

Arvydas KASČIUKAITIS

Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas

---

## The Image of God as Father in Qumran Writings

Dievo kaip Tėvo įvaizdis teologinėje literatūroje dažniausiai yra aptiriamas pasiremiant Šventuoju Raštu. Kadangi Kumrano raštuose šia tema nėra randama daug tiesioginių teiginių ar aliuzijų, jie dažniausiai lieka šešėlyje, kaip neteikiantys svarbios informacijos. Šis straipsnis kaip tik ir yra skirtas pristatyti ir aptarti visus iki šiol atrastų Kumrano raštų tekstus, kuriuose tiesiogiai ar netiesiogiai kalbama apie Dievo tėvystę. Visi tekstai suskirstyti į tris grupes: tekstai, kuriuose Dievo atžvilgiu vartojamas terminas „tėvas“; tekstai, kuriuose Dievo tėvystė žmonių atžvilgiu gali būti suprantama, kai jie vadinami jo „sūnumis“; ir tekstai, kuriuose Dievas traktuojamas „kaip tėvas“.

The image of God as Father in theological literature is usually analyzed with reference to the Holy Bible. Since in Qumran writings there are not many direct references or allusions to this subject, those fragments are often left in the shadow and considered having little importance. This article, namely, presents and discusses all the Qumran texts found by now which directly or indirectly refer to the divine fatherhood. These texts are grouped under the following three headings: texts in which the term “father” is employed with regard to God; texts, where people are called God’s “sons”; and texts, in which God is spoken of “as father”.

### Preface

---

Apart from the biblical passages of the OT the Qumran scrolls contain not only various texts proper to Qumran community life but also a number of fragments, which belong to the apocrypha of the OT or appear to be certain paraphrases of the biblical stories. The theme of the divine fatherhood in those parabiblical texts does not emerge frequently, nevertheless, there are several texts which either explicitly, by the pattern of filial relationships, or by a simile refer to God’s fatherly figure. There are also several minor possible references to God as Father, which have less importance because of their fragmentary state.

The object of the research – the image of God as Father as it is presented by various documents and fragments found in different Qumran writings.

The aim of the research – to give a fresh insight on the topic by means of an exhaustive textual presentation and to reveal the basic characteristics that are proper to the activity of God as Father.

The task of the research – to overview newly all texts in which terms “father”, “son”, “as/like father” occur, by grouping them under specific headings.

The method applied for the research – analysis of different texts and their contexts.

## 1. The minor references to the divine fatherhood

There are three fragments presented by Baillet in which the extant/restored term *ba* may originally have been attributed to God. The earliest of them *Words of the Luminaries*<sup>a</sup> (4Q504 1, III) comes from the middle of the second century B.C., the *Ritual of Marriage* (4Q502 39) was possibly written in the beginning of the first century B.C., and the *Songs of the Sage*<sup>b</sup> (4Q511 127 [4QShir<sup>b</sup> 127]) at the dawn of the Christian era. All of them were presumably used in certain liturgical practices: the document 4Q504 1 has even been called as ‘recueil d’hymnes liturgiques’; the 4Q502 may have been a part of a wedding ritual; finally, the 4Q511 shows a number of similarities to the *Hodayot* texts, even suggesting the idea of their common authorship.<sup>1</sup> The liturgical background of the latter document is somewhat uncertain and depends on what position one assumes towards the liturgical *Sitz im Leben* as regards the *Hodayot*, i.e. whether these hymns/psalms may also, apart from reflecting their strong individual character, be given communal interpretation<sup>2</sup>. These fragments, however, because of their small size and fragmentation do not contribute much to the understanding of the image of God. The reconstructed texts ‘... toute être vivant...<sup>3</sup> [...I]l (est) [notre] père...’ (4Q502 39, 2–3) and ‘...notre père...<sup>2</sup>... Tu [ne] regardes pas...<sup>3</sup>...manquant...’ (4Q511 127, 1)<sup>3</sup> may possibly be viewed as pointing to the divine fatherhood with a mind to their liturgical application<sup>4</sup>.

The last restored reference אבִי ‘...père...’ (4Q504 1, III, 1)<sup>5</sup> is isolated, and only thanks to the fatherly image of God, portrayed by filial relationships in subsequent verses in the same column (lines 4–7), may be supposed to have originally been applied to God<sup>6</sup>.

There are also two fragments in the book of Jubilees dated between the middle of the second and first century B.C., which may have contained references to God as Father and to Israel as God’s firstborn as it is presented in the Hebrew text reconstructed by VanderKam. The fatherhood of God is made plain by employing the terms בן דניא אב (4QJub<sup>a</sup> = 4Q216 1, 28) and בן בכור (4QJub<sup>a</sup> = 4Q216 2, 20).<sup>7</sup> However, actual definitions for God and Israel are not found in the surviving fragments and are merely restored on the basis of the critical edition of Ethiopic Jubilees prepared and translated by the same author<sup>8</sup>.

## 2. Divine fatherhood as attested to in ‘father-texts’

Apart from the minor references to the divine fatherhood, there are only three texts, which explicitly name God as Father (1QH IX, 35, 4Q372 1, 16, and 4Q460 9i, 6).

### 2.1. The God’s fatherly characteristics in 1QH IX, 35b–36

The reference to the divine fatherhood in 1QH IX, 35 in the second part of the *Hodayot* scroll, which presents the collection of the hymns of praise of the Qumran community

and may roughly be dated between the second century B.C. and first century A.D., is well-legible: *כי אהה אב לכל בני אמתכה* – ‘because you are father to all the [son]s of your truth’ (line 35b).<sup>9</sup> This reference used to be for a long time the only Qumran datum on this point<sup>10</sup>. The phrase of confidence in God’s fatherhood, a continuation and immediate explanation of ‘for my 35 father did not know me, and my mother abandoned me to you’, is just the beginning of a longer declaration of his fatherly-motherly attitude towards his sons and all creation: ‘You rejoice 36 in them, like her who loves her child, and like a wet-nurse you take care of all your creatures on (your) lap’. These words conclude the psalm whose beginning however is not so clear: it is disputable whether columns 8 and 9 should be viewed as one psalm or 1QH IX, 2–36 is to be taken as an independent unit<sup>11</sup>. The definition of the characteristic feature of divine fatherhood in lines 35–36 may vary according to the accentuated expressions: the wet-nurse care for the members of community<sup>12</sup>, the readiness of God the Father to help in time of need<sup>13</sup>, his tenderness and his efficacious protection<sup>14</sup> to those who are faithful to him and, finally, his all-encompassing care for all his creatures. This last aspect points implicitly to the divine and fatherly authority being very characteristic of the right and responsibility of the earthly father of that time. Apart from these very obvious functions of the divine Father, a painstaking analysis of 1Q IX, 35b–36 and of its preceding context done by Strotmann sheds more light on God’s fatherly figure. The following presentation is based on her investigation of this topic.<sup>15</sup>

The saying that God is Father ‘to all the [son]s’ of his truth (line 35b) finds its further explanation and development in line 36. It is very probable that this verse, while explaining ‘how’ the divine fatherhood is being realized with respect to the faithful ones, broadens, at the same time, the sphere of its application, i.e., God is Father of the all creatures as well. Thus line 36 shows the distinction between two groups of addressees of the divine fatherhood: on the one hand God is Father to his faithful sons inasmuch as he presents himself not only as *מרחמת* but also as *אמן* because they are the part of his creatures; on the other hand, God’s manifestation as Father to the rest of his creation is limited to his acting as *אמן*. Such a distinction of God’s fatherly attitude does not contradict those groups but only makes more apparent the privilege of being ranked in the first category. Although a collective understanding of the divine fatherhood is explicitly stated, its individual dimension cannot be excluded. The statement in line 35 about one’s abandonment by his father and mother is very personal and possibly grounded on individual experience, therefore, it seems plausible to consider the acknowledgment of the divine fatherhood to be valid on the personal level as well.

A female presentation of the divine Father and his rejoicing over his children are not usual in Jewish writings of that period; although female feelings and emotions are not totally foreign to the God of the OT. This is especially true about Isa 42:14; 49:15; 66:13; Jer 31:20. It is very probable that Isa 49:14–15 served as a *Vorlage* for 1QH IX, 36: there the theme of abandonment is also connected with *מרחמת*. The divine guarantee in Isa 49:15 portrayed by a female comparison had to assure the exiles that loosing their state and experiencing their actual humiliating conditions provoked by their sins by no means meant the total rejection of Israel. Although God’s fatherly faithfulness to his people is not so explicitly expressed in our text as in the use of *מרחמת* of Second Isaiah, it could hardly be

interpreted otherwise than as one's conviction that God is the only one in whom he can put his trust. The description of God who is Father but rejoices as *eine Frau, die gerade geboren hat* (so Strotmann) in the light of Isa 49:14–15 and Ps 103:13 (also רחם) reveals both his spontaneous and emotional love for the sons of his truth, that has found its best expression in a motherly simile (cf. Isa 49:15), and his responsible and protective love according to the pattern of the earthly father (cf. Ps 103:13). The fact that the fatherhood of God in 1Q IX, 35 is not directly connected with ברחמו, as it is the case of its earthly simile in Ps 103:13, may indicate that the dominant aspect of the divine mercy being appealed to in 1Q IX, 34 is namely his responsible fatherly self-commitment that prevails over his spontaneous yet faithful love. Nevertheless, the aspect of faithfulness of the divine Father in 1Q IX, 35b–36 due to the comparison with Isa 49:15 is given its more profound expression by the motherly image. The comparing of God's activity to the functions of אמן discloses one more important aspect of the divine fatherhood: the care for all creatures including the sons of his truth that consists in nutrition and protection.<sup>16</sup> Thus the feminine portrayal of the divine activity expresses once more his fatherly responsibility for the life of his creation. In addition, the image of a 'wet-nurse' well presents the level of everyone's weakness and dependence upon the divine Father.

Although the theme of divine education is not explicitly stated in connection with the fatherhood of God, and there is not even a particular term for it in 1Q IX, the divine reprimands (lines 9, 23, 24, 33), judgment (lines 9, 10, 31, 34) and afflictions (lines 9, 10, 12, 25) together with the mention of the one's offense (line 13) and finally God's kindness and mercy (lines 10–13, 34) enable us to discern some pattern already known in the OT: God afflicts and forgives; the divine affliction is sometimes interweaved with his educative goal (cf. 2 Sam 7:14; Prov 3:12). Since the theme of the divine fatherhood positively concludes the whole psalm, the image of God who rebukes, judges, and afflicts but who is also a savior (lines 25–29), who has supported the suppliant from his youth (line 32) and has had pity on him (line 34), turns gradually into the figure of the Father whose punitive activity finally proves to be his loving and responsible education.

## 2.2. God as Father in 4Q372 1 and 4Q460 9i<sup>17</sup>

The direct and explicit personal address to God as Father – אבי – is the distinctive feature of these two fragments. Furthermore, not only the phrases in which the divine fatherhood is stated אבי ואליהי (*Apocryphon of Joseph*<sup>b</sup> 4Q372 known also as *Psalm of Joseph*) and וארני אבי (*Narrative Work and Prayer* 4Q460) are similar, the contents in both cases present the common theme of 'non-abandoning' of the one who prays: 'My father, my God, do not abandon me into the hands of the nations' (4Q372 1, 16) and 'f]or you have not abandoned your servant ] my Father and my Lord. vacat' (4Q460 9i, 5–6). There also are some other similarities between these fragments: the texts referring to the divine fatherhood belong to the psalmic poetry and possibly were used in the liturgy<sup>18</sup>; on paleographic grounds both fragments may be dated to the late Hasmonean or early Herodian period; finally, they both present no specific signs of their Qumran sectarian provenience<sup>19</sup>. The identity of those whose prayers are recorded and the occasions they were created are not clear, yet they seem to be different in each case.

The speaking subjects in the *Narrative Work and Prayer* (4Q460) as a whole may point to either the patriarchs or kings or even some prophet<sup>20</sup>. Such an uncertainty also remains in 4Q460 9i. Neither the prayer in the first part of this fragment (lines 2–6), in which one addresses God, nor the second part, in which the addressee is Israel (lines 7–12) gives us any mention about the identity of the speaking subject. Moreover, since the *vacat* at the end of line 6 marks the end of the section the speaking subject in the subsequent section may have not necessarily been the same as in the previous one. Nevertheless, there is a point that sheds some light on the issue in line 5: *‘f]or you have not abandoned your servant’*. It would be more reasonable to see in the figure of בַּר[ the individual who prays rather than Israel, which is only mentioned in the second part (lines 7–12), though the latter possibility in the sight of the OT<sup>21</sup> cannot be excluded<sup>22</sup>. In any case a further specification would be highly speculative. Since this fragment as well as others in 4Q460 shows similarity to the *Hodayot*<sup>23</sup> it is plausible to think about its communal or personal liturgical application in the Qumran community.

The speaker in the poetic part of *Apocryphon of Joseph*<sup>b</sup> (4Q372 1, 16–32) is somewhat clearer. Although there is no explicit mention of Joseph, his name has already been used in the first (narrative) part in lines 10 and 14. The latter reference in line 14 is particularly suggestive for it connects the figure of Joseph, who was consigned to hostile hands, with the beginning of the prayer: *‘and he cried out [and aloud]’* (line 15) *‘he called to God the Mighty to save him from their hands and he said: “My father, my God, do not abandon me into the hands of the nations;’* (line 16). However, the identity of Joseph who cries for help is not in itself instantly recognizable: does it indicate the favorite son of the patriarch Jacob (Gen 37:39–45) or should it be understood only as a figurative language denoting the northern tribes of Israel and their descendants (cf. Josh 16:1–17:8)? If one were to adhere to the latter possibility and to admit that ‘Joseph’, who prays in the second part, is representative of the exiled northern tribes, then the first part of the fragment may be read in the Deuteronomistic historical key according to the scheme sin-exile-return.<sup>24</sup> This way the psalm is a real supplication of the people, which, having abandoned Lord’s ways, try to recover God’s confidence in the face of grief and suffering<sup>25</sup>. On the other hand, this psalm may reflect the post-exilic discussion within the different Jewish groups about who were the true descendants of Joseph and may have even been directed against the Samaritans<sup>26</sup>. At any rate the cry of individual or collective ‘Joseph’ of the Second Temple period shows a structural affinity close to the classical individual lament that possibly was given its actualization in the Qumran community: there is a plea (line 16), the theme of suffering (lines 20–21), and the confidence in the divine deliverance with the ‘vow of praise’ (lines 22–31).

The image of the divine Father in both fragments is principally the same: both psalmists appeal to God’s fatherly fidelity using the same term bz[ plus a negation ‘not’ thus once more confirming this biblical aspect of God’s fatherly image. In 4Q460 9i, 5 this is the only characteristic of the divine Father. As has already been pointed out, line 6 with אַבִּי וְאֵלֹהֵי concludes the section, so the juxtaposition ‘non-abandoning’ to the fatherhood of God at the very end of the prayer underlines the importance of this fatherly characteristic as at least the psalmist understood it. The same fatherly aspect in 4Q372 1, 16 is given its further explanation in line 17: *‘do justice for me, lest the afflicted and poor perish’*. As in the

case of Sir 23:1 so also here the ‘non-abandoning’ seems to have been understood as the first step of divine salvation, and more so since it is anchored on the invocation אבי ואלהי that sets the tone for the whole prayer.

The double personal appeal to the Father and to the Lord אבי ואדני (4Q460 9i)<sup>27</sup> or God אבי ואלהי (4Q372 1) probably reflects the two sides of the psalmist’s experience: the ‘strong’ hand of God by which he was saved or through which he is hoping to be saved and also God’s fatherly disposition towards him that proves itself in ‘non-abandoning’ him<sup>28</sup>. The sixfold list of adjectives in 4Q372 1, 29: ‘For God is great, holy, mighty and majestic, awesome and marvelous...’<sup>29</sup> may be viewed as a complementary to the designation of God as Father<sup>30</sup>.

### 3. Divine fatherhood as presented by filial relationship

There are merely two texts in which God’s fatherly figure is presented by the pattern of filial relationships (4Q246 II, 1 and 4Q504 1, III, 4–7 [4QDibHam<sup>a</sup> 3, 1]).

#### 3.1. The message of 4Q504 1, III, 4–7

The idea of Israel’s uniqueness in being God’s son in this fragment<sup>31</sup> is strongly highlighted by triple בן. The prayer enumerates God’s works: ‘4 We have [in]voked only your name; for your glory you have created us; 5 you have established us as your sons in the sight of all the peoples. For you called 6 [I]srael «my son, my firstborn» and have corrected us as one corrects 7 his son’.<sup>32</sup> The biblical motives of creation (ברא – in line 4 and Isa 43:1, 7) and disciplining (יסר – line 6 and Deut 8:5) the ‘first-born, son’ Israel (בני בכורי – line 6 and Exod 4:22) together with idea of adoption in these lines are quite evident and add actually nothing new to the biblical image of the divine Father. It is worth noting, however, that the two biblical aspects of the divine fatherhood, i.e. salvific (Exod 4:22) and educational (Deut 8:5) are juxtaposed. If the author did it deliberately, keeping in mind their proper contexts, it may well be that he wished to fashion them as far as possible to express his confidence in the positive end of the God-Israel/community relationships. Since salvation (from misery as well), continuous care, and disciplining (including precautionary *In-Zucht-nehmen*<sup>33</sup>) were certainly held as the main activities of God the Father, the appeal to them in the light of Israel’s fall<sup>34</sup> and of the divine anger<sup>35</sup> may have been prompted by the particular needs of the community on the day of the confession of sins<sup>36</sup>. Thus, though this column of the document has no conclusion, the mention of God’s justice at the end of fragment<sup>37</sup> leaves a possibility to speculate about the positive end of this liturgical text.

#### 3.2. The ‘Son of God’ text: 4Q246, II, 1

The Aramaic fragment 4Q246 known as the *Aramaic Apocalypse* or ‘Son of God’ text has been subjected to lengthy discussions and controversial interpretations especially as regards the figure of the son of God which is attested in line 1 of the second column of the document: ברה די אל יחאמר ובר עליין יקרונה – ‘*Il sera dit le fils de Dieu et le fils du Tres-Haut on l'appellera.*’<sup>38</sup> The English rendering of the Aramaic text: ‘*He will be called son of*

*God, and they will call him son of the Most High.*<sup>39</sup> The dating of the document to the last third of the first century (circa 25 B.C.) being proposed before its publication by Milik, has been generally accepted by scholars<sup>40</sup>. The second column, which contains our text, is well preserved but the first one is considerably damaged and this is a real difficulty for the interpretation of the text in the second column as they are closely connected. Despite this, a general scenario in both columns may be presented as follows. Column I: there are two personages one of whom interprets another's (king's) dream; the content of that interpretation is not very clear yet it refers to: the oppression that will come, the carnage in the cities, the kings of Ashur and Egypt, and the emergence of the one who will be great and will be called by this name. Column II: it seems to continue with the titles of the personage mentioned in the first column – he will be called the 'son of God' and 'son of the Most High'; then there will be a short rule of 'those' who will crush everything until the people of God will arise and will establish peace; then (his, its = people?) kingdom will be everlasting, (he, it) will judge the earth; peace will be everywhere and (his, its) strength will be God himself and everybody will pay (him, it) homage; then there will be a war in which God will battle on (his, its) side and will cast all the nations before him (it); then (his, its) sovereignty will be an everlasting sovereignty. Although the eschatological-apocalyptic character of the text is quite visible and have some parallels with biblical Dan 3:33; 4:31; 7:14; 7:27 scholars disagree on what extent our text may be dependent on Daniel and especially how the figures of the son of man in Daniel and the 'son of God' in the *Aramaic Apocalypse* should be interpreted, as well as what they represent with regard to the people of the holy ones (Dan 7:27) and the people of God (4Q246, II, 4). These and other uncertainties<sup>41</sup> in 4Q246 have prompted a whole range of different interpretations. They have been evaluated and even reciprocally criticized essentially by García Martínez<sup>42</sup>, Puech<sup>43</sup>, Fitzmyer<sup>44</sup>, and Collins<sup>45</sup>. There are arguments *for* and *against* every interpretation, yet least probable of all appears to be that in which one sees in the personage of the 'son of God' and 'son of the Most High' the figure of a certain Jewish 'Antichrist' (so Flusser). There are four principal directions of interpretation:

1. The mysterious personage to who the honorific titles have been applied is intended to be a historical Seleucid king, Alexander Balas, son of Antiochus Epiphanes (so Milik) or even Antiochus Epiphanes himself (so Puech). In this case the usurpation of the titles is seen in a negative sense; the people of God (col. II, 5–9) will be restored and guided by God himself or his angel. The third singular suffix from col. II, 5 onwards may refer to a certain personage in a collective sense.<sup>46</sup>

2. The 'son of God' and 'son of the Most High' is an eschatological heavenly personage, an almost divinized Messiah who through the power of God will bring salvation, judge the earth etc. (third singular suffix col. II, 5–9). He is similar to the figure of Melchizedek of 11QMelch or to the son of man of Dan 7.<sup>47</sup>

3. The text speaks positively about the future Jewish ruler, perhaps of the Hasmonean dynasty, which will be a successor to the Davidic throne without, however, being envisaged as a Messiah. To him eventually should be attributed the activity described in col. II, 5–9.<sup>48</sup>

4. The text announces the coming of the Messiah whose divine sonship should be

understood in terms of the biblical pattern: he is a human being who stands in a special relationship to God as a Davidic king.<sup>49</sup>

The first two interpretations add little to the concept of the divine Father in the fragments of Qumran. The last two are similar as they both interpret the 'son of God' and 'son of the Most High' in a historical and positive sense. The difference as to whether the titles reflect the messianic character of the future Davidic king or not<sup>50</sup> changes nothing as regards his relationship to God, at least as the document presents it. The text gives us just one characteristic those relationships reflect: '*the great God is his strength*' (col. II, 7). If we are to accept that in col. II, 5–9 the third person singular is to be understood the 'son of God', then the phrase '*the great God is his strength*' (line 7) that points primarily to the king's power over the nations and their subjection (lines 8–9) may also be regarded as the focal point of his every activity: judging the earth in truth (line 5–6), assuring peace (line 6), and receiving homage from every province (line 7). The biblical pattern as it is presented in Ps 2 and Ps 89 is well recognizable in our text. As in the OT so in our text the king's being the son of God reveals the dependence of his welfare and victories upon the divine authority.

#### 4. Divine fatherhood as alluded to by similes

There are two texts in which the term *ba* is put into comparison (*bak*): in one fragment God is explicitly compared with a father (4Q379 18, 4); in the other one the divine subject (4Q378 6i, 8) may only be supposed. These fragments belong to the two versions of the *Apocryphon of Joshua*<sup>a-b</sup> (4Q378–379), which represent a certain example of the 'rewritten Bible' and may be dated from the second (4Q379) to the late first (4Q378) century B.C.<sup>51</sup> The simile in *Apocryphon of Joshua*<sup>b</sup> (4Q379 18, 4) not only gives evidence to the fatherhood of God but also bears witness to another important idea. Although the fragmentary sentence אהיית לי אדנינו כאב א – 'to ]be for me, O o[ur] Lord, like a father'<sup>52</sup> has neither a beginning nor a conclusion, its inner meaning is clear enough: one is appealing to this God of 'o[urs]' to be/act towards him like a father. A plea to God to be/act as a father in favor of a certain individual is a real novelty compared even with the biblical image of the divine Father. The problem is that the fragment gives no further explanation as to what *content* had been meant by this appeal, i.e. what may have been addressed to as God's fatherly characteristic in a particular context. Nevertheless, there are some indications in the text, which in connection with line 4 may be useful in giving some suggestion: '*I will trust in you*' (line 3), '*God your words I will guard*' (line 5), '*in the decr[ee] of Elyon you have given understanding*' (line 6), '*I will show trustworthy with [all] your words*' (line 7). Newsom points out that the diction of lines 4–7 is evocative of the Ps 19 and Ps 119, and if the speaker is supposed to be Joshua the inspiration for our text may have been Josh 1:8 where the importance of Torah and the necessity to do all that is written in it is quite stressed.<sup>53</sup> The fatherhood of God in Ps 19 and Ps 119 is not referred to, yet the prayer's attitude towards God's words and statutes is similarly but more expressively stated than in our fragment (especially Ps 119). Furthermore, the content of the prayer's appeal in Ps 19:12–13 is very explicit: to be cleared from hidden faults and protected from presumptuous sins. The plea in Ps 119 is even more persistent: the main accent is over and over again placed on the importance of one's being



taught the divine statutes and being given understanding of the divine precepts.<sup>54</sup> Even the traditional cry for salvation from the wicked, for deliverance and life, is submitted and employed to underline the exceptional weight of those ideas. This enables one to suppose that the appeal to God to be/act as a father in our text may also have been intended in this sense, i.e., to teach his statutes and to give understanding to his words. If it is true, it will be the first case God's fatherhood is so clearly associated with his teaching faculty.<sup>55</sup> The meaning of the simile כֵּאֲב in *Apocryphon of Joshua*<sup>a</sup> (4Q378 6i, 8) is much more obscure than in the previous case. The occasion of the phrases in the manuscript as well as the identity of the speaker burdens the interpretation. As well as in 4Q379 the verse containing comparison is without a beginning and a conclusion: ] רַ [ - ' ] d[ ]mh and like a father would speak to his son'.<sup>56</sup> The other problem is the absence of the subject who is addressing his son. The preceding verses give no indication of the presence of the divine subject. Our verse is the last one in this fragment and seems to have little sense in connection with the preceding ones whose content consists of the references to 'a prayer on behalf of our sins' (line 4), to 'do not be like my brothers [who] go down' (line 5), to 'your [gu]ilt' and 'woe to you my brothers' (line 7). According to Newsom these pessimistic phrases may have been a part of a certain admonition, modeled in a manner similar to the Moses' discourse in Deut 1–3, and given by Joshua because of the people's reluctance to enter the land (Num 13–14). Such admonition probably consisted of the remembrance of the rebellions in the wilderness and served to motivate the people before they had to cross the Jordan.<sup>57</sup> This does not yet resolve the problem of the subject in line 8 but it gives at least an idea of the possible context of our phrase. In the Moses' speech in Deut 1:31 there is a comparison whose subject is very clear: 'and in the wilderness, where you saw how the LORD your God carried you, just as one carries a child,' (NRS). This verse in Deuteronomy constitutes part of the recollection of reprimands to the people given by Moses because of its lack of confidence in God's promises and its reluctance to enter the promised land. If it is the same occasion in our fragment, the figure of the father who speaks to his son may have been intended to be God who accompanied his people in the wilderness and spoke to it through Moses. The trace of such a 'God's speaking to his people in the wilderness' tradition is also visible in a prophetic announcement (Hos 2:16). Some support for our hypothesis may perhaps be found even in our fragment: 'for ever his deeds; for to its ages' (line 6). This abrupt verse stands between two statements (lines 5 and 7 see above), which both refer to the miserable situation of 'my brothers'. If as it has been suggested the speaker should be understood as being Joshua, line 6 may have served as a certain admonition that pointed to God's deeds, which endure forever. This way 'my brothers' is nothing more than a figurative expression of Israel whose relationship with God is likened to filial father-son rapports. One more point for this interpretative line might be the similarity of vocabulary of our document (4Q378) compared with 4Q379 and 4Q460 in which the word 'father' clearly refers to the divine fatherhood, even though the terms and parallels in these documents do not prove the dependence of one work on another.<sup>58</sup> In a word, if the simile of the 'father's speaking to his son' in our fragment points to God's fatherly image, it confirms the salvific and educational aspect of the divine fatherhood with which the desert experience had usually been connected.

## Conclusion

Having made the distinction in this brief study between the ‘father-texts’ and the texts in which the divine fatherhood is presented by filial relationships as well as by a simile, we also find proof of the texts’ different presentation of God’s fatherly activity. This is quite obvious observing the specific characteristics with which the divine fatherhood is connected in different groups. The examined texts reveal three principal aspects in which the image of God as Father is built up: his educational and teaching activity (4Q504 1, III, 4Q378–379), his strength (4Q246), and his ‘non-abandoning’ position (‘father-texts’). It is obvious that in all these texts the salvific aspect is kept in mind although not verbally expressed, yet the ‘father-texts’ deserve special attention. The analysis of the ‘father-texts’ shows that the ‘non-abandoning’ attitude of God as Father towards the people or individuals is to be considered as his basic characteristic. This fatherly image is clearly expressed not only in 4Q372 1 and 4Q460 9i but also in 1QH IX. Whereas in the first two documents God is being implored not to abandon or is being declared as one who is not doing so, the *Hodayot* text highlights the importance of this fatherly characteristic describing it from a human point of view: ‘*my mother abandoned me to you*’ (line 35).<sup>59</sup> The real point of this ‘complaint’ in the light of the subsequent acknowledgment in the same line ‘*because you are father to all...*’ is evident: God does not act in this way. The activity of the divine Father described in a motherly manner (line 36) even more emphasizes the magnitude of this fatherly aspect. In 4Q372 1 and 4Q460 9i the ‘non-abandoning’ is directly explained as protection from enemies; in 1QH IX the protection being an inner quality of such a divine attitude is portrayed as God’s fatherly responsibility for the life of his faithful and all his creation. The Qumran texts reveal another important point with regard to who stands in relationships with God the Father. The accent is put more on the individual(s) than on the people, as is common in the Hebrew Bible. The plea of the individual ‘*to /be for me, O o[ur] Lord, like a father*’ (4Q379 18, 4) has no parallels in the OT and shows the tendency to transfer the collective religious values (*O o[ur] Lord*) to the personal level. Yet the most significant feature is the manner one addresses God as Father. The very personal invocation *אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִי וְאֵלֵהֶי* in 4Q372 1, 16 and acknowledgment or invocation *אֲבִי וְאֵלֵהֶי* in 4Q460 9i,<sup>60</sup> not only bring a fresh air into the understanding of God’s relationships with an individual<sup>61</sup> but also add a new aspect regarding their contents. Since both addresses to the divine Father are closely connected with his ‘non-abandoning’ attitude, the personal invocation ‘*My Father*’ gives even more emphasis to the intimate character of the relationships between God and man.

## REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup> Cf. *Baillet M.* Qumrân grotte 4, III (4Q 482 – 4Q 520). Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan VII. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1982. P. 219–220.
- <sup>2</sup> For the problematic discussion about the author(s), the conception of ‘I’, and eventually the *Sitz im Leben* of the *Hodayot*, see *Holm-Nielsen S.* *Hodayot. Psalms from Qumran.* Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget. 1960. P. 316–348. The author believes there should have been more than one author of

- those psalms (p. 324), and insists on their liturgical use within the Qumran community (p. 348). Differently, Delcor, considers them individual thanksgiving songs (*Danklieder*) having been composed by the ‘Teacher of Righteousness’. With regard to their *Sitz im Leben* he strongly criticizes the proposal of Bo Reicke (psalms were basically composed for the cult) and less that of Bardtke (the psalms served didactic purposes). Although the author finds no psalm endowed with a special cultic framework, he admits some of them as possibly sung during the night service in the Qumran community (reading the Scripture and praying). On the other hand, he does not exclude their role in the field of individual piety; see *Delcor M. Les Hymnes de Qumran* (Hodayot). Paris: Letouzey et Ané. 1962. P. 19–26.
- <sup>3</sup> *Baillet M. Qumrân grotte 4, III. P. 91, 257.* These fragments are not included in the recent and comprehensive edition of the Dead Sea scrolls – The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition. 2 vols. / eds. F. García Martínez, E. J. C. Tigchelaar. Leiden: E. J. Brill – Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans. 1997, 1998.
- <sup>4</sup> So *Strotmann A. “Mein Vater bist du!”* (Sir 51, 10). Zur Bedeutung der Vaterschaft Gottes in kanonischen und nichtkanonischen frühjüdischen Schriften. Frankfurter Theologische Studien 39. Frankfurt: Verlag Josef Knecht. 1991. P. 330.
- <sup>5</sup> *Baillet M. Qumrân grotte 4, III. P. 141–142.*
- <sup>6</sup> Noteworthy, that this restoration “[...] yba 1” is given no translation “1...[...]” in The Dead Sea Scrolls. V. 2. P. 1014–1015.
- <sup>7</sup> See *VanderKam J. C., Milik J. T. The First Jubilees Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication // Journal of Biblical Literature 110 (2). 1991. P. 256, 266f., 269.*
- <sup>8</sup> Cf. *VanderKam J. C. The Book of Jubilees. 2 vols. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 510–511, Scriptorum Aetiopici 87–88. Louvain: E. Peeters. 1989. V. 2 (CSCO 511), pp. 6, 13.*
- <sup>9</sup> If not stated otherwise the Hebrew and English texts in this paragraph are taken from The Dead Sea Scrolls. V. 1. P. 182–183.
- <sup>10</sup> So, for instance *Jeremias J. The Prayers of Jesus. Studies in Biblical Theology II, 6. London: SCM Press. 1967. P. 19; Marchel W. Abba, Père! La Prière du Christ et des Chrétiens. Analecta Biblica 19A. Rome: Biblical Institute Press. 1971<sup>2</sup>. P. 86; Boer P. A. H. de. Fatherhood and Motherhood in Israelite and Judean Piety. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1974. P. 16; Schlosser J. Le Dieu de Jésus. Lectio Divina 129. Paris: Cerf. 1987. P. 116; Panimolle S. A. La paternità di Dio nei documenti letterari dell’Antico giudaismo // Dizionario di spiritualità biblico-patristica. Abbà-Padre. Vol. 1. Roma: Borla. 1992. P. 69–70.*
- <sup>11</sup> For different opinions and the problematic of the individual and communal character of this thanksgiving praise-psalm (*Lehrerlieder, Gemeindelieder*) see *Strotmann A. “Mein Vater bist du!”* (Sir 51, 10). P. 338–339.
- <sup>12</sup> So *Delcor M. Les Hymnes de Qumran* (Hodayot). P. 223.
- <sup>13</sup> So *Jeremias J. The Prayers of Jesus. P. 19.*
- <sup>14</sup> So *Schlosser J. Le Dieu de Jésus. P. 116.*
- <sup>15</sup> For a detailed analysis see *Strotmann A. “Mein Vater bist du!”* (Sir 51, 10). P. 340–359.
- <sup>16</sup> Both of these features may also be retraced in Num 11:12 in which the term !ma also occurs. There the theme of ‘eating’ in the desert context is coupled with God’s promises to bring the people to the promised land.
- <sup>17</sup> In the preliminary concordance the numbering of the fragments of this document was different: our fragment was counted as fifth; cf. *Wacholder B. Z., Abegg M. G. A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four. V. 3. Biblical Archaeological Society. Washington. 1995. P. 344–347.* The present numbering is given by *Larson E. 460. 4QNarrative Work and Prayer // Qumran Cave 4, XXVI. Cryptic Texts, Miscellanea. Part 1. Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan XXXVI. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 2000. P. 369–386.*
- <sup>18</sup> This is especially true for 4Q372 1.
- <sup>19</sup> Though there is a possibility to see another reference to the divine fatherhood in 4Q372 1, 26 בלן כך though there is a possibility to see another reference to the divine fatherhood in 4Q372 1, 26 בלן כך by reading אלהי ייחוד אלהי ייחוד instead of אלהי ייחוד, yet according to Schuller the restoration with אלהי ייחוד

- is more likely. In a more recent edition of García Martínez there is no restoration in line 26: [...]... [.]אבא; The Dead Sea Scrolls. V. 1, P. 736; cf. Schuller E. M. 4Q372 1: A Text About Joseph // *Revue de Qumran* 14 (55). 1990. P. 349–355, 365; Larson E. 460. 4QNarrative Work and Prayer. P. 370, 372, 382–383; Schuller E. M. The Psalm of 4Q372 1 Within the Context of Second Temple Prayer // *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 54 (1). 1992. P. 67–70. In the latter article Schuller instead of ‘my father, my God’ translates ‘my father and my God’.
- <sup>20</sup> So Larson E. 460. 4QNarrative Work and Prayer. P. 374.
- <sup>21</sup> Cf. Isa 41:8–9; 44:21; 49:3; Ps 136:22.
- <sup>22</sup> Cf. Larson E. 460. 4QNarrative Work and Prayer. P. 383.
- <sup>23</sup> Ibidem. P. 372.
- <sup>24</sup> Cf. Schuller E. M. 4Q372 1: A Text About Joseph. P. 367–370.
- <sup>25</sup> Cf. Allegue J. V. !Abba Padre! (4Q372 1, 16). Dios como Padre en Qumrán // *Estudios Trinitarios* 32. 1998. P. 177.
- <sup>26</sup> The dating of 4Q372 1 to the late Hasmonean or early Herodian period does not reflect the actual date of the composition of this psalm. According to Schuller it was probably composed circa 200 B.C. For a full discussion see Schuller E. M. 4Q372 1: A Text About Joseph. P. 371–376.
- <sup>27</sup> As the beginning of line 5 is not preserved it is impossible to know whether אבא יאדוני should be taken as invocation or as a simple acknowledgment.
- <sup>28</sup> Schuller also speaks about the twofold ‘strong-kind’ aspect that may be drawn from ‘my father and my God’ in 4Q372 1, 16. The author observes that the subsequent lines of the psalm give credit to such an interpretation: ‘strong’ – “[your fin]ger is greater and stronger than anything in the world” (line 18); ‘kind’ – “your mercies are abundant your kindness great” (line 19); Schuller E. M. The Psalm of 4Q372 1 Within the Context of Second Temple Prayer. P. 79. It may however well be that a certain tendency to relate the theme of ‘non-abandoning’ to the fatherhood of God in the late biblical literature (Sir 23:1; 51:10) and our cases (also observed by Schuller) reflects the growing understanding about the significance of such a characteristic as being proper to the fatherly attitude of God. This way the ‘non-abandoning’ attitude in the logical order is the source of God’s fatherly mercies and kindness and not vice versa.
- <sup>29</sup> All these designations for God seem to be a certain widening of the biblical traditional formulation (cf. Deut 7:21; 10:17; Jer 32:18; Neh 1:5; 4:8; 9:32; Dan 9:4) from the deuteronomistic background; their adjoining does not violate the traditional presentation on the transcendence of God; cf. Schuller E. M. The Psalm of 4Q372 1 Within the Context of Second Temple Prayer. P. 72–75.
- <sup>30</sup> So Allegue J. V. !Abba Padre! (4Q372 1, 16). P. 182.
- <sup>31</sup> The title and the date of its composition have already been mentioned in the section 1.
- <sup>32</sup> If not stated otherwise the English texts in this paragraph are taken from The Dead Sea Scrolls. V. 2. P. 1015. In this translation ~ynbw that in the Hebrew text belongs to line 4 is transferred to line 5. Baillet’s translation retains the original order: ‘4... Tu nous as créés, et de fils 5 Tu nous as donné le rang aux yeux de toutes les nations’. Baillet M. Qumrán grotte 4, III. P. 142.
- <sup>33</sup> Strotmann uses this phrase in connection with a precautionary aspect of divine education: do not allow the people to take a position opposite to God. The second aspect of that education was to let the Israelites know that God took care of and loved them; cf. Strotmann A. “Mein Vater bist du!” (Sir 51, 10). P. 334.
- <sup>34</sup> This is suggested by lines 13b–17: ‘so that evil would [over]take us in the last 14 days. Because [...] 15 and our kings, for [...] 16 to take [our] daughters [...] 17 and they acted pervertedly with [...]’.
- <sup>35</sup> Lines 10b–11: ‘For that reason you have poured on us your rage 11 [and] your [jealousy] with all the intensity of your anger’.
- <sup>36</sup> So Baillet M. Qumrán grotte 4, III. P. 137. The document 4Q504 1 according to him was used in a liturgical service throughout the whole week; the text in our column would have been recited on Friday, the day of the confession of sins.
- <sup>37</sup> Line 20: ‘You are just for [...]’.
- <sup>38</sup> The first official publication of the entire document was done by Puech É. Fragment d’une Apoca-

- lypse en araméen (4Q246=pseudo-Dan<sup>d</sup>) et le « Royaume de Dieu » // *Revue Biblique* 99 (1). 1992. P. 98–131. For the whole Aramaic text and its French rendering see pp. 106–109.
- <sup>39</sup> The translation is taken from *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. V. 1. P. 495. The other English renderings of this line are substantially the same; cf. *García Martínez F.* *Qumran and Apocalyptic*. Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 9. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1992. P. 164; *Fitzmyer J. A.* 4Q246: The “Son of God” Document from Qumran // *Biblica* 74 (1). 1993. P. 155; *Collins J. J.* *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. New York: Doubleday. 1995. P. 155; *Cross F. M.* Notes on the Doctrine of the Two Messiahs at Qumran and the Extracanonical Daniel Apocalypse (4Q246) // *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1996. P. 7.
- <sup>40</sup> Cf. *García Martínez F.* *Qumran and Apocalyptic*. P. 162; *Puech É.* Fragment d’une Apocalypse en araméen. P. 105; *Fitzmyer J. A.* 4Q246: The “Son of God”. P. 156; *Collins J. J.* *The Scepter and the Star*. P. 154.
- <sup>41</sup> *García Martínez* underlines three most important elements which one should clarify to understand the meaning of 4Q246: the uncertainty about the character of the future events (historical or apocalyptic); the identity of the mysterious personage who is given the titles (including how he is presented – positively or negatively); to whom refer the third singular suffix from II, 5 onwards (to the people or the mysterious personage); cf. *García Martínez F.* *Qumran and Apocalyptic*. P. 168. *Puech* adds some more questions: “Qui parle? devant quel roi? Dieu, un roi païen, un davidide? Le personnage mystérieux est-il le/un fils du roi, un roi et lequel? un ange, l’Antichrist?”; *Puech É.* Fragment d’une Apocalypse en araméen. P. 123. *Fitzmyer* summarizes and speaks about the sixfold difficulty of interpreting our text: “(a) Who is the speaker and whom does he address? (b) Are the references to the “king of Assyria” and to “Egypt” and the plurals being used allusions to historical figures or situations, or are they references similar to “the Kittim of Assyria” and “the Kittim in Egypt” in another apocalyptic text, 1QM 1, 2.4? (c) If they are to be taken in an apocalyptic sense rather than in a historical sense, can one say to whom they refer? (d) Who is X, the person of whom the titles are used? (e) Is X to be understood in a positive or negative sense? (f) To who does the third singular masculine in 2, 5–9 refer? Is it the “people of God” (2, 4) or X, the expected person?” *Fitzmyer J. A.* 4Q246: The “Son of God”. P. 167.
- <sup>42</sup> Cf. *García Martínez F.* *Qumran and Apocalyptic*. P. 168–172.
- <sup>43</sup> Cf. *Puech É.* Fragment d’une Apocalypse en araméen. P. 123–125; see also *Puech É.* 246. 4QApocryphe de Daniel ar // *Qumran Cave 4, XVII. Parabiblical Texts. Part 3. Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan XXII*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1996. P. 179–180
- <sup>44</sup> Cf. *Fitzmyer J. A.* 4Q246: The “Son of God”. P. 167–170.
- <sup>45</sup> Cf. *Collins J. J.* *The Scepter and the Star*. P. 155–157.
- <sup>46</sup> Cf. *Puech É.* Fragment d’une Apocalypse en araméen. P. 127–130; see also his article *Puech É.* Notes sur le Fragment d’Apocalypse 4Q246 – « Le Fils de Dieu » // *Revue Biblique* 101 (4). 1994. P. 548–552, and *Puech É.* 246. 4QApocryphe de Daniel ar. P. 181–183. It may be noted that the author does not devote himself completely to such an interpretation; he also sees good reasons for the messianic explanation of the text.
- <sup>47</sup> Cf. *García Martínez F.* *Qumran and Apocalyptic*. P. 172–179. In a later publication he defends his position yet recognizes that the term ‘angelic’ used by him earlier to describe the nature of the eschatological messiah was not very appropriate and changes it to ‘heavenly’ which may mean human and heavenly at the same time as in case of Melchizedek; see his article *García Martínez F.* Two Messianic Figures in the Qumran Texts // *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1996. P. 27–30.
- <sup>48</sup> Cf. *Fitzmyer J. A.* 4Q246: The “Son of God”. P. 171–174.
- <sup>49</sup> Cf. *Collins J. J.* *The Scepter and the Star*. P. 163–169; cf. also *Cross F. M.* Notes on the Doctrine of the Two Messiahs. P. 10–13. *Collins* observes that in an apocalyptic context the distinction between divine and human is somewhat fluid and the designations ‘son of God’ and ‘son of the Most High’ may imply that the entitled personage “is not an ordinary mortal.” (p. 168).
- <sup>50</sup> At this point the citation of 2 Sam 7:14 in 4Q174, I, 11 [4QFlor] along with a new interpretative

application of the divine fatherhood is very helpful: “I will be a father to him and he will be a son to me. This (refers to the) « branch of David », who will arise with the Interpreter of the law who 12 [will rise up] in Zi[on in] the [l]ast days...”. The Dead Sea Scrolls. V. 1. P. 353. Thus the identification of one to whom God promises to be a father with the ‘branch’ that in its turn is called the Messiah of Righteousness in 4Q252 [4QpGen] allows speaking about the future Davidic king (the ‘son of God’ and ‘son of the Most High’) in messianic terms; cf. *Collins J. J.* The Scepter and the Star. P. 164.

- <sup>51</sup> Cf. *Newsom C.* Apocryphon of Joshua // Qumran Cave 4, XVII. Parabiblical Texts. Part 3. Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan XXII. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1996. P. 237, 241, 263.
- <sup>52</sup> The Hebrew and English text has been presented by *Newsom C.* Apocryphon of Joshua. P. 275–276.
- <sup>53</sup> Cf. *Newsom C.* Apocryphon of Joshua. P. 276.
- <sup>54</sup> It may be noted that of 9 cases the form לְמַדְנִי (*teach me*) is employed in the OT the 7 are in Ps 119.
- <sup>55</sup> The OT image of the divine Father who disciplines and corrects his son(s) *in praxis* may have already intended his fatherly teaching; nevertheless, there is no text in the OT that presents it explicitly.
- <sup>56</sup> *Newsom C.* Apocryphon of Joshua. P. 247–248.
- <sup>57</sup> Cf. *Ibidem.* P. 247.
- <sup>58</sup> The table of phrases and parallels in Hebrew see in *Larson E.* 460. 4QNarrative Work and Prayer. P. 373.
- <sup>59</sup> The same verb עִזַּב is employed in all three documents.
- <sup>60</sup> For the אָבִי וְאֲדֹנָי see a note in the section 2.
- <sup>61</sup> The closest example in the OT is in Sir 51:10 (in Hebrew) וְאֲדֹנָי אֲבִי אֲהָהּ, yet it must be considered as an acknowledgment and not as a direct invocation as it is in our case.

## LITERATURE AND SOURCES

1. *Allegue J. V.* !Abba Padre! (4Q372 1, 16). Dios como Padre en Qumrán // Estudios Trinitarios 32. 1998. P. 167–186.
2. *Baillet M.* Qumrán grotte 4, III (4Q 482 – 4Q 520). Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan VII. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1982.
3. *Boer P. A. H. de.* Fatherhood and Motherhood in Israelite and Judean Piety. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1974.
4. *Collins J. J.* The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature. New York: Doubleday. 1995.
5. *Cross F. M.* Notes on the Doctrine of the Two Messiahs at Qumran and the Extracanonical Daniel Apocalypse (4Q246) // Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1996. P. 1–13.
6. Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls / eds. D. W. Parry, S. D. Ricks. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1996.
7. *Delcor M.* Les Hymnes de Qumran (Hodayot). Paris: Letouzey et Ané. 1962.
8. *Fitzmyer J. A.* 4Q246: The “Son of God” Document from Qumran // *Biblica* 74 (1). 1993. P. 153–174.
9. *García Martínez F.* Qumran and Apocalyptic. Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 9. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1992.
10. *García Martínez F.* Two Messianic Figures in the Qumran Texts // Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1996. P. 14–40.
11. *Holm-Nielsen S.* Hodayot. Psalms from Qumran. Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget. 1960.
12. *Jeremias J.* The Prayers of Jesus. Studies in Biblical Theology II, 6. London: SCM Press. 1967.
13. *Larson E.* 460. 4QNarrative Work and Prayer // Qumran Cave 4, XXVI. Cryptic Texts, Miscellanea. Part 1.

- Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan XXXVI. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 2000. P. 369–386.
14. *Marchel W.* Abba, Père! La Prière du Christ et des Chrétiens. *Analecta Biblica* 19A. Rome: Biblical Institute Press. 1971<sup>2</sup>.
  15. *Newsom C.* Apocryphon of Joshua // *Qumran Cave 4, XVII. Parabiblical Texts. Part 3. Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan XXII.* Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1996. P. 237–288.
  16. *Panimolle S. A.* La paternità di Dio nei documenti letterari dell'Antico giudaismo // *Dizionario di spiritualità biblico-patristica. Abbà-Padre. Vol. 1.* Roma: Borla. 1992. P. 67–81.
  17. *Puech É.* Fragment d'une Apocalypse en araméen (4Q246=pseudo-Dan<sup>d</sup>) et le « Royaume de Dieu » // *Revue Biblique* 99 (1). 1992. P. 98–131.
  18. *Puech É.* Notes sur le Fragment d'Apocalypse 4Q246 – « Le Fils de Dieu » // *Revue Biblique* 101 (4). 1994. P. 533–558.
  19. *Puech É.* 246. 4QApocryphe de Daniel ar // *Qumran Cave 4, XVII. Parabiblical Texts. Part 3. Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan XXII.* Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1996. P. 165–184.
  20. *Qumran Cave 4, XXVI. Cryptic Texts. Miscellanea, Part 1. Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan XXXVI / eds. S. J. Pfann, P. Alexander.* Oxford: Clarendon Press. 2000.
  21. *Qumran Cave 4, XVII. Parabiblical Texts, Part 3. Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan XXII / eds. G. Brooke et al.* Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1996.
  22. *Schlösser J.* Le Dieu de Jésus. *Lectio Divina* 129. Paris: Cerf. 1987.
  23. *Schuller E. M.* 4Q372 1: A Text About Joseph // *Revue de Qumran* 14 (55). 1990. P. 349–376.
  24. *Schuller E. M.* The Psalm of 4Q372 1 Within the Context of Second Temple Prayer // *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 54 (1). 1992. P. 67–79.
  25. *Strotmann A.* "Mein Vater bist du!" (Sir 51, 10). Zur Bedeutung der Vaterschaft Gottes in kanonischen und nichtkanonischen frühjüdischen Schriften. *Frankfurter Theologische Studien* 39. Frankfurt: Verlag Josef Knecht. 1991.
  26. *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition. 2 vols. / eds. F. García Martínez, E. J. C. Tigchelaar.* Leiden: E. J. Brill – Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans. 1997, 1998.
  27. *VanderKam J. C.* The Book of Jubilees. 2 vols. *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* 510–511, *Scriptores Aetiopici* 87–88. Louvain: E. Peeters. 1989.
  28. *VanderKam J. C., Milik J. T.* The First *Jubilees* Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication // *Journal of Biblical Literature* 110 (2). 1991. P. 243–270.
  29. *VanderKam J. C., Milik J. T.* Jubilees // *Qumran Cave 4, VII. Parabiblical Texts. Part 1. Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan XIII,* Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1994. P. 1–185.
  30. *Wacholder B. Z., Abegg M. G.* A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four. V. 3. *Biblical Archeological Society.* Washington. 1995.

Gauta: 2009 06 16

Parengta spaudai: 2010 03 08

Arvydas KASČIUKAITIS

## DIEVO KAIP TĖVO ĮVAIZDIS KUMRANO RAŠTUOSE

S a n t r a u k a

Kumrane rastiems rankraščiams tyrinėti įvairių sričių mokslininkai skiria tikrai nemažai dėmesio. Biblijos tyrinėtojams ši raštija suteikia galimybę pamatyti vėlyvojo judaizmo religines tendencijas tiek tęstinumo su Senoju Testamentu, tiek naujų apraiškų atsiradimo prasme, kurios, manoma, galėjo turėti įtakos ir kai kurioms Naujojo Testamento idėjoms. Dievo tėvystės idėja Senajame Testamente yra gana išplėta: kalbama ir apie individą, ir apie žmonių grupę, ir apie visą tautą. Būtent pastarosios atžvilgiu Dievo tėvystės koncepcija yra labiausiai išplėta. Naujajame Testamente Dievas yra Tėvas pirmiausia todėl, kad jis yra Jėzaus iš Nazareto Tėvas. Būtent per Jėzaus sūnybę jį tikintys taip pat tampa Dievo sūnumis ir dukromis. Kumrano raštijoje apie Dievo tėvystę sužinome iš įvairių dokumentų: liturginių himnų (giesmių), apokrifų, apokalipsės. Didžiausia

problema ta, kad didžioji tekstų dalis yra fragmentiška, trūksta raidžių ir žodžių. Straipsnyje pateikiami visi Kumrane rasti dokumentai, kuriuose galima įžvelgti nuorodą į Dievo tėvišką įvaizdį. Šie tekstai restauruoti ir publikuoti skirtingu metu, todėl tikslinga visus juos pateikti drauge. Iš tekstų analizės, kuri buvo atlikta remiantis nuorodomis, susijusiomis su Dievu „tėvu“, „sūnumi“, „kaip tėvu“, galima daryti kelias svarbias išvadas. Visų pirma Dievo kaip Tėvo funkcija atskleidžia tris pagrindinius jo veiklos aspektus: auklėjimą ir mokymą, jo galią, ir atsakingą bei rūpestingą poziciją, kurią galima pavadinti „neapleidimo“ nuostata. Būtent pastaroji labiausiai pabrėžiama tuose tekstuose, kur tiesiogiai minimas terminas „tėvas“ Dievo atžvilgiu. Galima sakyti, kad tai bene svarbiausia Dievo tėvystės charakteristika, kuri apima ne tik žmones, bet ir visą kūriniją. „Neapleidimas“ yra suprantamas ir kaip apsauga nuo priešų, ir kaip motiniškos meilės savo kūdikiui išraiška. Kitas ne mažiau svarbus dalykas yra Dievo kaip Tėvo santykis su individu. Lyginant su Senoju Testamentu, nagrinėtuose tekstuose jis yra asmeniškėnis. Šių santykių kulminacija pasiekama keliuose pasakymuose, kuriuose individas šaukiasi (4Q372 1, 16) arba šaukiasi (pripažįsta) (4Q460 9i, 6) Dievo(ą) žodžiais „mano Tėve“.

---

PAGRINDINIAI ŽODŽIAI: Dievas kaip Tėvas, sūnus, atsakomybė, ištikimybė, neapleisti.

KEY WORDS: God as Father, son, responsibility, fidelity, non-abandoning.

---

**Arvydas KASČIUKAITIS** – kunigas, biblinės teologijos licenciatas, Katalikų teologijos fakulteto Vytauto Didžiojo universitete lektorius asistentas. Mokslinių interesų kryptys: Naujasis Testamentas, ypač Pauliaus laišakai ir Jono tradicija, bei parabolinė literatūra. Adresas: Naujoji g. 6, 46114 Kaunas. Tel. +370 677 23 929. El. paštas arvido@libero.it.

**Arvydas KASČIUKAITIS** – priest, licentiate in biblical theology, a lector assistant at the Faculty of Catholic theology at Vytautas Magnus university in Kaunas. Fields of scientific interests: New Testament, especially Pauline letters and Johannine tradition and Para biblical literature. Address: Naujoji g. 6, 46114 Kaunas. Phone +370 677 23 929. E-mail: arvido@libero.it.