11.

131 4Q544 1, 12 // 4Q543 5–9, 2 // 4Q547 1–2, 11–12.

132 4Q544 1, 12 // 4Q543 5–9, 3–4 // 4Q547 1–2, 12–13.

133 4Q544 2, 12–15.

addresses Amram says that he is ruler over all light.¹³⁴ One of his three names is probably *Melkhi Tsedeq*.¹³⁵

Like the *Two Spirits Treatise*, the *Visions of Amram* text presents angelic or demonic beings disputing about human beings. Unlike the *Two Spirits Treatise*, *Visions of Amram* presents Amram with a choice between the two angelic figures, between light and darkness, righteousness and wickedness. They parallel the Prince of Lights and the Angel of Darkness from the *Two Spirits Treatise*, who have divided authority (ממשלה) over two groups of people between them, although the Angel of Darkness and the spirits from his lot still exert influence over the people under the authority of the Prince of Lights. The Aramaic words for dispute or strife (תגר and דיין) in *Visions of Amram* parallel the Hebrew word (ריב) from the *Two Spirits Treatise* (1QS IV, 23). The *Visions of Amram* text does not explicitly state what the dispute between the two angels is about. However, from the rest of the text it seems that they are arguing about who has authority over Amram.

Should we think of this scene in *Visions of Amram* as a parallel to 1QS IV, 23? The statement in 1QS IV, 23 that two spirits strive in man's heart may have been understood in terms of a competition between these spirits over who would have authority over a human being. The striking difference is that Amram is able to provide a vivid description of the two angelic beings. He can see them and he can also talk with them, asking questions and hearing their answers. Of course, all this happens in a visionary dream, where human sensory perception may be extraordinary. Nonetheless, the contrast with the *Two Spirits Treatise* is evident. The references in the *Two Spirits Treatise* remain much more vague and abstract.

A further striking feature of *Visions of Amram* is of course that Amram has a choice over which figure to have as his ruler. In the *Two Spirits Treatise* the situation seems more or less settled by the text's deterministic perspective: God has predetermined everyone's path. At the same time, the text refers to this struggle between the two spirits within the heart of man. As de Jong notes "there is a structural dilemma within the 1QS instruction on the two spirits, which can most economically be solved by allowing for a combination of two different 'patterns of belief': the recognition, demanded by biblical tradition, that God is one, and is thus responsible for everything, and the (perhaps intuitive) notion that the world is currently going through a struggle dominated by two spiritual beings, representing good and evil."¹³⁶

134 4Q544 2, 12–16.

135 4Q544 3, 2. See A. Steudel, "Melchizedek," *EDSS* 1:535–537, esp. 535.

136 De Jong, "Iranian Connections," 493.

However, the issue of choice in *Visions of Amram* is interesting in light of Iranian traditions and with regard to the matter of outside influences and the transmission of cultural learning to Jewish Palestine. De Jong notes that in Zoroastrianism “it is the *choice* everyone has made that determines his/her afterlife and eventual fate at the end of time.” There is no sense of predestination in this regard.¹³⁷ In this light the pattern presented in *Visions of Amram* of an angelic and a demonic figure arguing over a human being and the human being having a choice in this shows more of a systemic resemblance to Zoroastrianism than does the *Two Spirits Treatise*. It has been suggested that Aramaic served as a medium for the transmission of learning from the east to Palestine in the west.¹³⁸ The pattern of dualistic thought, together with the element of choice in *Visions of Amram* as well as the text’s Aramaic language may suggest that these specific elements originated within an Iranian context and were subsequently transmitted, via Aramaic channels, westwards to Jewish Palestine.¹³⁹

With regard to anthropology, pneumatology, and demonology, what the *Visions of Amram* text reminds us of is that human beings were not necessarily

137 De Jong, “Iranian Connections,” 493.

138 See, e.g., R. Leicht, *Astrologumena judaica: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der astrologischen Literatur der Juden* (TSMJ 21; Tübingen 2006), 37–38; J. Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years: Astronomy and Calendars at Qumran in Their Ancient Context* (STDJ 78; Leiden 2008), 259–266; J. Ben-Dov, “Scientific Writings in Aramaic and Hebrew at Qumran: Translation and Concealment,” in *Aramaica qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July, 2008* (ed. K. Berthelot and D. Stökl Ben Ezra; STDJ 94; Leiden 2010), 379–399; M. Popović, “The Emergence of Aramaic and Hebrew Scholarly Texts: Transmission and Translation of Alien Wisdom,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts* (ed. S. Metso, H. Najman, and E. Schuller; STDJ 92; Leiden 2010), 81–114, esp. 100–106; M. Popović, “Networks of Scholars: The Transmission of Astronomical and Astrological Learning between Babylonians, Greeks and Jews,” in *Ancient Jewish Sciences and the History of Knowledge in Second Temple Literature* (ed. J. Ben-Dov and S.L. Sanders; New York: New York University Press, 2014), 151–191.

139 The oldest manuscripts of *Visions of Amram* date to the second half of the second century BCE, but the composition may date to the third century BCE, according to É. Puech, *Qumrân grotte 4.XXII: Textes araméens, première partie, 4Q529–549* (DJD 31; Oxford 2001), 285. For considerations about possible periods and contexts of transmission of Iranian ideas and notions, see de Jong, “Iranian Connections,” 485–487, 496. However, these considerations are in need of further research. For late antique contexts and scenarios, see, e.g., S. Secunda, “Talmudic Text and Iranian Context: On the Development of Two Talmudic Narratives,” *AJSR* 33 (2009): 45–69; S. Secunda, “Reading the Bavli in Iran,” *JQR* 100 (2010): 310–342.

thought of as having been created with two spirits inhabiting man, suggesting a form of dualistic anthropology. *Visions of Amram* illustrates the notion of external spirits that sought to have authority over human beings and to influence them during their lifetime. We have seen above that the issue of the authority of angels, spirits, and demons over human beings was important in the various texts. As far as we can tell, *Visions of Amram* does not locate the strife of the angelic beings somehow within the human self. However, from 1QH^a IV, 37 and 4Q444 1-4 + 5, 2 one may infer that the authority of spirits and their strife could also be thought of as internalized within the human structure. The difference is that in the case of the *Visions of Amram* the angels or spirits do not belong to the creational framework of man, but represent separate, independent creational entities. Although the *Two Spirits Treatise* is not as concrete in its descriptions as *Visions of Amram*, it also has passages that suggest viewing the spirits as distinct from humans, while all having been created by God (1QS III, 17, 25; see the discussion above).

5 Concluding Remarks

The above discussion has demonstrated that early Jewish texts on the relationship between humans and spirits do not attest to one but to various perspectives on the matter.

Thus, the *Barkhi Nafshi* text suggests a somewhat different perspective than *Visions of Amram*. The end of the first column and the beginning of the second column of 4Q436 have been reconstructed as follows by the editors of the text, Weinfeld and Seely: “The evil inclination [you] have driven with rebukes [from my innermost part] ... [and the spirit of ho]liness you have set in my heart.”¹⁴⁰

As Tigchelaar has recently emphasized, the mention of evil inclination occurs in a context that refers to “the removal of ‘adulterousness of the eyes’, the sending away of ‘the stiffness of neck’, the removal of ‘wrathful anger’, and the carrying away of ‘haughtiness of heart and arrogance of eyes’. The ‘evil inclination’ may belong to the same category of the following vices, especially since the combination of ‘thoughts of a guilty inclination’ and ‘adulterous eyes’ is also found in CD II 16.”¹⁴¹

He observes from a phenomenological perspective that in our texts “there is not always a clear distinction between virtues and vices, and spirits as person-

140 Weinfeld and Seely, “Barkhi Nafshi,” 299.

141 Tigchelaar, “Evil Inclination,” 351.

ifications of those virtues and vices.¹⁴² This is not only the case in the *Barkhi Nafshi* text, but also in the so-called *Plea for Deliverance from the Cave 11 Psalms Scroll* (11Q5 XIX).¹⁴³ It is not entirely clear whether we are dealing with external or internal forces, but at the same time they seem also to have gained a substance of their own, independent of the human self.

A number of magical texts or texts with magical elements have also been discussed that refer to spirits taking possession of body parts and influencing human behaviour. Some of these are explicitly addressed to the *maskil*, such as 4Q510–511 (*Songs of the Sage*), as is the *Two Spirits Treatise*, and they share certain concepts and language. In fact, concomitant with the notion of external spirits possessing human beings comes a worldview in which these external dangers can and must be rebuked.¹⁴⁴

As the *Two Spirits Treatise* is addressed to the sons of light, they may have understood its teaching as explaining to them their position over against those who were not sons of light and why it was important to strengthen themselves against attacks, harassment, and temptation from the dark side. The emphasis on the sons of justice/light in the second section of the text reveals an important element of the knowledge that the *Two Spirits Treatise* is interested to disseminate. The construction of this knowledge reveals something of the text's worldview and may also, more specifically, inform us about one of the manners in which the *Two Spirits Treatise* was read and understood. The text is apparently not interested in whether the sons of iniquity/darkness might also do good things because of the Prince of Lights. This should not surprise us. The *Two Spirits Treatise* speaks to the sons of light (1QS III, 13) and therefore addresses that which is of interest to them.¹⁴⁵

The determinism that seems almost absolute in the *Two Spirits Treatise* is put into a different perspective in other texts from Qumran. The text in 1QH^a IV, 34–37 has already been discussed. This passage from the *Hodayot* asks for strength against spirits (of wickedness) to be able to walk in all that God loves. The *Incantation* text exhorts us to keep God's laws and thus to strengthen oneself in the fight against the spirits of wickedness (4Q444 1–4 + 5, 4). Texts such as these suggest that the understanding of 1QS III, 21–24 may have been that God and the angel of his truth could be sought to strengthen the sons of justice/light so

142 Tigchelaar, "Evil Inclination," 352.

143 Tigchelaar, "Evil Inclination," 350–351.

144 On exorcism in the Second Temple period, see, e.g., Bohak, *Ancient Jewish Magic*, 88–114.

145 Cf. 1QM XIII, 9. See also H. Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde* (SUNT 15; Göttingen 1980), 129.

as not to be influenced by the Angel of Darkness and his spirits and to avert their evil influence.

Furthermore, it is clear from a recent re-edition of 4Q468i by Tigchelaar that this composition is not directed against outsiders who sin but that the speakers themselves are the recalcitrant sinners (line 2: “our neck is hard”; line 3: “the evil inclination of our heart”). This text “presents the first case where the evil inclination of one’s heart is not attributed to sinful others, but is part of a confession of one’s own human nature.”¹⁴⁶ Although there is no basis to regard this composition as sectarian, this self-understood confession of sinful human nature ties in nicely with the knowledge expressed in the *Two Spirits Treatise* that the sons of light can sin. In the *Communal Confession* text (4Q393 1 11) the speakers also talk of “our sins” and attribute to themselves “stiffness of neck.” Although the speakers in *Communal Confession* do not explicitly locate an evil inclination within themselves, they do ask God to wipe out all their sins, to create a new spirit, and to establish a faithful inclination within them (see the discussion above). These texts thus acknowledge the existence of human failings even in the chosen ones and thus demonstrate the preoccupation with understanding the ways of the right and wrong paths as in the catalogue of virtues and vices in the *Two Spirits Treatise*.

Thus, to conclude, in the *Two Spirits Treatise* the notion of רוח takes on different meanings which are sometimes difficult to distinguish. In light of the entire corpus of Qumran texts now being available, the impression is that the different levels—anthropological, ethical, and cosmological—can intersect and in such a way that it is not always evident to us (nor perhaps to those who read them at the time) how we should distinguish between virtuous and corrupt behaviour and between spirits as personifications of those virtues and vices. Spirits were thought of as distinct beings and at the same time as innate character traits of the human self. Sometimes texts distinguish more or less clearly between them, but more often they do not.

Moreover, the dualism found in most Dead Sea Scrolls is not anthropological but manifested in opposing spiritual beings.¹⁴⁷ With regard to the *Two Spirits Treatise*, on the one hand the other texts that have been discussed throw into sharper relief the lack of a clear, unequivocal statement of dualistic anthropology in the *Two Spirits Treatise*. Humankind’s framework was not created out of two opposing spiritual elements. Although the *Two Spirits Treatise* does refer to two opposing groups of human beings, this opposition is not strictly dualis-

146 Tigchelaar, “Evil Inclination,” 357.

147 See also Tigchelaar, “Evil Inclination,” 353.

tic, as the Angel of Darkness also exerts influence over the sons of light.¹⁴⁸ The text's concern is thus not for a strict dualism at the level of different groups of human beings. On the other hand, the other Qumran texts support the impression that notions of cosmological and ethical dualism in the *Two Spirits Treatise* are intricately connected and that these also exert their influence at an anthropological level, expressed in human behaviour. However, this is not a dualistic anthropology.¹⁴⁹

148 This aspect seems to be ignored by de Jong, "Iranian Connections," 493, as the realms of both spirits are not completely distinct.

149 I am most grateful to Eibert Tigchelaar for his many valuable comments and suggestions. This article appears in a slightly revised form in *Sibyls, Scriptures, and Scrolls: John Collins at Seventy* (ed. J. Baden, H. Najman, and E. Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill, 2016).