

וְאֵנִי לֹא אֶחָדָם עַל-
הַעֵינַיִם הַגְּדוֹלִים אֲשֶׁר
יִשְׁ-בָּהּ הַרְבֵּה מִשְׁתַּ



Journal of
HEBREW SCRIPTURES



VOLUME 24 | ARTICLE 7

JANSON CONDREN

The End of Desire: On the Meaning of
תְּשׁוּקָה *in the Hebrew Scriptures and the*
Dead Sea Scrolls

Articles in JHS are being indexed in the ATLA Religion Database, RAMBI, and BiBIL. Their abstracts appear in Religious and Theological Abstracts. The journal is archived by Library and Archives Canada and is accessible for consultation and research at the Electronic Collection site maintained by Library and Archives Canada.

ISSN 1203-1542 <http://www.jhsonline.org> and <http://purl.org/jhs>

THE END OF DESIRE: ON THE MEANING OF תְּשׁוּקָה IN THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES AND THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

JANSON CONDREN
SYDNEY MISSIONARY AND BIBLE COLLEGE

Despite the long-standing tradition of translating תְּשׁוּקָה as “desire” in its three biblical occurrences (Gen 3:16; 4:7; Cant 7:11 [Eng. 10]), recent studies have put forth alternatives such as “return, turning,” “preoccupation, devoted attention” and “driving.” This essay examines these possibilities in light of the usage of תְּשׁוּקָה in the Dead Sea Scrolls (1QM 13:12; 15:10; 17:4; 1QS 11:22; 4QInstr^b 2:4). The meaning “desire” is shown to be particularly problematic, not only as a result of its absence in the earliest biblical versions, but also due to the expression לְעֵפֶר תְּשׁוּקָתוֹ immediately after a depiction of mankind being created from dust (עֶפֶר) in 1QS 11. The standard translation, “for dust is [mankind’s] desire,” appears incongruous, and parallels in Hodayot reinforce the likelihood that a “return” to dust is in view. The meanings “preoccupation, attention” and “driving” also lack plausibility in 1QS 11, yet “return, turning” proves problematic in 1QM 13 and 15. It is suggested the semantic range of תְּשׁוּקָה as “preoccupation, attention” be extended to include “a focused movement toward.” This latter meaning is well suited to 1QS 11, where the notion of “return” is supplied by the context. In all other occurrences, תְּשׁוּקָה is best understood as “preoccupation, devoted attention.”

“your desire shall be for your husband and he shall rule over you” (Gen 3:16 NRSV)

“its desire is for you, but you must master it” (Gen 4:7 NRSV)

“I am my beloved’s, and his desire is for me” (Cant 7:10 NRSV)

Translations of תְּשׁוּקָה have long agreed on “desire” or its equivalent for the word’s three biblical occurrences (Gen 3:16; 4:7; Cant 7:11 [Eng. 10]). Indeed, HALOT offers “desire, longing” (German: “begehren, verlangen”) as its only option.¹ In Genesis 3, the traditional understanding has been to see the woman’s sex-

¹ HALOT 4:1801–2.

ual desire for her husband in view,² although a broader affection is sometimes assumed.³ More recently, many have discerned an adversarial desire by the woman to dominate her husband.⁴ This has led to new and strikingly opposing translations such as “your desire shall be contrary to your husband” (ESV).⁵ Nevertheless, a growing number of studies are reconsidering whether תשוקה should be understood to mean “desire” at all. Most prominent in this regard is the *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew (DCH)*, where the expected entry on “desire” is followed by a proposed homonym giving the alternative meaning “driving.” The primary impetus behind the shifting interpretive landscape has been the DSS with their addition of four well-preserved attestations of תשוקה in non-biblical contexts (1QM 13:12; 15:10; 17:4; 1QS 11:22).⁶ In addition, there has been a growing appreciation of the widespread ancient practice of not rendering תשוקה with words meaning “desire” but rather “turning, return,” or perhaps “pre-occupation, attention.”

The present study will evaluate four major candidates for the meaning of תשוקה with reference to the word’s usage in the DSS: “desire,” “driving,”⁷ “return, turning”⁸ and “preoccupation, devoted attention.”⁹ We will begin with a review of the challenge posed by the early versions to the traditional

² E.g., the comment of Rashi on Genesis 3 (http://www.sefaria.org/Rashi_on_Genesis.3.16?lang=en); Terrence Fretheim, “Genesis,” in NIB (Nashville: Abingdon, 1994), 1:363. See also Hermann Gunkel, *Genesis*, trans. M. Biddle, Mercer Library of Biblical Studies (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997), 21; Adele Berlin and Marc Z. Brettler, eds., *The Jewish Study Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 17.

³ See Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis: A Commentary*, trans. J. Marks, rev. ed., OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972), 93; Carol L. Meyers, “Gender Roles and Genesis 3:16 Revisited,” in *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. Carol L. Meyers and Michael O’Connor (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 347.

⁴ Susan T. Foh, “What Is the Woman’s Desire?,” *WTJ* 37 (1975): 376–83; Gordon J. Wenham, “Genesis,” in *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*, ed. James D. G. Dunn and John W. Rogerson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 41; Bill T. Arnold, *Genesis*, NCBC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 70; Iain Provan, *Discovering Genesis: Content, Interpretation, Reception*, DBT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 86. For a critique, see Janson C. Condren, “Toward a Purge of the Battle of the Sexes and ‘Return’ for the original meaning of Genesis 3:16b,” *JETS* 60 (2017): 227–45.

⁵ Similarly, NLT² (“desire to control your husband”) and NET² (“You will want to control your husband”).

⁶ In three cases the term appears in contexts insufficiently preserved to be helpful (6QHymn 2:4; 4QPoetA 3:1; 4QInst^d 168:3).

⁷ Chaim Rabin, “Etymological Notes” (זוטות אטימולוגיות), *Tarbiz* 33 (1963): 114–17.

⁸ See especially Joel N. Lohr, “Desire? Eve, Gen 3:16 and תשוקה,” *JBL* 130 (2011): 227–46.

⁹ A. A. Macintosh, “The Meaning of Hebrew תשוקה,” *JSS* 61 (2016): 365–87.

translation “desire,” followed by a brief examination of תשוקה in standard lexical works.

I. THE CHALLENGE TO “DESIRE” FROM THE EARLY VERSIONS¹⁰

The LXX renders תשוקה, perhaps surprisingly, not with words that mean “desire” (e.g., ἐπιθυμία) but rather with ἀποστροφή (typically “turning,” “return,” “turning away from”) in Gen 3:16 and 4:7 and ἐπιστροφή (“turning [toward]”) in Cant 7:11.¹¹ In fact, virtually all early versions offer a similar sense, including not only the daughter translations of the LXX (Old Latin, Ethiopic, Armenian, and Coptic, both Bohairic and Sahidic), but also the Peshitta. To this can be added Charlesworth’s translation from Jubilees, in reference to Gen 3:16: “to your husband is your return.”¹²

Philo, when commenting on the same text, speaks of the woman’s ἐπιστροφή to her husband.¹³ Josephus, in reference to Cain in Gen 4, uses the similar word ἀναστρέφω (“overturn, return, associate with someone”) (*Ant.* 1.55).¹⁴ Likewise, Targums Onqelos and Neofiti use words related to “return” for Gen 3:16.¹⁵ It comes with little surprise, then, that the Fathers consistently use ἀποστροφή, as well as *comersio* (“turning, return, turning towards”), when commenting on תשוקה.¹⁶

Despite this early and pervasive rendering of תשוקה with words related to the idea of “turning, return,” there is evidence the meaning “desire” gradually gained traction in the interpretive tradition. The Babylonian Talmud (‘Erub. 100b; Yebam. 62b) and ‘Abot de Rabbi Nathan (‘Abot R.Nat. 1) both explain תשוקה in terms of the woman’s “sexual desire” (משתוקקת) for her husband. Pseudo-Jonathan uses מתוי in Gen 3:16 and 4:7, a rare term glossed as “longing,”¹⁷ and Symmachus uses ὄρμη

¹⁰ For an extended overview, see Lohr, “Desire?” 228–40.

¹¹ *NETS* translates these “your recourse [fn: “or return”] will be to your husband” (Gen 3:16); “his recourse is to you” (Gen 4:7); “his attention is for me” (Cant 7:11).

¹² Jub. 3:23; *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985), 2:60.

¹³ *Questions and Answers on Genesis*, 1.49.

¹⁴ Noted in Karl A. Deurloo, “תשוקה ‘dependency,’ Gen 4,7,” *ZAW* 99 (1987): 406.

¹⁵ Onqelos: תיובה (“repentance,” “reply,” “return”) in Gen 3:16; תוב (“return,” “repent”) in Gen 4:7; Neofiti: מתב (“turn”) in 3:16. The marginal reading of the latter, רחצונך (“your safety”), according to Hanneke Reuling, captures the idea likely implied in the Greek ἀποστροφή (Hanneke Reuling, *After Eden: Church Fathers and Rabbis on Genesis 3:16–21*, JCP 10 [Leiden: Brill, 2006], 41). See Lohr, “Desire?” 235–36.

¹⁶ E.g., Clement of Rome, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Didymus the Blind, Ambrose of Milan, Chrysostom, Augustine, Epiphanius, and Theodoret (see esp. Lohr, “Desire?” 237–40).

¹⁷ So *CAL*, citing late Jewish literary Aramaic, and Jastrow, citing only this text (860). But this has been debated. Rabin argues rather for the meaning of “return” or “repent” (115); so also, independently of

(“desire,” “impulse”) in Gen 3:16. This latter apparent introduction of “desire” into an otherwise dominant tradition of “turning, return” in the LXX is perhaps reflected in Genesis Rabbah and the Vulgate, both of which witness to the co-existence of both meanings.¹⁸ Hence, Genesis Rabbah speaks of women, who after childbirth, nonetheless “return” to their “desire” for their husband.¹⁹ And Jerome, in Cant 7:11, follows the return tradition by using *conversio* but then uses *appetitus* (“grasping at,” “passionate longing,” “attack”) in Gen 4:7. That he does not use *appetitus* in reference to the passionate relationship between lovers in Canticles suggests he did not view “desire” as a possible meaning for תְּשׁוּקָה. At minimum, it appears the “desire” tradition found in Symmachus and Genesis Rabbah had not yet achieved a sufficient level of acceptance for Jerome to adopt it. Unfortunately, his rendering of אֶל-אִשְׁךָ תְּשׁוּקֶךָ in Gen 3:16 as *sub viri potestate eris* (“under the power of your husband you will be”) is too free to confidently draw conclusions regarding his understanding of תְּשׁוּקָה. However, it is telling that in his later commentary on Genesis he overtly conforms to widespread Christian practice by rendering תְּשׁוּקָה as *conversio*.²⁰

In summary, the dominate early testimony to תְּשׁוּקָה points not to the idea of “desire” but rather to “turning, return.” Joel N. Lohr draws upon this evidence as a major plank in his argument that “return” is the word’s original meaning.²¹ Against this, however, A. A. Macintosh rightly argues ἀποστροφή and ἐπιστροφή can both mean “turning toward,” and thus also “pay attention to.” These and similar such renderings of תְּשׁוּקָה discussed above, he believes, fit well with the meaning “preoccupation, devoted attention, focus, concern.”²²

II. תְּשׁוּקָה IN THE STANDARD LEXICAL WORKS

Standard lexical works strongly favour the meaning “desire.” As noted, *HALOT* gives no hint of an earlier “turning, return” tradition. *BDB*, on the other hand, although rendering תְּשׁוּקָה as “longing,” registers tension between the traditions with a parenthetical reference to the language of “return” in the LXX. For explanation, reference is made to Eberhard Nestle’s proposal

Rabin, Lohr (“Desire?” 236).

¹⁸ Ibn Ezra also witnesses to both traditions by explaining תְּשׁוּקָה in Gen 4:7 in terms of the “[evil] impulse” (הַיֵּצֵר) that will “return” (יָשׁוּב) to obey Cain if he so desires.

¹⁹ Gen. Rab. 20:7. See Menahem Kister, “Metamorphoses of Aggadic Traditions,” (Hebrew) *Tarbiz* 60 (1991): 221–22.

²⁰ C. T. R. Hayward, *Jerome’s Hebrew Questions on Genesis*, OECS (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 33.

²¹ Regarding Gen 3:16, Lohr concludes it was only around the time of the first English translations that there was a shift away from the “long-standing tradition that understands Eve’s ‘curse’ to involve a ‘turning’ or ‘return’ to her husband” (“Desire?” 232).

²² “תְּשׁוּקָה,” 367–69, 385.

that תשוקה should be emended to תשובה, “turn, return,” though doubt is raised regarding the plausibility of this change.²³

In support of the meaning “desire,” it has been customary to see the Arabic root *šwq*, “desire,” as a cognate. For example, HALOT derives תשוקה from שוק II, with reference to Arabic *šāqa*, “to fill with longing, desire, craving.”²⁴ This is problematic, however, as Hebrew *šwq* corresponds to Arabic *šm*, not *šw*.²⁵ Hence, BDB, despite listing תשוקה under שוק III with reference to Arabic *šwq*, gives preference to Arabic *sāqa*, “drive (a beast).”

Chaim Rabin, viewing “desire, lust” as a late “midrashic” meaning of תשוקה, and seeking to reconcile the translation “desire” with the use of “turning, return” in the early versions, argues from Arabic *swq* for the meaning “being driven.”²⁶ Although not gaining widespread acceptance, Rabin’s view is cited by DCH as the impetus for its entry on תשוקה II, “driving.” The entry on תשוקה I, “desire, longing,” lists the word’s three biblical and seven DSS attestations.²⁷ However, its citations of the three biblical references parenthetically include “driving” as an alternative gloss. Macintosh rightly calls this gloss “unsatisfactory” and “verging on the comical.” He notes that “used absolutely, as here, it has no clear or detectable meaning in English.”²⁸ Guidance regarding the intended meaning of “driving,” however, is provided under תשוקה II, “driving,” where it is explained the word is an “expression of ruling over someone.”

[תשוקה] | 30.5 n.f. **desire**—*šf.* תשוקתו, תשוקתך, Q תשוקתו, Q תשוקתם—**desire, longing**, of woman for man (Gn 3:16 (unless תשוקה II driving)), man for woman (Ca 7:11 (unless תשוקה II)), appar. sin descr. as beast (Gn 4:7 (unless תשוקה II)), human for (return to) dust (IQS 11:2), angels of destruction for darkness (1QM 13:12), the wicked for darkness (1QM 15:10), sons of darkness for emptiness (1QM 17:4).

<NOM CL> [ה]ישך תשוקתנו | darkness is our longing 6QHymn 2:4, תשוקתך אל־אישך תשוקתך, your desire shall be for your husband Gn 3:16 (unless תשוקה II driving), תשוקתו אל־יך תשוקתו, its desire is for you Gn 4:7 (unless תשוקה II), var. 4QInst^a 2:43 (תשוקתה) | עָלֶי, תשוקתה his desire is for me Ca 7:11 (unless תשוקה II; perh. em. עָלֶי to אֶלֶי in same sense), לעִפְרוֹ תשוקתו, his desire is for the dust IQS 11:2, לְבַדּוֹ תשוקתם, תשוקתם their desire is for it 1QM 13:12 (אֵלֶי תשוקתם) | תשוקתם תשוקתם their desire is for emptiness 1QM 17:4, <CSTR> [ת]שוקה אב[ן] | desire of a poor one 4QInst^d 168:3 (unless תשוקה אב[ן] | of her father or sim).

Also 4QPoetA 3:1.

* [תשוקה] | 3 n.f. **driving** (unless תשוקה I desire)—*šf.* תשוקתו, תשוקתך—as expression of ruling over someone, **specif.** of husband over wife (Gn 3:16), female over male lover (Ca 7:11), sin over person (Gn 4:7), <NOM CL> תשוקתך אל־אישך תשוקתך, your driving shall be for your husband, i.e. he will rule over you Gn 3:16, תשוקתו אל־יך תשוקתו, its (sin’s) driving is for you, i.e. it would rule over you Gn 4:7, עָלֶי תשוקתו, his driving is for me, i.e. I will rule over him Ca 7:11 (perh. em. עָלֶי to אֶלֶי in same sense).

²³ Viz., “but how to explain the unusual and striking word in MT?” (BDB, 1003).

²⁴ It is also seen as a bi-form of שקק II, “to strive for, desire” (1801–2, 1448, 1647).

²⁵ For a list of the multiple efforts to circumvent this problem, as well as an additional proposal, see Simon Hopkins, “Hebrew *tašwqa* and Arabic *šawq* “desire” — an etymological study,” *WZKM* 101 (2011): 213–14.

²⁶ “Etymological Notes,” 114–17.

²⁷ DCH 8:684.

²⁸ “תשוקה,” 383.

These two entries in *DCH* contain further difficulties and are worth examining in greater detail. In Gen 3:16, the woman's driving for her husband (אל-אישך תשוקתך) is taken to mean "he will rule over" her (emphasis added).²⁹ Such a meaning might be perplexing for readers not familiar with Rabin's interpretation that reads the possessive pronoun as objective, and thus in view is her "being driven" by her husband.³⁰ The effect is to form a parallel to the following line והוא ימשל-בך ("and he will rule over you"). No commentator of which I am aware, however, uses Arabic *sāqa* to argue תשוקה refers to the husband's rule.³¹ In fact, precisely the opposite is the case as advocates of an adversarial desire use the connection to argue it is the woman's rule that is in view (via her desire to dominate).³²

Regarding Cant 7:11, *DCH* suggests the male lover's "driving" to the Shulamite (עלי תשוקתו) means she "will rule over him" (i.e., his being driven by her).³³ This may seem counterintuitive since the parallel line, אני לדודי ("I am my beloved's") (i.e., "I belong to him"), more likely implies the male's rule over, or ownership of, the female.³⁴ Rabin, however, interprets the Shulamite as playfully countering the convention of male headship by insisting precisely the opposite is the case: against expectation, she is the one who wields the power in this relationship(!).³⁵ Finally, in Gen 4:7 sin's "driving" to Cain (ואליך תשוקתו) is understood in *DCH* to mean sin "would rule over" Cain. Yet if the woman's "driving" indicates the husband's rule over her, and the male lover's "driving" indicates the Shulamite's rule over him, we might expect sin's "driving" to indicate Cain's rule over it. But this is not what *DCH* offers. This is apparently because, assuming a context in which God is challenging Cain to rule sin (viz., "you must rule over it"), to state Cain already rules over sin makes nonsense of the challenge. But at this point *DCH* actually departs from Rabin's interpretation of the context (which sees 4:7 not pertaining to Cain's relationship with sin, but with Abel,³⁶ and thus that Abel's "driving" indicates Cain's rule over him). Unfortunately, Rabin makes no mention of how תשוקה should

²⁹ Cf. the added comment: "specifically] of husband over wife (Gen 3:16)" (*DCH* 8:684).

³⁰ "Etymological Notes," 117.

³¹ The standard interpretation, although rarely with reference to Arabic cognates, is that the woman's תשוקה enables her husband's rule that is only then described in v. 16b. See, e.g., John Skinner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*, 2nd ed., ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1930), 83; Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, 81.

³² Foh argues from the Arabic that תשוקה can be rendered "control" and that the woman's desire is "to contend with [her husband] for leadership in their relationship" ("Woman's Desire?" 378, 383). See also the references in footnote 4.

³³ "female over male lover (Cant 7:11)" (*DCH* 8:684).

³⁴ Cf. Waltke and O'Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 206. Note that this notion is expressed reciprocally in Cant 2:16 which reads לי דודי לו ואני לו ("my beloved is mine and I am his").

³⁵ "Etymological Notes," 117.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 116.

be understood in the Scrolls.³⁷ Likewise, *DCH* makes no effort to include the Scrolls under תשוקה II, “driving.”

III. תשוקה IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

We now turn to an examination of the Scrolls not only to test the proposal of תשוקה as “driving, being driven,” but also “desire,” “return, turning” and “preoccupation, devoted attention.” It should be noted it is possible we are dealing with two different words entirely. This is rendered unlikely, however, when it is observed every occurrence of תשוקה, in both biblical and non-biblical texts, appears within the same nominal clause structure (or its inverse): [X + תשוקה] [Y + אל/ל/על], where X is an attached, personal, pronominal suffix.³⁸ תשוקה appears in four DSS contexts sufficiently clear to be helpful (1QM 13:12; 15:10; 17:4; 1QS 11:22), in addition to one where it is conjectured (4QInstr^b 2:4). In each case the proposed meanings will be evaluated and placed on a plausibility continuum (very plausible—plausible—less plausible—implausible).

In both 1QM 13 and 15, תשוקה appears in the formulaic clause [X + תשוקה] [Y + אל/ל/על], where Y=darkness.

1QM 13

A prayer is given in 1QM 13 for recitation by the leaders of the Sons of Light after their victory over the Sons of Darkness. The following text and translation is from García Martínez and Tigchelaar:³⁹

You made Belial for the pit,	ואתה עשיתה בליעל לשחת
angel of enmity;	מלאך משפטה
in dark[ness] is his [dom]ain,	ובחושך ממשלתו
his counsel is to bring about wickedness and guilt.	ובעצתו להרשיע ולהאשים
All the spirits of his lot are angels of destruction,	וכול רוחי גורלו מלאכי חבל
they walk in the laws of darkness;	בחוקי חושך יתהלכו
towards it goes their only desire	ואליו [תש]וקתמה יחד

³⁷ For explanation and critique of Rabin’s interpretation, see Macintosh, “תשוקה,” 384.

³⁸ “Personal” is inclusive of spirit beings and possibly, in the case of the most popular interpretation of Gen 4:7, personified sin.

³⁹ *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 1:135. Unless otherwise noted, all text, versification and translations will follow García Martínez and Tigchelaar.

(1QM 13:11—12)

In this text, the “spirits of Belial,” called “angels of destruction,” are described as those who “walk in the laws of darkness” (בְּחֻקֵי חוֹשֶׁךְ יִתְהַלְכוּ). The use here of the “desire” tradition to translate תְּשׁוּקָה yields a desire for darkness as a metaphor for their evil deeds, and is a plausible meaning.⁴⁰ Also plausible is Rabin’s proposed meaning “driving, being driven,” resulting in their “being driven to/by darkness,” and meaning they are under its authority.⁴¹ Similarly fitting is the proposal by Macintosh that תְּשׁוּקָה means “concern, preoccupation, devoted attention, focus,”⁴² resulting in the angels of destruction having a “preoccupation for” or “devoted attention to” darkness. The meaning “return, turning,” however, is more difficult. Lohr proposes that in view is the “(continual) return” of the angels of destruction to their evil deeds.⁴³ However, it is far from clear in what sense a “return” is taking place, and Lohr leaves this unaddressed. Also problematic is the addition of “continual,” an apparent iterative notion added without explanation and lacking lexical support. Macintosh goes so far as to say “return” “simply does not fit this sentence.”⁴⁴ We conclude that, at minimum, it is a less plausible reading.

<i>Text: 1QM 13</i>	<i>Proposed meaning of תְּשׁוּקָה</i>	<i>Plausibility</i>
X=“angels of destruction”	= “desire”	plausible
	= “being driven”	plausible
Y=“darkness”	= “preoccupation, devoted attention”	plausible
	= “return”	less plausible

⁴⁰ Wise, Abegg and Cook: “it is their only [des]ire” (162). See also James Charlesworth: “towards it is their one [de]sire” (*The Dead Sea Scrolls* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995], 2:123); Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, *Texts Concerned with Religious Law*, DSSR 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2004). Geza Vermes: “towards them is their [inclination]” (*The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* [New York: Penguin, 1997], 179).

⁴¹ Again, neither Rabin nor DCH suggest meanings for תְּשׁוּקָה as “driving” in the DSS. Rabin’s view that תְּשׁוּקָה governs interpersonal relations would need broadened for his definition to be applied here (“Etymological Notes,” 116).

⁴² “תְּשׁוּקָה,” 378, 385.

⁴³ “Desire?” 242. Vermes seems to assume a similar sense in 1QM 17: “they tend towards Darkness” (*Scrolls*, 182). Lohr does not entertain the (less likely) possibility that darkness refers to future destruction, as he argues for 1QM 15. In fact, in his rendering “to them is their (continual) return,” their return is to “laws” and not “darkness” (“Desire?” 242). In this case, the singular pronomial suffix in אֱלֵיוֹ functions collectively. In favor of “darkness” as the antecedent, however, is the fact that the antecedent to the pronomial suffix in the identical expression in 1QM 15 is clearly “darkness”: “and all their deeds are in darkness and to *it* [אֱלֵיוֹ] go [their] desires.”

⁴⁴ “תְּשׁוּקָה,” 378.

1QM 15

In 1QM 15 the High Priest exhorts God's faithful warriors not to be afraid as they prepare for battle. He tells them:

Do not turn backwards,	ואל תשובו אחור
or [run away from th[em].	ואל [תנוסו מפניה]ם
For they are a wicked con- gregation	כיא המה עדת רשעה
and all their deeds are in darkness	ובחושך כול מעשיהם
and to it go [their] desires, [...] their refuge,	ואליו תשוקת[ם] [...] מחסיהם
their power disappears like smoke.	וגבורתם כעשן נמלח
All the assembly of their [ho]rdes וכול קהל המונם ...
[...] ... will not be found.	[...] מממה לוא ימצא
All the essence of their be- ing swiftly vanishes	ובול יקום היותם מהר ימלו
[as a flow]er in har[vest ti]me ...]	כציץ בק[ץ] ק[ציר] ...]

(1QM 15:8–12)

Similar to 1QM 13, the standard translation that the wicked congregation's "desire(s)" is for darkness is plausible.⁴⁵ The same is true for the proposals of Rabin ("driving for" or "under the authority of" darkness) and Macintosh ("preoccupation with, or devoted attention to, darkness").⁴⁶ Lohr departs from these understandings of darkness as a metaphor for evil deeds and instead sees a state of "eventual ruin" to which the wicked congregation will "return," and thus will no longer be able to threaten the faithful.⁴⁷ He notes subsequent lines address the coming judgment that will condemn the wicked to nothingness.⁴⁸ The appropriateness of this notion of returning to the darkness of judgment can be seen in Wise, Abegg and Cook's translation of 4Q548 fr. 1:12–13: "[... all the children of light] are destined for light" ... "while all the children of dark[ness] are destined for darkness ...".⁴⁹ Yet elsewhere in the War Scroll חושך is used only in reference to evil behavior; it does not refer to future judg-

⁴⁵ So also Michael Wise, Martin Abegg, Jr., and Edward Cook (*The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*, rev. ed. [London: HarperCollins, 2005], 164); Charlesworth (*Scrolls*, 2:129). Vermes: "they tend toward Darkness" (*Scrolls*, 182).

⁴⁶ "תשוקה," 378, 385.

⁴⁷ "Desire?" 243.

⁴⁸ Lohr, "Desire?" 242–43.

⁴⁹ *Scrolls*, 550.

ment.⁵⁰ In fact, as seen above in 1QM 13, the תשוקה of angels of destruction is for darkness in the sense of wicked deeds. As a result, Lohr's interpretation that "darkness" refers to the wicked's eventual condemned state of judgment is implausible. Alternatively, in line with his understanding of 1QM 13, the wicked congregation's "continual return" to darkness, in the sense of its evil deeds, is perhaps possible. But as discussed above, this means the reading of "return" in 1QM 15 can at best be moved from implausible to less plausible.

<i>Text: 1QM 15</i>	<i>Proposed meaning of תשוקה</i>	<i>Plausibility</i>
	= "desire"	plausible
X="wicked	= "being driven"	plausible
congregation"	= "preoccupation, de-	plausible
Y="darkness"	voted attention"	
	= "return"	less plausible

1QM 17

In 1QM 17 the clausal syntax [X + תשוקה] [Y + על/אל/על] is used where X=enemies and Y=chaos/emptiness. Here, the faithful are urged not to fear their enemies in view of the coming judgment. For these enemies, according to García Martínez and Tigchelaar, "their desire goes toward chaos and emptiness (לתהו (ובהו תשוקתם" (1QM 17:4).

And you, exert yourselves and do not fear them,	ואתם התחזקו ואל תיראום
[for] their desire goes to- wards chaos and empti- ness,	[כיא] המה לתהו ולבהו תשוקתם
and their support is with- out [...].	ומשענתם בלוא ה[...].
Not [do they know that from the God of] Israel everything is and will be	ולוא [ידעו כיא מאל] ישראל כול הויה ונהיה
[...] in all that will happen eternally.	ו[...][...]ה[...] בכול נהיי עולמים
Today is his appointed time to humiliate and abase the prince of the dominion of evil	היום מועדו להכניע ולהשפיל שר ממשלת רשעה
(1QM 17:4—5)	

⁵⁰ This is found most often in the frequent reference to the "Sons/forces of Darkness." 1QM 13 is the exception where Belial's domain is "in darkness" (13:11) and angels of destruction are "the lot of darkness" (13:5) who "walk in the laws of darkness" (13:12).

Wise, Abegg and Cook offer the alternative translation, “[... for] their end is emptiness and their desire is for the void.”⁵¹ Either way, this kind of description of the enemies’ “desire” for תהו and/or בהו is a plausible reading.⁵² Perhaps similarly plausible is the idea, on Rabin’s proposal, that these enemies are “being driven” to emptiness/chaos in that they are under its authority. Macintosh’s description of תהו ובהו as “chaotic nihilism,” for which the enemies are “preoccupied,” is also plausible.⁵³ On Lohr’s view, these enemies “will return to chaos and emptiness” in the sense of divine judgment.⁵⁴ Support can be found in v. 5 which speaks of God’s judgment upon them. Lohr draws attention to allusions to creation in the use of תהו and בהו (Gen 1:2) and in v. 5, where God is apparently envisioned as creator of everything. This makes the imagery of a “return to chaos” appropriate in that it yields the reassuring declaration that the creator is about to “uncreate” his people’s enemies.⁵⁵ Against this Macintosh argues that, as in the other War Scroll texts, in view is not the future but the present. It follows that any idea of “returning” to *tobû wabobû* is “most unlikely.”⁵⁶ He further argues *tobû wabobû* in the Scrolls nowhere refers to future judgment or destiny but rather is only used to describe “the depraved thought and intentions of the forces of wickedness.”⁵⁷ However, the terms appear together elsewhere only in the fragmentary Meditation on Creation A (4Q303), where the pre-creation chaos of Gen 1 is in view. It may well be that the collocation is an especially fitting allusion to pre-creation chaos and thus points here in 1QM 17 to the future judgment that a return to such chaos implies. This is the case in the Hebrew Bible, where the only use of the terms together outside Gen 1:2 comes in two prophetic

⁵¹ *Scrolls*, 163. DCH: “their desire is for emptiness” (8:684); Charlesworth: “Their own desire (aims) towards nothingness and voidness” (*Scrolls*, 2:133). Vermes: “[for they tend] towards chaos and confusion” (*Scrolls*, 183).

⁵² Among meanings attributed to תהו are “wasteland,” “emptiness,” “futility,” and “worthlessness” (M. Görg, “תהו,” in *TDOT*, 15:570; DCH, 8:592; HALOT, 4:1689). Neither terms occur elsewhere in the War Scroll. בהו appears elsewhere in the DSS only once, in reference to precreation chaos of Gen 1:2. תהו notably appears with הבל in 1QH^a 15:35 (איש תהו ובעל הבל). Cf. 1QS 5:19: “futile are all who do not know the Covenant” (הבל כול אשר לוא ידעו את בריתו) (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Scrolls*, 1:81).

⁵³ Hence, the enemies “are not invincible,” but according to the following line, they are “without support” (תשוקה, 378). Here Macintosh refers to “darkness” in 1QM 13 and 15 and argues the language of “emptiness” and “nothingness” describes “the faulty and depraved thoughts and intentions of the forces of wickedness” (379). He also finds support in CD 1:15 where wayward Israel is made by the Scoffer (or Man of Mockery) to “wander in a pathless wilderness of *tobû* . . . abolishing the ways of righteousness” (379).

⁵⁴ Lohr, “Desire?” 244.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 243.

⁵⁶ “תשוקה,” 378.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 379.

descriptions of judgment.⁵⁸ The translation of Wise, Abegg and Cook (“their end is emptiness”) also sees a future judgment on display in 1QM 17.⁵⁹ Additionally, we saw judgement on the wicked congregation in 1QM 15 described in terms of not “being found” and “their essence vanishing,” notions perhaps similar to the use תהו and בהו here. In fact, as Macintosh observes, אפס in Sir 41:10 is placed in parallel to תהו. The context of Sirach clearly has humanity’s future destiny in view (כל מאפס אל אפס) “שוב”; “everything from nothing returns to nothing”).⁶⁰ As a result, Lohr’s understanding of a “return to chaos” in reference to one’s ultimate fate is not necessarily a foreign one. In conclusion, we judge all four candidates for the meaning of תשוקה in 1Q17 as plausible.

<i>Text: 1QM 17</i>	<i>Proposed meaning of תשוקה</i>	<i>Plausibility</i>
X=“enemies”	=“desire”	plausible
Y=“chaos/emptiness”	=“being driven”	plausible
	=“preoccupation, devoted attention”	plausible
	=“return”	plausible

4QINSTR^b 2 (4Q416)

4QInstruction^b contains a lacuna into which תשוקה is often inserted.⁶¹ While this uncertain text must be given less weight than others, it is included here due to the frequent acceptance of תשוקה as the best reading.⁶²

In what is a reworking of Gen 3:16, marital instruction for a husband is given using the clausal syntax [X + תשוקה] [Y + ל/אל/על], where X=wife and Y=husband. Immediately after a citation of Gen 2:24 about man leaving father and mother and clinging to his wife, the husband is told:

He has made you ruler over her, so [...]	אותכה המשיל בה ותש [--]
He did not give [her father] authority over her,	[-- אביה] לא המשיל בה

⁵⁸ See Isa 34:11 and Jer 4:23, where the latter clearly depicts a return to pre-creation chaos.

⁵⁹ *Scrolls*, 163.

⁶⁰ The text continues, כן חנף מתהו אל תהו (“so also the corrupt go from emptiness to emptiness”) (Martin G. Abegg Jr. and Casey Towes, *Ben Sira* [Canonical Order] [OakTree Software: Altamonte Springs, FL, 2009], version 3.4; Benjamin H. Parker and Martin G. Abegg Jr., *Ben Sira English Translation* [OakTree Software: Altamonte Springs, FL, 2008], version 1.3).

⁶¹ García Martínez and Tigchelaar instead insert לבבה, so the translation displayed here is from Wise, Abegg and Cook. The text is from Martin G. Abegg Jr., ed., *Qumran non-Biblical Manuscripts* (OakTree Software: Altamonte Springs, FL, 2014), version 4.6.

⁶² DCH includes 4QInstr^b 2:4 under תשוקה I, “desire,” as a variant (8:684). Macintosh likewise includes it (“תשוקה,” 379).

He has separated her from her mother,	מאמהּ הפרידה
and unto you [He has given authority ...	ואליכה [תשוקתה]
He has made your wife] and you into one flesh.	[ותהיה] לך לבשר אחד
(4QInstr ^b 2:4)	

The woman's **תשוקה** for her husband in Gen 3:16 is here placed in a context focused on the husband's authority.⁶³ The previous clauses concerning the woman's separation from her parents' authority suggest such separation enables or prepares for her **תשוקה** for her husband.⁶⁴ If so, the sense "desire" does not seem particularly well-suited. That is, her "desire" for her husband is not obviously a consequence of her being freed from parental authority.⁶⁵ Even if this could be granted, the introduction of the topic of the woman's desire appears abrupt and out of place. That this is the only place where Wise, Abegg and Cook do not translate **תשוקה** as "desire" or "longing" is telling. Their translation of the larger clause as "unto you He has given authority" illustrates the appropriateness of a meaning well-suited to the topic of authority. Perhaps dependent on Rabin's proposal of "being driven by," as in "subjected to the authority of," such a translation is very plausible here. The sense "desire," however, is judged less plausible.⁶⁶

Macintosh's "preoccupation, devoted attention" is perhaps suitable given that an increase in the woman's preoccupation with, or attention to, her husband might be seen to be a reasonable consequence of her release from parental authority. The woman's devoted attention to her husband can also be seen to fit well with the focus on his authority.⁶⁷

Although Lohr does not examine this text, "return" might be understood as the woman's return to the "one flesh" relationship she was created to share with her husband, made explicit in the following clause. This relationship is severed by the couple's disobedience to the divine command and the subsequent fallout in which the man places culpability on his wife (Gen 3:6–12). Most prominent might be the woman's return to being under the presumed authority of her husband that existed prior to her tak-

⁶³ Subsequent lines continue this focus.

⁶⁴ Concern for motherly authority is explicit in the foregoing lines where the comparison is made that a man's father is like one's god and a man's mother like one's master.

⁶⁵ Indeed, "desire" for her mate might easily be seen to precede any official separation from her mother.

⁶⁶ It is possible Gen 3:16b was understood to mean that the woman's desire in some way facilitates her subordination to her husband (as per many commentators). However, it seems too much to assume a mere description of her desire for her husband in 4QInstr^b could have been understood as a description of her acquiescence to his authority.

⁶⁷ The alternative reading **לבבה** is similar.

ing the lead in eating the fruit. In conclusion, “desire” is judged to be less plausible in 4QInstr^b while the other three candidates are judged plausible.

<i>Text:</i>	<i>Proposed meaning of תשוקה</i>	<i>Plausibility</i>
4QInstr ^b	= “desire”	less plausible
X=“wife”	= “being driven”	Plausible
Y=“husband”	= “preoccupation, de- voted attention”	Plausible
	= “return”	Plausible

1QS 11

In a lament concerning human lowliness before God, the speaker in 1QS 11 refers to mankind’s תשוקה “for/to dust” using the familiar syntactic structure [X + תשוקה] [Y + על/אל/ל], where X=mankind and Y=dust.⁶⁸ García Martínez and Tigchelaar, in agreement with most translations, understand mankind’s “longing” for dust to be in view:⁶⁹

As what shall one born of woman be considered in your presence?	וילוד אשה מה י(ח)שב לפניכה
Shaped from dust has he been,	והואה מעפר מגבלו
maggots’ food shall be his dwelling;	ולחם רמה מדורו
he is spat saliva, moulded clay,	והואה מצירוק חמר קורץ
and for dust is his longing	ולעפר תשוקתו
What will the clay reply	מה ישיב חמר
And the one shaped by hand?	ויוצר יד
And what advice will he be able to understand?	ולעצת מה יבין

(1QS 11:21–22)

The use of the “desire” tradition here in reference to mankind’s desire for dust seems especially awkward.⁷⁰ Henoch

⁶⁸ The first person voice (referred to here as “speaker” and “Maskil”) in fact merges self-reference with reference to mankind more generally.

⁶⁹ So also Sarianna Metso, *The Community Rule: A Critical Edition with Translation*, EJL 51 (Atlanta: SBL, 2019), 59; Parry and Tov (*Texts*, 43). Charlesworth: “urge” (*Scrolls* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994], 1:51); Vermes: “inclines towards” (*Scrolls*, 117).

⁷⁰ E.g., Deurloo, in reference to the DSS, notes the meaning “desire” in standard lexical works “does not suit the context very well” (“תשוקה” ‘dependency,’” 406). His own proposal for “dependency” in Gen 4:7 is unconvincing, and he offers no defense for his translation

Yalon, soon after the discovery of the Scrolls, grappled with the difficulty raised by the idea of mankind's desire for dust and argued תשוקה should be emended to תשובה ("return"), yielding "to dust is his return."⁷¹ The resultant allusion to Gen 3:19 ("you are dust, and to dust you shall return") was an obvious appeal. Jacob Licht, with reference to LXX translations of תשוקה as ἀποστροφή, soon extended the same emendation to 1QM 13:12 and 15:10.⁷² This proposal continues to be popular today.⁷³ Of course, Lohr's argument that תשוקה does in fact mean "return" renders such emendation unnecessary. According to him, the text of 1QS 11 is "quite straightforward" and deserves the majority of weight in determining the meaning of תשוקה. On the other hand, Macintosh contends the "the reference is to [mankind's] present state rather than to his ultimate destiny," and thus that mankind's return to dust is not view.⁷⁴ The analysis below will both show the matter is not as "straightforward" as Lohr claims and at the same time confirm his overall instinct regarding תשוקה in 1QS 11 as meaning "return."

1QS 11:22 is the concluding line to the Community Rule scroll and is part of a first-person Hymn (10:9–11:22) often compared to the hymns in Hodayot.⁷⁵ Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, for instance, argues this concluding Hymn and the hymns in Hodayot share the common *Sitz im Leben* of the annual feast of a covenant renewal ceremony.⁷⁶ For our purposes, it is significant that expressions of human lowliness in the Hymn are matched by similar expressions in Hodayot. In Hodayot such expressions regularly appear together in passages called *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien* (lowliness doxologies)⁷⁷ which both lament the human condition and are set in stark juxtaposition to descriptions of the glorious fate of the elect. The effect is to magnify the speaker's wonder

in DSS contexts.

⁷¹ As per earlier proposals for biblical instances of תשוקה in agreement with the early versions' use of ἀποστροφή, etc. (see above). Henoch Yalon, "Review of Dead Sea Scrolls II 2, ed. M. Burrows," *Kiryat Sepher* 28 (1952): 73 [Hebrew].

⁷² *The Thanksgiving Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judea* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1957).

⁷³ Elisha Qimron, referring to Jubilees and the targums, writes of the "surprising" conclusion that תשוקה should be seen as closely connected with תשובה ("return") in the Scrolls ("Biblical Philology and the Dead Sea Scrolls" [Hebrew], *Tarbiz* 58 [1989]: 312). He draws attention to additional parallels such as שב אל עפרו in 1QH^a 12:31 and ואל-עפר תשוב in Gen 3:19. Similarly, *BHQ*, 85; Menahem Kister, "Metamorphoses of Aggadic Traditions" (Hebrew), *Tarbiz* 60 (1991): 179–224.

⁷⁴ "תשוקה," 377.

⁷⁵ Charlotte Hempel describes the hymn as "an anthology of disparate material" (*The Community Rules from Qumran: A Commentary*, TSAJ 183 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020], 266).

⁷⁶ "La genèse littéraire de la Règle de la Communauté," *RB* (1969): 545.

⁷⁷ First coined by Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran mit einem Anhang über Eschatologie und Gegenwart in der Verkündigung Jesu* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 27.

as he considers that, despite his lowly estate, he has nevertheless been chosen to receive divine knowledge and “participation in the (heavenly) communion of worshippers.”⁷⁸ Central to Hodayot’s portrayal of mankind’s lowliness is the use of stereotyped language, of which the most common expressions allude to humanity’s creation from the ground.⁷⁹ Indeed, included here are expressions of mankind being “spat saliva,” “moulded clay,” as well as being “shaped from dust,” and “returning to dust.”

1QH^a 18

In order to better understand how these expressions are used, and so to better substantiate the likelihood לעפר תשוקתו in 1QS 11:22 describes mankind’s “return” to dust, two Hodayot texts (18 and 20) are especially relevant. 1QHodayot^a 18 shares an impressive number of similarities with 1QS 11. Most notable is that, among so many similarities, rather than לעפר תשוקתו, we find לעפר תשובתו.⁸⁰ That is, in a very similar context and in a nearly identical clause to the one in which תשוקה appears in 1QS 11, the more expected imagery of mankind’s “return” to dust is clearly present. The pertinent lines of 1QH^a 18 are as follows:

What, then is man?	ומה אפהו אדם
He is nothing but earth.	ואדמה הוא
[From clay] he is fashioned	[מתמר] קורץ ולעפר תשובתו
And to dust he will return. (18:3–4)	...
How can I be learned if you do not mould me?	ואיכה אכשל (אשכיל) בלא יצרתה לי
What can I say if you do not open my mouth?	ומה אדבר בלא פתחתה פי
And how can I answer if you do not give me insight? (18:6–7)	ואיכה אשיב בלוא השכלתני
...And what, then, is someone who returns to his dust to retain [stren]gth ... (18:12)	ומה אפהו אש לעפרו כי יעצור [כת] ...

⁷⁸ Nicholas A. Meyer, *Adam’s Dust and Adam’s Glory in the Hodayot and the Letters of Paul: Rethinking Anthropogony and Theology*, NovTSup 168 (Leiden Brill, 2016), 34.

⁷⁹ Carol A. Newsom, “Deriving Negative Anthropology,” in *Is There a Text in this Cave? Studies in the Textuality of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of George J. Brooke*, ed. Ariel Feldman, Maria Cioatã and Charlotte Hempel, STDJ 119 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 259.

⁸⁰ Here I follow the lead of Qimron who refers to “1QH^a 12:31, etc.” (“Biblical Philology,” 312 n. 86).

Features common to 1QS 11:21—22 and 1QH^a 18 include:

1. the speaker is designated as a maskil,⁸¹
2. a hymnic context;
3. a “merging of hymnic and calendrical material”;⁸²
4. the theme of creation and accompanying language;⁸³
5. an emphasis on human lowliness before God (*Niedrigkeitsdoxologie*);
6. the assertion of mankind’s earthly origins, using the terms עפר (“dust”) and חמר (“clay”), with the implication drawn for mankind’s present lowliness (e.g. “he is spat saliva,” “molded clay” in 1QS 11 // “he is nothing but earth” in 1QH^a 18);⁸⁴
7. the collocation חמר (“clay”)⁸⁵ + קורץ (“molded”//“fashioned”) in reference to mankind’s origin;
8. the root יצר (“shape”//“mold”) in reference to mankind’s origin;
9. a series of rhetorical questions emphasizing human lowliness and inability to have knowledge;
10. a context praising God for giving knowledge to the speaker;
11. a focus on mankind’s inability to understand (בין) divine wisdom;⁸⁶
12. doubt expressed regarding human ability to respond (“reply”//“answer”), using the Hiphil of שוב (אשיב//ישיב);
13. the overall sequence: a) a rhetorical question expressing doubt regarding mankind having signifi-

⁸¹ The Maskil is generally accepted as the speaker in the Rule Hymn. According to Carol A. Newsom, this figure functions as ideal representative of the community (*The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*, STDJ 52 [Leiden: Brill, 2004], 157–58, 166); Hempel: “an exemplaric model of liturgical piety” (*Community Rules from Qumran*, 266). Within Hodayot, “for the Maskil” appears in 1QH^a 5:1; 7:11; 20:4; 25:10). Cf. 6:8–22, where responsibility is assigned to him.

⁸² Trine Bjørnung Hasselbalch, *Meaning and Context in the Thanksgiving Hymns: Linguistic and Rhetorical Perspectives on a Collection of Prayers from Qumran* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015), 146.

⁸³ Meyer speaks of creation as “the major of theme” of the Hodayot’s Community Hymns, “in the sense of the origin and coming-to-being of things” (*Adam’s Dust*, 27 [emphasis original]).

⁸⁴ Argued below is that mankind’s earthly destiny is also asserted, using the syntactically identical nominal clause ([X + תש(ק/ב)ה] [לעפר]), where X= “mankind.”

⁸⁵ This assumes García Martínez and Tigchelaar are correct in their proposed reading for the *lacuna* in 1QH^a 18:5.

⁸⁶ 1QH^a 18:2, [ולא יתבונן כול בחוכ[מתכה], “and no-one understands [your] wis[dom]”]; 1QS 11:22, [ולעצת מה יבין, “and what advice will he be able to understand”].

cant status or ability; b) reference to mankind as “molded clay” (חמר + קרץ), immediately followed by the syntactically identical nominal clause ([X + תשוקה] [לעפר] תשוקה/ק/ב), where X=mankind.

1QH^a 20

Most of the above features shared by 1QH^a 18 and 1QS 11 are likewise shared with 1QH^a 20. Although lacking the use of תשובה as part of the matching clausal structure in which תשובה appears in 1QS 11 (as per 1QH^a 18), mankind in 1QH^a 20 is nonetheless again depicted both as created from and returning to dust (the latter using the collocation עפר [“dust”] + שוב [“return”]). Here, however, we have the additional similarity in that both 1QS 11 and 1QH^a 20 use “spat saliva” (מצירוק) in parallel with shaped “clay” (חמר) to depict mankind’s lowliness. Further, the rhetorical question in 1QS 11:22, “What will the clay reply?” is matched in 1QH^a 20:27 by “What will dust and ash[es] reply?” The text and translation of relevant sections are as follows:

And there is no one just with you [...]	ואין צדיק [...] . עמכה
and [to] understand all your mysteries	ו[ל]השכיל ככול רויכה
and to be able to answer [...] (20:19–20)	ולשיב דבר [...] . ואני מעפר לקח[תי]
And I, from dust [I] have been gathered, [and from clay] I have been [formed] to be a source of impurity,	ומחמר קו[רצתי] למקור נדה וערות קלון מקוי עפר
And of vile filth, a pile of dust, mixed with [water, ...] a lodging of darkness.	ומגבל[ים] ה[...] . ומדור חושך ותשובת עפר
The creature of clay must return to the dust	ליצר בקץ [...] . בעפר
at the time of ... [...] in the dust,	אל אשר לקח משם
to the place from which he has been taken.	ומה ישיב עפר ואפ[ר]
What will dust and ash[es] reply? (20:24–28)	...ומה [יבין במ]עשיו
[... How] can it under- stand his [wo]rks?	ואין להשיב על תוכחתה כיא צדקתה ואין לנגדכה

There is no reply to your reproach,	ומה אפיה שב אל עפרו
for you are just and there is no-one before you.	ואני נאלמתי ומה אדבר על זות
What is he (to do that), he who returns to his dust?	כדעתי דברתי מצירוק יצר חמר
I have kept silence, for what can I say about this matter?	
In accordance with my knowledge /I spoke/, spat saliva, one fashioned from clay. (20:30–32)	

Trine Bjørnung Hasselbalch observes 1QH^a 20 and the Community Rule Hymn (1QS 9–11) share a “considerable amount” of common vocabulary.⁸⁷ Further, 1QS 11:21 concludes the final section of the Hymn (11:15b–22), a section that begins with the speaker’s blessing of God as a giver of knowledge (11:15b second-person, **אתה אלי ברוך**) as well as a transition from third person description of God to second person address. Both the blessing and second person address are consistent features of Hodayot. Hasselbalch is right to conclude there is a “fundamental affinity” between the Community Rule Hymn (1QS 9–11) and 1QH^a 20.⁸⁸ It should be added that the portrayal of the human condition in the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien* is viewed as a “radical” and “distinctive” perspective that occurs in the Qumran literature only in the Hodayot texts (from Cave 1 and 4), the Community Rule and in 4Q511, the latter likely borrowing from Hodayot.⁸⁹

In terms of the language of “dust,” Hasselbalch speaks of “endless references to humankind as a creation of dust and clay in the Hodayot.”⁹⁰ The result is that the speaker’s dominant self-characterization is “as a human being created from clay, [who] is incapable of doing anything at all.”⁹¹ References to mankind’s “return” to dust function to complement this characterization.⁹²

⁸⁷ He concludes: “the rate of common words . . . is very high” (*Meaning and Context*, 161).

⁸⁸ *Meaning and Context*, 126. Cf. Eileen Schuller’s description of the Hymn as “a very ‘Hodayot-like’ psalm” (“Recent Scholarship on the Hodayot,” *CBR* 10 [2011]: 143).

⁸⁹ Newsom, “Deriving Negative Anthropology,” 299.

⁹⁰ *Meaning and Context*, 140 n 58. According to Newsom, “dust” occurs approximately thirty-five times, more frequently than any other term (“Deriving Negative Anthropology,” 263). Meyer calls humanity’s creation from dust “an almost ubiquitous feature of the Hodayoth” (*Adam’s Dust*, 39).

⁹¹ *Meaning and Context*, 141.

⁹² Three other texts speak of “returning to dust,” however, the number of shared features is significantly less (1QH^a 22:7 (top): **ש|ב** | **אל עפרו**; 22:11 (bottom): **שב אל עפרו**; 23:4–5 (bottom): **מעפר לוקחתי**)

According to Jason Maston, the resulting “parallel conception of humanity’s beginning and ending reinforces the idea that humans are frail creatures by virtue of the material from which they are created.”⁹³

The effect of so many close parallels of language and purpose between 1QS 11:21–22 and 1QH^a 18 and 20, among which are the strikingly similar clauses לעפר תשובתו and לעפר תשוקתו, increases the likelihood that תשוקה should be understood as having a meaning closely related to תשובה. Before drawing such a conclusion, however, more needs to be said about the function of the language of lowliness in the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien*. The portrayal of humans as “incapable of doing anything,” to use Haselbalch’s words, is at least in part frequently used to describe moral incapacity. That is, often in view is mankind’s sinfulness and guilt in the face of divine righteousness. According to Newsom, lowliness expressions emphasize “the overwhelming power and mercy of God” by means of “articulating one’s natural human sinfulness and loathsomeness.”⁹⁴ The connection between mankind’s terrestrial origin and its moral failure is especially evident in 1QH^a 20: “And I, from dust [I] have been gathered, [and from clay] I have been [formed] to be a source of impurity, And of vile filth, a pile of dust, mixed with [water, ...] a lodging of darkness” (24–26).⁹⁵

As expected, the Community Rule Hymn exhibits a similar interest. Shortly before the language of earthly composition in 1QS 11:21–22, the Maskil confesses, “I belong to evil human-kind, to the assembly of unfaithful flesh; my failings, my iniquities, my sins, {...} with the depravities of my heart, belong to the assembly of worms and of those who walk in darkness” (1QS 11:9–11).⁹⁶ Syend Holm-Nielsen goes as far as to describe this language as involving “technical terms in the DSS for man’s sinfulness as contrasted with the divine nature.”⁹⁷ In other words, expressions indicating mankind’s earthly origin and destiny are simply “idioms or dead metaphors”⁹⁸ narrowly focused on human sinfulness. This understanding raises the possibility that “longing for dust” in 1QS 11:22 could be a plausible description of mankind’s desire to act corruptly.

Maston, however, rightly argues the pervasive allusions in these texts to the storyline of Genesis 1–3 indicate the language

[וא] [ל] [עפר שבתי...]

⁹³ “Anthropological Crisis and Solution in the Hodayot and 1 Corinthians 15,” *NTS* 62 (2016): 533–48, here 537.

⁹⁴ *Self As Symbolic Space*, 173.

⁹⁵ See also 1QH^a 9:23; 12:30; 19:13–15; 21:10; 23:13. On the use of terminology of ritual purity to describe moral concerns, see Meyer, *Adam’s Dust*, 47–58.

⁹⁶ García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scroll Study Edition*, 1:99.

⁹⁷ *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran*, ATDan 2 (Aarhus, Denmark: Universitetsforlaget, 1960), 24 n. 3, cited in Daniel Frayer-Griggs, “Spittle, Clay, and Creation in John 9:6 and Some Dead Sea Scrolls,” *JBL* 132 (2013): 559–70, here 667, in specific reference to “creature of clay” and “kneaded with water.”

⁹⁸ Maston, “Anthropological Crisis,” 537.

of earthly composition has a function beyond a narrow focus on human moral corruption. Specifically, also in view is God's creative activity, with its resultant stark contrast between God as creator and humans as mere creatures.⁹⁹ According to Maston, "When the hymnist describes humans in the language of Gen 2.7, that language does not denote in the first instance sinfulness, but rather weakness, frailty and ultimately mortality."¹⁰⁰ Similarly, in reference to the expression "creature of clay," Newsom notes it "underscores the susceptibility of the speaker to the dust of death."¹⁰¹ The language of "dust" in Hodayot is simply not reducible to a "technical term" denoting human sinfulness. It is reasonable to conclude, then, that any purported reference to mankind's "desire for dust" in 1QS 11 is unlikely to refer to "desire for sin."

Given the strong allusions to the storyline of Gen 2–3, where mankind is formed from the dust (2:7) and destined to return to the dust (3:19), it can be concluded that the many commonalities between 1QS 11 and Hodayot (18 and 20) greatly reinforce the probability that לעפר תשוקתו in 1QS 11 should be read as closely parallel to לעפר תשובתו ("to dust is his return") in 1QH^a 18. Standard translations of 1QS 11, like that of García Martínez and Tigchelaar ("for dust is his longing"), ask us to assume, in the face of the very high degree of similarity of the respective contexts, that the use of these two strikingly similar clauses is actually a point of significant distinction between the two texts. That is, although 1QH^a 18 speaks of mankind's "return" to dust as a clear echo of Gen 3:19 ("to dust you will return," אלה-עפר תשוב), we are to read 1QS 11 as introducing, into a remarkably similar context, the otherwise unattested idea of humanity's "longing" for dust. Far simpler is the conclusion that תשוקה in 1QS 11 conveys a sense at least broadly similar to "return."¹⁰² Rather than introducing an especially distinctive element within a recognised literary form, the use of תשוקה is better understood to refer to an idea readers of such texts expect: mankind's fate lies in a movement back to the dust from which he was made. If so, Macintosh is clearly misguided in his critique of the translation "return" on the assumption the future is not in view in this text.

Further support for the idea of "return" can be seen in the way *DCH* smuggles it into its listing of 1QS 11:21 under תשוקה

⁹⁹ Ibid., 538. Julie A. Hughes argues the resemblance of the frequent expression "creature of clay, kneaded with water" to Job 10:9; 33:6 and Isa 29:16; 41:25 suggests such expressions may be used idiomatically (46–47). Nevertheless, she observes this is not always the case. In an analysis of 1QH^a 20, she concludes the expression "creature of clay," in combination with other allusions to Genesis, is used "in a clear evocation Genesis 3:19" (*Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot*, STDJ 59 [Leiden: Brill, 2006], 47).

¹⁰⁰ "Anthropological Crisis," 538.

¹⁰¹ "Self as Symbolic Space," 256.

¹⁰² Of course, it is possible a scribal error rendered תשוקה for an original תשובה. The dominant early tradition understanding תשוקה as "turning, return" cautions against this.

I, “desire” by giving the sense “human for (return to) dust.” The parenthetical assertion offers ready acknowledgement of the view that תשוקה in 1QS 11 actually means “return.” The sense “desire,” on the other hand, is an abrupt intrusion and otherwise unwarranted. At least for this text, it is the meaning “return” that is very plausible.

Finally, it has been mentioned the LXX translates תשוקה in Cant 7:11 with ἐπιστροφή, a use Muraoka lists under the gloss “act of returning to the point of origin.”¹⁰³ According to Sir 40:1, “a heavy yoke is on Adam’s sons from the day of their exit from their mother’s womb until the day of return (ἐπιστροφή) to the mother of all [viz., mother earth]” (NETS). Sirach elsewhere uses ἀποστροφή (used in LXX Gen 3:16 and 4:7) to speak of the return of all living creatures to the earth from which they were created (Sir 16:30) and ἀποστρέφω for God’s return of mankind to the earth (17:30). Such use of the same words that translate תשוקה in its three biblical occurrences, each here in reference to mankind’s “return” to the earth, further reinforces the conclusion that “return” is an appropriate translation of תשוקה in the very similar context of human destiny in 1QS 11.

In terms of Rabin’s proposal, “being driven by” (“under the authority of”) dust in 1QS 11 also suffers from being an abrupt introduction of a novel idea. Perhaps its presence can be justified by seeing it as imaginatively communicating the point that even lowly dust wields authority over lowly mankind. On balance, however, this sense is judged unlikely. Unfortunately, Macintosh does not specify how he understands his proposal (“preoccupation, devoted attention”) in relationship to dust in 1QS 11.¹⁰⁴ In order to make good sense of “preoccupation for dust,” it would appear necessary to add the meaning of “return” (viz., “preoccupation for returning to dust”) just as *DCH* does with “desire.” Finally, “preoccupation” too suffers from the introduction of an unexpected sense to the otherwise multiple stock expressions present in the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien*. It too is judged implausible.

¹⁰³ *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Louvain: Peters, 2009), 283.

¹⁰⁴ Hempel cites Macintosh’s article in support of the translation “whose predilection is for dust,” yet she offers no explanation (*Community Rules*, 291). Not only does Macintosh nowhere mention “predilection” as a translation, but this translation appears closer to “desire” than to Macintosh’s “preoccupation, attention, focus.” *The Oxford Dictionary of English* (online 3rd ed., 2005) defines “predilection” as “a preference or special liking for something; a bias in favour of something; your *predilection for* pretty girls” (emphasis original). *The Oxford Paperback Thesaurus* (online, 4th ed., 2012) lists “inclination” as a possible synonym for both “predilection” and “desire.”

<i>Text:</i>	<i>Proposed meaning of</i>	<i>Plausibility</i>
1QS 11	תְּשׁוּקָה = “desire”	implausible
X=“mankind”	= “being driven”	implausible
(“one born of woman”)	= “preoccupation, devoted attention”	implausible
Y=“dust”	= “return”	very plausible

CONCLUSION

<i>Meaning of</i>	<i>1QM 13</i>	<i>1QM 15</i>	<i>1QM 17</i>	<i>*4QInstr^b</i>	<i>1QS 11</i>
תְּשׁוּקָה “desire”	plausible	plausible	plausible	less plausible	implausible
“being driven”	plausible	plausible	plausible	plausible	implausible
“preoccupation, devoted attention”	plausible	plausible	plausible	plausible	implausible
“return”	less plausible	less plausible	plausible	plausible	very plausible

This study has evaluated four major proposals for the meaning of תְּשׁוּקָה within the context of the DSS. It has been argued that the notion of “return” is best suited to 1QS 11, a conclusion supported by the numerous parallels between 1QS 11 and 1QH^a 18 and 20. Most notable is the matching clausal structure within which תְּשׁוּקָה and תְּשׁוּבָה appear, suggesting a close correspondence between these two words. Furthermore, the customary understanding of “desire” for תְּשׁוּקָה in 1QS 11 has been shown to be particularly implausible, a conclusion reinforced by the absence of “desire” in the earliest biblical versions in favor of words that often mean “return, turning.” This suggests that, despite its widespread usage, the meaning “desire” fails to reflect the intention of תְּשׁוּקָה in any of its biblical or DSS contexts. Translations such as “your desire shall be for your husband” (Gen 3:16 NRSV) and “for dust is his longing” (1QS 11:22, García Martínez and Tigchelaar) should be abandoned. Finally, “preoccupation, devoted attention” and “driving, being driven” (as an expression of ruling or being ruled) have likewise been shown to be implausible in 1QS 11, and “return, turning” has proven problematic for 1QM 13 and 15. As a result, none of the proposed options convincingly fits every instance of תְּשׁוּקָה in the Scrolls.

One possibility for resolving the impasse is to see less distinction between “preoccupation, devoted attention” and “return, turning” than is typically recognised. Macintosh, in making the case תְּשׁוּקָה is related to Arabic *sūq*, notes the root’s use to

indicate a person's "driving to God" as the only help on Judgment Day: "Upon that day unto thy Lord shall be the driving."¹⁰⁵ That is, it describes one's recourse to God, a "turning to" him for protection that can be described as a "movement towards a goal or destination" (which "implies, as of necessity, complete focus upon him").¹⁰⁶ For Macintosh, this supports the meaning of תשוקה as "focus, preoccupation, devoted attention." Yet the nuances of "turning to," and especially, "focused movement toward," fit 1QS 11 impressively well.¹⁰⁷ In this way, given the context of mankind being created from dust, whereas the literal translation of לעפר תשוקתו would be "to dust is his focused movement," readers would nevertheless discern the expected sense "to dust is his return."

The early and pervasive testimony to translating תשוקה in its biblical occurrences with words having the meaning "return, turning" is difficult to ignore. We have also noted ἐπιστροφή both translates תשוקה (Cant 7:11) and depicts mankind's end-of-life "return" to the earth (Sir 40:1). This could suggest תשוקה carried both the sense of a "focused movement toward" (together with "preoccupation, devoted attention") and also "movement back toward," and thus "return."¹⁰⁸ The evidence for this conclusion, however, remains insufficient. Rather than תשוקה carrying the meaning of "return" on its own, it is preferable in 1QS 11 to see it indicating only man's "turning toward" or "movement toward" the dust. The sense of "movement back" is merely implied from the context.

The following senses can thus be suggested for the remaining DSS and biblical texts. In 1QM 13, 15, and 17, evil persons (whether men or angels) are devoted to/preoccupied with deeds of darkness and chaos. For Gen 3:16, 4QInstruction^b and Cant 7:11, the woman and male lover exhibit a devoted attention/focus upon, or perhaps a focused movement toward, their partners.¹⁰⁹ Finally, for Gen 4:7, assuming personified sin as the subject, sin's devoted attention is toward Cain (and his destruction).¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁵ "תשוקה," 381–82, citing Arthur J. Arberry, *The Koran Interpreted: A Translation* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1955), 2:313.

¹⁰⁶ "תשוקה," 381–82.

¹⁰⁷ Semantic overlap between "turning to/movement towards" and "desire" is likewise worthy of consideration.

¹⁰⁸ A similar semantic range is in fact evident for ἐπιστροφή and ἀποστροφή. See above, and Macintosh, "תשוקה," 367–69.

¹⁰⁹ For Gen 3:16 the immediate context of childbirth suggests a sexual intention on either rendering. Yet the larger context of relational intimacy loss (e.g., the "one flesh" partnership of אִישׁ and אִשָּׁה, celebrated by the man in poetic verse, devolves into the man blaming the אִשָּׁה [2:18, 23–24; 3:12]) implies a broader relational intimacy is also in view. A similar two-fold sense is likely present for Cant 7:11. It should also be noted that for 4QInstruction^b the context of authority makes a primarily physical "movement toward" the husband unlikely.

¹¹⁰ The adversarial force, in this case, is implied by the context.