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Introduction

Now that most of the texts from the Dead Sea are published, a study of a theologically significant word in the Scrolls suggests itself; for only now might we will be able to expound fully the scope of usage and meaning of such a word.

This study, therefore, is first of all an investigation of the usage and the meaning of כַּכֶּרֶם in 1QH (the Thanksgiving Hymns) and the Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice in comparison with the understanding of δόξα / כַּכֶּרֶם in the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint. The profound significance of the term can already be seen in the Hebrew Bible. Here, כַּכֶּרֶם occurs quite frequently and is important especially with respect to the relationship between the chosen people Israel and God (JHWH), for it is strongly linked with God (JHWH), His mode of appearance, the place where He dwells, and even His nature.

Because the scope of this study is limited, we cannot include all Dead Sea Scrolls in detail. We will, therefore, focus especially on 1QH (Thanksgiving Hymns) and 4Q400-407 (the Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice), where כַּכֶּרֶם has an important and significant function, and where the understanding of the term differs most decisively from the understanding of כַּכֶּרֶם in the Hebrew Bible and of δόξα in the Septuagint.

Furthermore, it is very interesting to record that despite the theological significance כַּכֶּרֶם / δόξα in the different writings and the nuanced manner in which the texts use כַּכֶּרֶם, very little scholarly work has been done to investigate the precise sense of כַּכֶּרֶם in the different writings from Qumran. In the scholarly literature, comments on the exact sense of כַּכֶּרֶם in

---

1 A thorough examination of the usage and meaning of "gloria" in the Vulgate is beyond the scope of this study. The Vulgate, however, will be taken into consideration where appropriate.
IQH are very rare. בְּכֹרֵה in the Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice has not been the object of any detailed analysis.

This situation, and the fact that there is little material on בְּכֹרֵה in the secondary literature, are good reasons in themselves for a detailed investigation of the usage and meaning of בְּכֹרֵה especially in IQH and the Shirot.

Apart from the investigation of the sense of בְּכֹרֵה/ δὸξα, his study has another purpose: the comparison of the usage and meaning of בְּכֹרֵה in IQH and the Shirot with בְּכֹרֵה/ δὸξα in the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint. What are the differences between the understanding of בְּכֹרֵה/ δὸξα in the Hebrew Bible, the LXX, IQH, and the Shirot? Where are the connections or links between the writings with respect to בְּכֹרֵה/ δὸξα? The answers of these questions are only possible after the investigation of the sense of the terms in the different writings. The comparative study sets out to discover whether we can find a tradition of understanding of the term between these different writings. This study does not intend to define the relationship between the writings themselves (if any), but it will certainly be a step towards a more complete understanding of their relationship. The investigation of the usage of בְּכֹרֵה/ δὸξα in the different writings and their comparison will at least, we hope, produce a result which might allow comments on the relationship of the writings as well.

Investigating the usage and meaning of בְּכֹרֵה/ δὸξα this study will mainly focus on the בְּכֹרֵה/ δὸξα of God, for this is the most important aspect of the term especially in the Qumran writings which will be considered. Hence this study intends to bring the relationship of the members of the Qumran community and their God to a new light.
Methodologically the emphasis of this study will lie on a linguistical approach. I will look at the occurrences of כְּבָרוּד/ δόξα in the different writings. How are the terms used grammatically? What words of theological significance are connected and linked with the terms? How are the terms grammatically linked especially with God? The question of authorship, historical background of the persons or place where the texts have their origin, or the textual form of the texts where כְָבָרוּד/ δόξα occur will also be considered where appropriate.

Because the understanding of כְָבָרוּד has not yet been fully investigated in 1QH and the Shirot, nor have its meanings in the different writings been compared with one another, the investigation of כְָבָרוּד/ δόξα in the two writings of Qumran and in the LXX will consider all occurrences of the terms. Such a method of approach should present a full picture of the understanding of כְָבָרוּד in the different writings, and should therefore avoid superficial conclusions.

Unfortunately, a complete enumeration of the occurrences in 1QH and especially the Shirot is not always possible. The quality of the extant texts is occasionally rather poor. The context of כְָבָרוּד, or the setting the term occurs in is often missing. Sometimes we cannot define anymore how כְָבָרוּד is linked with the surrounding text, or what function כְָבָרוּד might have within the structure of the sentences. In these cases, only those occurrences will be taken into consideration which really allow a comment on the understanding of כְָבָרוּד. If the usage of the term proves hard to determine, a comment will not be given: this should prevent unnecessary wrong impressions of the term from exercising any influence on the conclusions reached here.
Part I: כנור in the Masoretic Text (MT)

The purpose of this study is the examination of the understanding of כנור in 1QH and the Shirot in comparison with the MT, the LXX, and occasionally the Vulgate. Hence, the investigation of the understanding of כנור in the MT is not aiming at an elaboration of a "history" of the term כנור within the MT. This investigation of the understanding of כנור in the MT intends to give a basic description of the understanding of כנור in the MT as the term must have been appeared to the authors of Qumran (or related writers).

1. Basic meaning

In the MT כנור occurs 199 times. Its basic or original meaning is "weight" (gravitas). Even if the word כנור adopts other meanings they are basically developments of its sense as gravitas.

2. Secular understanding of כנור

The MT, significantly, draw a distinction between כנור understood in a secular sense, and the כנור ידוהה. So in the former case כנור was, based on its basic meaning as "gravitas", understood as "jenes Aktivum, das Völker oder Menschen, ja sogar Gegenstände imponierend macht und zwar meist als etwas sinnfällig Erfahrbares". In Isa. 5:13, for example, the

---

2 For that see especially B. Stein, K'hot Jahveh, 1939.
3 Therefore, I will not draw a distinction between the usages and understandings of כנור within different sources of the OT. Such a distinction is the result of a modern theological approach. The writers of Qumran certainly did not draw this distinction, but read the writings of the Hebrew Bible as one text.
4 M. Weinfeld, ינור, 24.
5 E. Jacob, Theology, 79; M. Weinfeld, ינור, 24; W. Eichrodt, Theology v.2, 30.
6 G. v. Rad, Theologie I, 238.
of a people is its "nobility", its "upper class" or in 17:3; 21:16 its "geschichtliche
Mächtigkeit". In Isa. 16:14 כְּבוֹד is used as something which has quantity.\(^8\)

A very important aspect of the understanding of כְּבוֹד in a secular sense is its usage in con-
junction with human beings. G.v. Rad even calls כְּבוֹד an "anthropological term".\(^9\) Referring
to humans and again based on its original denotation as "gravitas" כְּבוֹד was used often in
the sense of "honour".\(^10\) "Yet honour was not thought of as a purely ideal quality, but, in ac-
cordance with the basic meaning, as something 'weighty' in man which gives him impor-
tance"\(^11\) (for example: Gen. 13:2; 31:1; 45:13; Ps. 49:16; Isa. 5:13 etc.). In addition the
meaning "strength" for כְּבוֹד is attested in Job 29:20, referring to a human.\(^12\)

3. כְּבוֹד related to sacred paraphernalia

כְּבוֹד is used in the MT not only in connection with God himself "but all kinds of special re-
ligious objects may be endowed with kabod (...)"\(^13\): for example: the throne (1S. 2:8; Isa.
22:23; Jer. 14:21\(^14\), 17:12\(^15\)), holy garments (Ex. 28:2,40), and crowns (Job. 19:9). These oc-
currences show כְּבוֹד in a "semi-secular" sense, for it is used grammatically independently
of JHWH,\(^16\) but it is an attribute of objects which are closely related to JHWH.

\(^7\) ibid.
\(^8\) Isa. 16:14*; "(...) the כְּבוֹד of Moab will be brought into contempt, (...)"
\(^9\) G.v. Rad/ G. Kittel, דָּוְקֹד, 238.
\(^10\) G.v. Rad/ G. Kittel, דָּוְקֹד, 238.
\(^11\) ibid.
\(^12\) M. Weinfeld, כְּבוֹד, 25.
\(^13\) M. Weinfeld, כְּבוֹד, 28.
\(^14\) Correctly B. Stein, קְּבֹד יְהֹウェָה, 100f: elaborates that in this case the כְּבוֹד יְהֹウェָה is not meant.
\(^15\) See footnote above.
\(^16\) Correctly B. Stein, קְּבֹד יְהֹウェָה, 105 points out with regard to the relationship of כְּבוֹד and "the ark" that כְּבוֹד as such is not necessarily the כְּבוֹד of JHWH; this observation applies to the occurrence of כְּבוֹד as an attribute of other sacred paraphernalia as well.
4. "הכבוד" related to God

In the MT, "הכבוד" is used 33 times as an attribute of JHWH. Here "הכבוד" is an attribute of JHWH. "הכבוד" belongs directly to JHWH. "הכבוד" is a part of the nature of God. Here as well "הכבוד" keeps its basic meaning as "gravitas" or "importance" referring here to JHWH. It denotes here, then, "glory" or "splendour". This understanding of "הכבוד" might be in the OT the most important one.

In order to describe the understanding of "הכבוד" more precisely, we will examine a few aspects of its occurrence in this sense in detail.

4.1. "הכבוד" and the theophany

The "הכבוד" occurs frequently in association with the description of a theophany (Ex. 16:10; 24:16; 40:34f.; Nu. 17:7; Ps. 97:1-6; Ez. 1:4; 10:4). This appearance of the "הכבוד" occurs mainly in two different ways.

First, especially in Exodus, the "הכבוד" "is conceived as a blazing fire surrounded by a cloud". Cloud and fire are the indispensable elements of the theophany. G.v. Rad calls, therefore, the "הכבוד" the "terminus technicus" for the theophany. Then he states that the "הכבוד" is "die Erscheinungsform schlechthin, in der sich Jahwe nach der Anschauung

---

17 And many more times it is found grammatically differently linked with God.
18 M. Weinfeld, "כבוד", 27 who extends this denotation also to JHWH's sanctuary, city, or other sacred paraphernalia.
19 See also Freiherr von Gall, Herrlichkeit Gottes, 61.
21 A discussion whether cloud and fire were understood as manifestation of the "כבוד", or as "accompanying phenomena" (M Weinfeld, "כבוד", 32) of the theophany, depends on the distinction between different sources within the text of the Hebrew Bible. With regard to Qumran this distinction must not be drawn. Therefore, such a discussion is secondary in the context of this thesis.
22 G.v. Rad, Theologie I, 239.
von P Israel zur Offenbarung besonderer Willensentschlüsse, zu wichtigen Schlichtungen usw. gestellt hat\textsuperscript{23}.

Secondly, in Ezekiel occurs another description of the קְבֹד יְהֹוָה. "Ezekiel, whose imagery is closely allied to that of P, transfers his concept of kabod to the Jerusalem temple. Here kabod is depicted as a phenomenon of radiant splendour (Ez. 10:4; 43:2) that moves, rises, and comes near (9:3; 10:18; 11:23; 43:4). Like P, Ezekiel describes kabod as a blazing fire surrounded by radiance and a great cloud (1:4; 8:2).\textsuperscript{24} קְבֹד יְהֹוָה is here as well a divine phenomenon. Hence the statement of Th. C. Vriezen, \textit{Theology}, 208 that in the visions of Ezekiel glory has to be considered as an "independent manifestation of Yahweh" certainly pushes the point too far, for Vriezen is referring to Ez. 3:23 and 8:4 where explicitly the קָבֹד of God is mentioned.\textsuperscript{25}

As the word קָבֹד יְהֹוָה is grammatically always an attribute of God, understood as a divine element, as part of the nature of JHWH. קָבֹד is here also "that aspect of activity of Jahweh that could be perceived by man and in which he [JHWH] himself is revealed in his power"\textsuperscript{26}.

4.2. The visibility of קָבֹד

With respect to the visibility of the קָבֹד יְהֹוָה, the MT offers an ambiguous picture.\textsuperscript{27}

Maybe depending on the different sources of the MT, the קָבֹד יְהֹוָה is described as well as a visible phenomenon, as something that people cannot see.\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{23} G. v. Rad, \textit{Theology I}, 239.
\textsuperscript{24} M. Weinfeld, קְבֹד, 27.
\textsuperscript{25} קָבֹד אלוהי יָשָׁב, קָבֹד יְהֹוָה, 3:23; קָבֹד יְהֹוָה, 8:4.
\textsuperscript{26} M. Weinfeld, קְבֹד, 33.
\textsuperscript{27} A comprehensive discussion with respect to the different MT materials is beyond the scope of this study. For further details see: M. Weinfeld, קְבֹד, 31-34, esp. 33; W. Eichrodt, \textit{Theology} v.2, 29-35, esp. 31ff.; B.
When ידועו is used as terminus technicus of the theophany, it is not always clear whether the authors meant that the ענבר ידועו itself, or rather cloud and fire are the visible elements of the theophany.\(^{29}\) Similarly, when the ענבר ידועו appears above the "tent", it is difficult to define whether Israel or the Priests see the cloud or the ענבר ידועו itself.\(^{30}\)

Especially in Isaiah and the Psalms ענבר ידועו is used as object of חז פה, but in many of those cases the text is prophetic and refers to the future. Hence, ענבר ידועו does not seem to be understood as a visible element in the presence of God.\(^{31}\)

Besides the above texts, the MT offers also verses where ענבר ידועו is definitely understood as something which is not visible for humans. In Ex. 33:18-23 Moses desires to see the ענבר ידועו (v.18), but he has to stand behind a cleft in the rock while it passes by (v.22), and can only see it "from behind" (v.23).

The ambiguity of this aspect of the understanding of the ענבר ידועו can also be demonstrated on the occasions where ענבר ידועו is the subject of the verb form נראת (3.sg.m.perf.niph.: "to appear")\(^{32}\), or נרש (3.sg.m. impf. niph.)\(^{33}\). Here the ענבר ידועו seems to be understood as visible phenomenon. But again no watching people are mentioned,\(^{34}\) and the action of the event comes from the ענבר ידועו.

---


\(^{29}\) In all the following cases ענבר ידועו is linked, sometimes as object, with the verb חז פה which indicates already that ענבר ידועו might have been understood as visible. ענבר ידועו occurs 18 times in connection with this verb denoting "to see" (Qal), or "to appear, look" (Nif) (W. Gesenius, *Handwörterbuch*, 734f.).

\(^{30}\) Cf. Ex. 24:17 where ענבר ידועו is an object of חז פה, and it is compared with the fire ("המשוא ענבר").

\(^{31}\) Cf. especially Nu. 14:10; 17:7; 20:6; also in Ez. 10:4 the appearance of the ענבר ידועו is linked with the cloud; in Ez. 1:28 the appearance of the ענבר ידועו is compared with the "rainbow", hence it is not certain what the visible element is.

\(^{32}\) Cf. Isa. 35:2; 66:18; Ps. 97:6; 102:17; in Lev. 9:6 the future appearance of the ענבר ידועו depends on the observance of the commands of God.

\(^{33}\) Nu. 14:10.

\(^{34}\) Indicating visibility most clearly is Lev. 9:23. Cf. also Nu. 16:19; 17:7; 20:6.
Hence, the נברזרה is a visible phenomenon is ambiguous. Yet, we might state that the נברזרה is a phenomenon of the presence of God which might be perceptible directly or indirectly by people.

4.3. נברזרה and a sacred place

Another aspect of נברזרה in the OT is that, according to some texts, the theophany takes place either in "the tent" (for example Ex. 29:44; Lev. 9:6,23; Nu. 14:10; 17:7; 20:6), and נברזרה is also "associated in particular with the temple" (1.K. 8:11, Hag. 2:9, and Ps. 26:8; also in Isa. 6:3; Ez. 43:4). So in some traditions of the OT the appearance of the נברזרה of God was associated with "holy places".

4.4. Eschatology

Many times נברזרה occurs in the OT in an eschatological setting. נברזרה was understood in some texts as an element of future revelation. The נברזרה of God is, in those cases, the element which is revealed to Israel. Especially "in the prophets and the Psalms the future

---

34 Problematic is also the question who was able to see the נברזרה. According to several indications only people chosen by God (Moses: Ex.24:18; Moses and Aaron: Nu. 20:6) seem to have the ability. This idea might have been developed in the Shirat where only heavenly beings or purified people can experience נברזרה (see below).

35 H.D. Preuß, Theologie Bd 1, 191: "Zeichen und Mittel seiner [JHWH's] wirksamen Gegenwart".

36 But one cannot call it simply visible, as E. Jacob, Theology, 80 does. Stating that נברזרה is only understood as visible "im messianischen Reich" (Freiherrn von Gall, Herrlichkeit Gottes; 65f.) does not reflect its occurrence in the MT. Correctly M. Weinfeld, נברזרה, 33 (see above footnote 26). Also correct to W. Eichrodt, Theology v.2, 29-35, who sees that the נברזרה "includes an element of appearance, of which catches the eye" (p.30), and that it "becomes the reflected splendour of the transcendent God" (p.32), but that it is also understood as absolutely transcendent (p.31).

37 Th. C. Vriezen, Theology, 208; also E. Jacob, Theology, 81.

38 נברזרה is a sacred place.

39 In Hag. 2:9 even the word combination נברזרה נברזרה occurs which is a grammatical link between the נברזרה and the temple.
deliverance of the people in Zion is depicted as a new revelation of the kabod. In the future, the Lord will reveal his glory again, as in the days of old when he led Israel out of Egypt (for example Isa. 4:5; 24:23; 60:1f.; 62:1f.; 66:18f.; Ez. 39:21; Ps. 102:17).

4.5. קְבֹר and creation

The texts Nu. 14:21; Ps. 72:19; Isa. 6:3; 52:10; 63:12 show, in their eschatological setting, another understanding of the קְבֹר of God: the future revelation of the קְבֹר יְהוָה takes universal dimensions. "Not just the Israelites but the whole world will behold the glory and splendour of God (...)".

Furthermore, it is mentioned that the creation has also the קְבֹר of its creator (Ps. 42:8; 48:11).

4.6. קְבֹר uttered to God

In the MT, קְבֹר is not only a divine phenomenon, but it is also described as being given from people to God (cf. Jos. 7:19; Ps. 29:1). Here קְבֹר is grammatically not linked with JHWH, but because its origin is in JHWH, its character is here "divine" too.

---

40 M. Weinfeld, קְבֹר, 34f.
41 G.v. Rad, Theologie I, 238; M. Weinfeld, קְבֹר, 35.
Part II: δόξα in the Septuagint

I. Introduction

If we seek for an understanding of ח useRef in the time of the OT and the writings of
Qumran, for fuller understanding of ח useRef in 1QH and the Shirot, it is absolutely essential to
examine the Septuagint. How did the Septuagint translate the ח useRef of the Hebrew Bible?

Two different aspects of ח useRef as understood by the LXX need to be examined. First, what is
the general translation of ח useRef in the LXX? Second, does the term which LXX mostly use as
translation of ח useRef have the same sense as ח useRef in the MT? 43

II. The translation of ח useRef in the LXX

According to J. Lisowsky 44, ח useRef occurs 191 times in the OT. 170 times the LXX has 
δόξα for ח useRef. 43 Only 21 times the LXX has a term other than δόξα, when the OT reads
חרב. Hence the usual and basic translation of ח useRef in the LXX is  δόξα. But, because the
LXX translates ח useRef 21 times not with δόξα, but with some other words, and because the
LXX uses the term δόξα more often in the canonical texts of the OT than the Hebrew Bible
uses the word ח useRef, 46 the term δόξα cannot simply be considered as identical with ח useRef in

43 A.H. Forster, “The meaning of δόξα in the Greek Bible”, Anglican Theological Review 12 (1929/30),
pp. 311-316 enumerates in her article first all verses where δόξα is not the translation of ח useRef (pp. 312-314),
then the meaning of ח useRef in the MT is examined (pp. 314f.), and finally the author demonstrates the relationship
of δόξα and the ח useRef of God. So she is right in pointing out that “δόξα passes from its original meaning of sub-
jective opinion to its most common meaning of reputation, renown, and then suffers a sea change because it
happens to be the word selected to translate kabod in G. (...)” (ibid, p. 316). But she misses entirely the point
that exactly those occasions when δόξα does not render ח useRef demonstrate very clearly how the phenomenon
δόξα was understood in the LXX in contrast to ח useRef in the MT.
44 J. Lisowsky, Konkordanz, 661f.
45 A.H. Forster, Δόξα, 314 finds 181 occurrences, and notes also the the immense importance of this fact.
a different language.\textsuperscript{47} Hence δόξα is at the most a "dominant equivalent"\textsuperscript{48} of the Hebrew כבוד in Greek LXX. But as we shall see, δόξα is not only a translation of כבוד. It presents itself in the LXX as a theological concept depending on the theological ideas of the translator, or translators.

So the questions we have to ask now are: How did the LXX understand δόξα? In which settings and with what understanding does the LXX use δόξα in verses, where the Hebrew Bible does not have כבוד? What are the differences in the understanding of כבוד in the OT and δόξα in the LXX?

III. How is δόξα used in verses where the Hebrew Bible has כבוד?

In the Canonical writings of the Hebrew Bible, כבוד occurs most in the Psalms (49 times), 40 times in Isa., 19 times in Ez., 15 times in the Prov., 12 times in 2.Chr., 10 times in Ex., 7 times in Nu., and 6 times in 1.Chr.\textsuperscript{49}

Now, it is very informative to see how many times the LXX has in its different writings δόξα for כבוד, or uses δόξα when it is not the translation of כבוד. It is a very interesting question why the LXX dealt with δόξα differently in its writings. For example, כבוד occurs 49 times in the Psalms of the Hebrew Bible, but only three times (Ps. 4:3; 7:6; 16:9) it is not translated with δόξα. The situation in Isaiah is entirely different: there כבוד occurs 40 times in the Hebrew writing, whereas the LXX translates כבוד 9 times (!) with a different term. In

\footnote{Δόξα occurs 280 times in the canonical books of the LXX (G. v. Rad/ G. Kittel, δοξα... 242).

\textsuperscript{47} Therefore, one can agree with the statement of G. v. Rad and G. Kittel that "the LXX word receives its distinctive force from the fact that it is used for כבוד," (G. v. Rad/ G. Kittel, δοξα... 242), but one cannot agree with their statement that δόξα "has become identical with כבוד" (ibid.). The last statement ignores the fact that δόξα (21 times) is not used where the Hebrew Bible has כבוד, and is used 177 times without rendering כבוד.

\textsuperscript{48} G. v. Rad/ G. Kittel, δοξα... 242.

\textsuperscript{49} At this point I am focusing on purpose only on those canonical writings where כבוד occurs 6 times or more, to gain a general overall impression of how LXX deal with the word.
Ezekiel (as we have seen an important writing for the understanding of בָּלָה in the Hebrew Bible) the term בָּלָה occurs 19 times, but only once (!) it is not translated in the LXX with δόξα (Ez. 31:18). In the Proverbs of the Hebrew Bible בָּלָה occurs 15 times, only twice the LXX has not δόξα. And in 2 Chronicles, where בָּלָה occurs 12 times, the LXX translates always (!) with δόξα. In Genesis we can find בָּלָה three times, and only one of these texts has not δόξα in the LXX. In Exodus בָּלָה occurs 10 times, the LXX only once does not read δόξα. In Numbers the LXX translates always with δόξα (7 times). Jeremiah in the LXX has only once not δόξα: בָּלָה occurs there 5 times. In 1 Chronicles the term בָּלָה is used 6 times, and the LXX has only once not put δόξα for it. In all other writings of the Hebrew Bible, where בָּלָה occurs (1.S.; Ho.; Ha.; Hg.; Sa.; Qo.; Est.; Ne.; Lev.; 1K.; Mi.; Ma.; Hi.), the LXX translates בָּלָה always with δόξα.

IV. The Greek translation of בָּלָה where the LXX does not have δόξα

1. Isaiah

9 times in Isaiah the LXX does not translate בָּלָה with δόξα. It is useful to analyse those verses first, because they show how the authors of the LXX precisely understood the Hebrew term בָּלָה: in general, one can state that as soon as the Hebrew Bible uses בָּלָה in a secular sense, the LXX avoids the Greek term δόξα. The LXX translates בָּלָה only with δόξα when בָּלָה is used in relation to God, i.e. grammatically in conjunction with the Tetragram.

50 The following verses belong all to the category of secular usage of בָּלָה in the Hebrew Bible which we examined above (see pp. 4f.).
or other divine attributes. At this stage of our investigation we can say that δόξα is understood as a purely divine referent in the Septuagint of Isaiah.

So in Isa. 5:13 the Hebrew Bible uses כבֹּר in a secular fashion as the "upper class" of a people (ךָּכֹּבֹר מִרְיָם רַעְב), and therefore the LXX does not translate כֶּבֹּר with δόξα, but with πληθוς (καὶ πληθος ἐγεννηθην νεκρῶν διὰ λειμῶν). In Isa. 10:18 (ךָּכֹּבֹר יְהוָה) כֶּבֹּר is used in a secular sense as an attribute of the "forest" (יִרְמָי). Hence the LXX translates not with כֶּבֹּר, but with τὰ θύρια, by changing the whole structure of the phrase (ἀποσβέσθησαν τὰ θύρια καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ καὶ οἱ δρυμοὶ). In Isa. 11:10 (ךָּכֹּבֹר) the LXX has τιμὴ for כֶּבֹּר, because כֶּבֹּר is used in a secular fashion as attribute of "Jesse". Again, in Isa. 14:18 τιμὴ occurs for כֶּבֹּר in the LXX, for in the Hebrew כֶּבֹּר is used as an attribute of "all kings of the people" (כָּל מלכי נפש), therefore used in a secular sense. In Isa. 22:18 כֶּבֹּר is used as an attribute of the "chariots" (_cgמִכְּבֹּר), and therefore in a secular sense. The LXX translates with καλὸς (τὸ θῦρα σου τὸ καλὸν). In Isa. 61:6 the LXX has καὶ ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτῶν θαυμασθήσεσθε for בּוכָּבֹר. The כֶּבֹּר of the Hebrew Bible is here the כֶּבֹּר of the הָגְיָם, and therefore appears in a secular sense. LXX consequently translates with δ πλούτος.

In Isa. 22:24 כֶּבֹּר is used in a secular sense:

כָּל כֶּבֹּר בָּתַיד אַבֵּי.

The LXX render this secular use of כֶּבֹּר not with δόξα, but with the adjectival form ἐπιδοξίας:

---

51 This term is used in Ps. 8:6 as translation of דָּרוֹן!
52 The LXX has: πάντες of βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐκοιμήθησαν ἐν τιμῇ.
πῶς ἐνδοξοὺς ἐν τῷ αἰῶν τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ.

Hence ἐνδοξοῦς seems not to be used the same way as δόξα, and may even be a way of avoiding that noun on the part of the translators.

In 59:19 the Greek term ἐνδοξοῦς occurs again for the Hebrew יְדֹרֶם. But here the situation is more difficult, because in the MT יְדֹרֶם is used as the יְדֹרֶם of God:

καὶ φοβηθῆσονται οἱ ἄντω δυσμῶν ὡς οὖν οἱ κυρίου καὶ οἱ ἄνατολῶν ἡλίου τὸ οὖν τὸ ἐνδοξοῦν.

Here one could argue that ἐνδοξοῦς is used in a secular sense, for it does not have a personal pronoun referring to God. But ἐνδοξοῦς depends grammatically here on τὸ οὖν οὗ which in 19a is mentioned as τὸ οὖν οὗ κυρίου.51 In 19b τὸ οὖν οὗ has certainly the same connotation, and ἐνδοξοῦς is therefore used grammatically independent of ὁ κύριος, but in a "divine setting". Hence ἐνδοξοῦς is not used in the same way as δόξα.

In Isa. 24:23 the situation is different again. Here ידֹרֶם occurs in the Hebrew Bible in a divine setting, for the author tells us that יְדֹרֶם יְהוָה will be King on Mt. Zion and in Jerusalem "in glory" (ידֹרֶם). Uniquely, LXX does not have the noun δόξα here, but changes the structure of the sentence and uses the verb δοξάζεω (δοξασθήσεται). This way of dealing with the term ידֹרֶם agrees with the thesis that the LXX uses δόξα only for יְדֹרֶם when the word is used directly as the ידֹרֶם of God.

51 It is difficult to give reasons, why τὸ οὖν οὗ occurs also in 19b. It is doubtful that it is the translation of the 3 sg m. suffix of יְדֹרֶם referring to God. In that case τὸ οὖν οὗ would be a substitute for יְדֹרֶם. It is more plausible that LXX either translated שְׁמוֹ安全事故 with οὖν, or it tried to assimilate 19b to 19a: the enemies fear the name of God or the glorious name (of God). יְדֹרֶם was therefore replaced by τὸ οὖν to ἐνδοξοῦς. The last possibility is the more plausible one. Possibly LXX translators, seeing reference to the Name of God and glory in the same verse, have introduced into their version a phrase which has become common through its use in liturgy and prayer: see Tobit 8.5; cf. Judith 16:13.
2. Other relevant texts:

We now turn the other canonical writings of the OT. The situation there is similar to what we have already noted, although the number of exceptions is higher than in Isaiah. In five verses (Ex. 28:2,40; Ps. 4:3; 16:9; Ez. 31:18; Prov. 26:19) הַבָּרֹד is used in a secular sense. In all of these verses the LXX does not translate δόξα.

In addition we find four verses (Ps. 7:6; Prov. 25:27; Jer. 48:18; 1.Chr. 17:18), where the LXX translated הַבָּרֹד either with a derivative of δόξα, or even with δόξα itself. The question is, whether these verses are arguments against the thesis that the authors of the LXX tried to give δόξα a purely divine reference. Looking at the texts in detail, one notes that some present problems. For example in Prov. 25:27 the LXX seems to have ἐνδόξος for הַבָּרֹד; indeed we have already seen that ἐνδόξος could sometimes be used for הַבָּרֹד. However, MT is almost certainly corrupt; it reads:

(27b)

which should probably be emended to רָבָרֶךְ הַבָּרֹד. Hence, the setting of the verse is secular. The LXX, then, reads a text which is (referring to the whole phrase) neither identical with text in the OT, nor with the proposals for alternatives in the apparatus of the BHS (LXX: τιμῶν δὲ χρῆ λόγους ἐνδόξος(27b)) Of these observations show very clearly that the authors of the LXX saw the difficulties of the Masoretic text, and tried to correct it according to their own ideas. The usage of ἐνδόξος is explainable, because it demonstrates an attempt to find a solution for the difficult Hebrew text: LXX is not using the theologically

---

54 See above pp. 14f.
55 One might think that MT is lectio difficilior. But, considering the proposal given in the apparatus of the BHS ("רחֵלֶךְ הַבָּרֹד"), it is more plausible that text contains a copying mistake which was later corrected by the LXX (see especially Syriac and Targum). Without the correction, the text does not make sense.
56 Looking at v.27a one can easily see that the setting is secular: "It is not good to eat much honey. (...)" (v.27a). Thus v.27b does not really refer to divine matters, although the terms רָבָרֶךְ (prp of text) of λόγος (LXX) have (in the Christian religion) traditionally a divine character.
57 "...it is right to honour glorious words...".
highly significant δόξα (because the Hebrew text is difficult, and the setting secular), but it is
at the same time not doing something entirely different from the Hebrew. This verse is, there-
fore, not an argument against our thesis above.

In 1.Chr. 17:18 once more the LXX changes the structure of the Hebrew sentence, and uses
the verb δοξάζω instead of the noun δόξα. Here as well the LXX avoids the theologically
highly significant term δόξα and uses the verb δοξάζω which in the LXX is not inextricably
linked to purely divine or heavenly contexts.

Problematic for this thesis are two texts (Ps. 7:6 and Jer. 48:18), where רָבָרָב in the MT is
used in a secular sense, and the LXX still translates רָבָרָב with δόξα. These exceptions,
however, are of no great significance. In the Psalms, as we have seen above59, רָבָרָב occurs
49 times in the Hebrew Bible, and only three times the LXX does not have δόξα for רָבָרָב.

So 45 times in the Psalms the LXX has δόξα for רָבָרָב used in a divine context in the MT. A
single verse should not, therefore, be given too much weight.

Because רָבָרָב in the Hebrew Bible and δόξα in the LXX do not often occur in Jeremiah60,
Jer. 48:18 (LXX: Jer. 31:18), where רָבָרָב occurs in a secular sense, and which is in the LXX
translated with δόξα, has a similar significance: it does not falsify the thesis that the authors
of the LXX tried to use δόξα only when רָבָרָב in the Hebrew Bible was used as the רָבָרָב of
God.

---

58 In Ps. 7:6b the LXX has "καὶ τὴν δόξαν μου εἰς χορὸν κατασκοπήσασαν διάψαλμα," for the Hebrew
רָבָרָב לְפָרָשְׁךָ." In both cases the possessive pronoun (1 sg.suffix) refers to the psalmist. The
usage of δόξα for רָבָרָב is, therefore, intended to convey a secular sense.

59 See p. 12.

60 See above p. 13.
3. Summary

It is clear that the LXX draw a distinction between a secular sense of בַּכֶּרֶד, and its employment as the הָכֶרֶד of בַּכֶּרֶד. In the former case the LXX avoids the noun δόξα; in the latter case, the LXX has always δόξα. Therefore, δόξα, is understood in the LXX as a purely divine referent, in contrast to הָכֶרֶד in the Hebrew Bible, which may be used in secular setting. Δόξα, used as a translation of בַּכֶּרֶד, is always the δόξα of God.

V. δόξα as substitute in the LXX Pentateuch for הָכֶרֶד in the Hebrew Bible?

בַּכֶּרֶד, as we have seen, is very much linked with God. Hence δόξα could be understood as a substitute for the Divine Name. Was the word δόξα in the LXX a way of speaking about God without using the Name הָכֶרֶד?52

In the Septuagint Pentateuch the word δόξα occurs 31 times. In 16 of these verses the Hebrew Bible has also the Name הָכֶרֶד.53 What exactly is the relationship between הָכֶרֶד in the Hebrew Bible and δόξα in the LXX?

In 13 cases, where δόξα occurs in the LXX, and the Hebrew Bible has הָכֶרֶד, the word combination in which הָכֶרֶד occurs is הָכֶרֶד בַּכֶּרֶד.54 The LXX has in all these cases ἡ δόξα κυρίου. The authors of the LXX, therefore, translate בַּכֶּרֶד with δόξα, and the Name הָכֶרֶד with ὁ κύριος. That means that one cannot presume that the LXX uses δόξα grammatically as a substitute for the Name הָכֶרֶד. Nevertheless, the frequent usage of δόξα in connection

---

51 Enumeration of these texts also in D.M. Leon, Pelebre y Gloria, 147.
52 In order to answer this question at this point I will focus on the most important part of the LXX: the Pentateuch.
53 Ex. 16:7; 16:10; 24:16,17; 40:34,35; Lev. 9:6,23; Nu. 12:18; 14:10,21; 16:19; 17:7; 20:6,24:11; Dtn. 5:24(21).
with the Name הָרוֹהֵר is obvious, and ἥν δῶξα κυρίον is indeed the Greek word combination for הָרוֹהֵר בָּברָך. So the link between δῶξα and the Name הָרוֹהֵר is very strong. The usual translational term in the LXX for הָרוֹהֵר is ὁ κύριος.

In Nu. 12:8, however, the LXX has τὴν δῶξαν κυρίον for the Hebrew יְרְאוֹ בָּברָך. The usage of δῶξα is identical here with the text above; it merely translates a different Hebrew term. In Nu. 24:11 the situation is similar to the text above, but the grammatical circumstances are different: the LXX has κύριος τῆς δῶξης for הָרוֹהֵר בָּברָך. And in Dtn. 5:24(21) in the Hebrew Bible occurs בָּברָך. The suffix refers to הָרוֹהֵר who is mentioned immediately beforehand (וְגָדְרָא וְיוֹדָה אֶלְדָּר הַמַּכְעָבָר). The LXX has ἐδοξῆσεν θημῖν κύριος ὁ θεὸς θημῖν τὴν δῶξαν αὐτοῦ. Here also the LXX reads δῶξα for בָּברָך, and κύριος for הָרוֹהֵר. These verses corroborate the view given above, that δῶξα was not used in the LXX as substitute for the Name הָרוֹהֵר.

In sum: grammatically δῶξα is mainly the translation of בָּברָך. ὁ κύριος is the translation of הָרוֹהֵר. But, because ἥν δῶξα κυρίον is the translation of בָּברָך, δῶξα is of course very strongly linked with the Name הָרוֹהֵר. One could say that it is almost a part of the Name itself, but grammatically it is not the translation of הָרוֹהֵר. Therefore, one cannot say that it is understood as a substitute for the Name הָרוֹהֵר.
VI. How did the LXX understand the term δόξα where this term is not the translation of כבוד?

The use of δόξα in the LXX, where the Hebrew Bible does not have כבוד, is one of the most fascinating. We have already seen above⁶⁵ that δόξα may be called the "equivalent of כבוד". This equivalent is only used as the "δόξα of the Lord".

But in the LXX can be found 63 verses where δόξα occurs not as translation of כבוד.⁶⁶ Including כבוד, δόξα is used as translation of 25 different Hebrew terms.⁶⁷ Many of them "bear the meanings of strength, wealth, beauty"⁶⁸, as we will see. The analysis of these verses will help to clarify the understanding of δόξα in the LXX.

1. Δόξα as attribute of God

The first and obvious feature of δόξα in the LXX is its use as attribute of God. Δόξα occurs 23 times (Ex. 15:7,11; Nu. 23:22 (24:8); I.Chr. 22:5; Ps. 16(17):15; Mi. 5:4(3); Isa. 2:10,19,21; 14:11; 24:14; 26:10; 28:5; 30:30; (40:6); 40:26; 45:25(24); 60:19; 62:8; 63:12,14; Jer.23:9) with this meaning. A very good example of this understanding is Nu. 23:22 (24:8).

There the Hebrew text describes God by paraphrasing: God is like זרע מרים⁶⁹. The LXX translates this term with δόξα (ὡς δόξα μονοκέρωτος). One can see here how the authors of the LXX have translated Hebrew terms denoting earthly things with δόξα, since there terms describe something of the nature of God. In I.Chr. 22:5 (למעלה לשבurniture प्रामाणीय पृष्ठ")

---

⁶⁵ See above pp. 11ff.
⁶⁶ The number of occurrences of δόξα in this sense in Isaiah is striking (34 times), when compared with occurrences in all the other canonical writings (29 times).
⁶⁷ A.H. Forster, Δόξα, p. 314.
⁶⁸ ibid.
⁶⁹ "Horns of a wild ox."
the LXX translate the term ὄνομα with δόξα: the "name" and "glory" of God are according to the LXX "magnificent". 70

Sometimes the LXX translates with δόξα terms which denote "majesty", and which are used as attributes of God. So in Mi. 5:4(3) 71 the LXX translates יאֵחַ, an attribute of the "name of JHWH (his) God", as δόξα. In Ex. 15:7 יאֵחַ, as attribute of God, is the Hebrew original of δόξα.

A very interesting verse, where δόξα is in the LXX the translation of an attribute of God is Ps. 16(17):15, for the LXX has for the הָплавָה of JHWH ("form of JHWH") the δόξα of JHWH. The term δόξα is also used for an attribute of God in Ex. 15:11 (for הָплавָה), and in Jer. 23:9 (ἅπαξ προσώπου εὐπρεπείας δόξης αὐτοῦ for ἐστήκει ἀμύνοι).

A tendency for understanding δόξα in the LXX becomes clearer: words which describe elements strongly linked with God, or even parts of the nature of God Himself, are translated as δόξα. δόξα seems to be understood as a phenomenon intimately linked to God. So the LXX either replaces Hebrew terms which are used to describe those elements or parts of the nature of God in a rather poetic manner by δόξα, or makes δόξα do duty for the power of God. δόξα, however, in the LXX is a theologically refined term; the authors understood it in a quite distinctly theological way as associated with God.

In Isaiah, the LXX uses δόξα 16 times as an attribute of God. On these occasions δόξα translates four times יראות which is used in the Hebrew Bible as an attribute of God (28:5; 60:19; 63:12,14). So in 28:5 δόξα is used to translate an attribute of an element which is used to describe God's rule of His people (ὅ πλακεῖσθε γεγένη δόξης για τὴν ἀληθήρας

70 For the investigation of the relationship between ὄνομα/δόξα and יש see pp. 53ff.
71 תשרים רוח新たה בנים ירושלים יאֵחַ יש יר יאֵחַ אָלָלְדָה
   каί στάθηκεν καί ἦμαται καί παμανεῖ το πνεῦμαν αὐτοῦ ἐν ισχύι κυρίου, καί ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ
   δυνάματος κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ ὑπάρξεισιν.
60:19 is a classic case: because ἐστὶν λατρεύτω is literally used as attribute of God, the LXX translates with δῶξα (ὁ θεὸς δῶξα σου for ἡλιοφάνεια) and in 63:14 δῶξα is the translation of an attribute (ἵνα λάμβηται) of σῶς which refers to the name of God (ὄνομα δῶξης for τὰ ἐπανάφερε). In 63:12 τὰ ἐπανάφερε is again used as attribute of an element of God, hence the LXX translates with δῶξα. Moreover, δῶξα is used frequently (three times 14:11; 24:14, 26:10) as translation for יְהוָה. In all three verses יְהוָה is used in the Hebrew Bible as an attribute of God. In 2:10,19,21 two Hebrew terms are used to describe the nature of God. One of them (דבר) is translated in the LXX with δῶξα. On one occasion (30:30) the LXX translates רָדָר used as attribute of the "voice of God" (רָדָר נָגִיא) with δῶξα (δῶξα τῶν φωνής αὐτοῦ). The same phenomenon occurs in 40:26. There the LXX translates בּוֹרֵא used as an attribute of God in the Hebrew Bible with δῶξα. In 45:25(24) the LXX has for וַיֶּשָּׁם δῶξα. וַיֶּשָּׁם is used in this verse as attribute of God, while in 62:8 it is used as attribute of an element of God.72 Here as well the LXX translates with δῶξα.73

In 12:2 too, the LXX has δῶξα for וַיַּשָּׁם. Here the psalmist talks about his own וַיַּשָּׁם δῶξα.74 But his δῶξα is defined in relation of JHWH.

This shows clearly that the term δῶξα belongs in the realm of the divine, only used, but necessarily used, if a part of the nature of God or an element of God is described. Δῶξα is here used as an attribute of God, and understood as a part of the nature of God. The nature of δῶξα is divine.

72 For the textual problem in Isa. 62:8 see G. v. Rad/ G. Kittel, δῶξα... 244.
73 There is only one more verse left where the LXX seems to translate an attribute of God with δῶξα (Isa. 40:6). But there the text of the LXX is different from the Hebrew text. The LXX adds the genitive ἄνθρωπον. Hence the δῶξα which is the translation of an attribute of God (ὁ θεὸς) is not the attribute of God anymore, but of man (ΜΕΤΑ ΤΕ: οὐκ ἔλεγεν τοῖς Θεοῖς, LXX: πᾶσα δῶξα ἁγιότητα θεοῦ γένος ἁγιοτός). Hence the δῶξα which is the translation of an attribute of God (ὁ θεὸς) is not the attribute of God anymore, but of man (MT: the θεὸς, LXX: πᾶσα δωξα ἁγιοτητα θεου δεν θεοτοχ ξοτου).
74 "(... my [author's] strength (נָשָׁם) and my singing is JHWH (...)."
"(... διά τι δῶξα μου κακ' αυτοτις μου κύριος (...)."
2. Δόξα as visible phenomenon

The authors of the LXX understood δόξα as an divine element or even an attribute of God which may be visible to human beings. Four times (Ex. 33:19; Nu. 12:8; 27:20; Ps. 16(17):15) the authors of the LXX translate a Hebrew term which either itself denotes a visible earthly thing, or which occurs in a setting giving it the sense of something visible. Three times the Hebrew term is used as attribute of JHWH! The most important text in this regard which shows clearly the intention of the authors of the LXX is Ex. 33:19. As we have seen above, Moses desires in this text to see the בימה of JHWH. God, however, answers him that he, the mortal Moses, will not be able to see the "glory of God". But, God says to Moses, he will be able to see the מראות דער רואים which will pass before him. The authors of the LXX translate the term which in the Hebrew Bible is used to describe an attribute of God which can be seen by Moses, namely מראות, with δόξα. Here the theological intention of the authors of the LXX is clear: δόξα is understood as an element of God (perhaps a phenomenon alongside God) which is visible for human beings.

This theological idea is also evident in Nu. 12:8. Instead of רואים מראות, the LXX has δόξα κυρίου εἴδε. Here the authors of the LXX point out literally that the δόξα κυρίου can be seen by the humans. Ps. 16(17):15 implies that the δόξα of JHWH is visible, because of the context: v. 15a talks about "seeing" (רואים) the righteousness (צדק) of JHWH. Hence, by replacing מראות by δόξα in v. 15a, the authors imply that the δόξα of JHWH can be seen as well. The situation in Nu. 27:20 is a little different. According to the Hebrew Bible, Moses gives some of his מראות to Joshua. This event is observed by the congregation. The LXX reads

75 See p. 8.
δόξα for דּוֹחַ. Hence, the text implies that the δόξα given from Moses to Joshua can be seen by the humans.

In Isaiah δόξα is also understood in 5 verses (11:3; 26:10; 33:17; 52:14; 53:2) as a visible element. Most important is 26:10, where δόξα has a strongly visible aspect, although it is literally an attribute of God. In 33:17 the visibility of δόξα is also implied, because רֵדֶשׁ occurs in connection with the verb רוֹדֶשׁ, respectively δόξα in conjunction with ὡσμα. Δόξα is used here as an attribute of the king. In 52:14 and 53:2 another theological idea of the authors of the LXX comes into focus. Here the LXX translates attributes of the Messiah with δόξα. Each time it is implied that the δόξα as attribute of the Messiah is visible.

Concluding, one may say that the LXX replaces Hebrew words with δόξα which in the Hebrew Bible are on the one hand linked with God, and on the other hand denote elements which are visible. Δόξα, therefore, could be understood in the LXX as visible divine element, or even as a visible attribute of God.

3. Δόξα offered by humans towards God

Δόξα as something which is given by men towards God indicates that the worshippers are giving God what is due to Him. In 2.Chr. 30:8 the Hebrew text says: "(...) but give your hand (נָדַרָי) to JHWH and come to His sanctuary." The LXX has instead: "δότε δόξαν κυρίω τῷ θεῷ...". So, according to the LXX, the temple is the place where humans give δόξα to JHWH.

In Ps 67(68):35 the LXX uses δόξα in the same way. Within the praise of the psalm 67 is used in an invitation to "give power to God" (נָתַן לְךָ לְאָלָלַר), v.35a. The LXX replaces

---

The LXX has in 26:10: εἰς μή τὴν δόξαν κυρίου; the Hebrew Bible has רֶדֶשׁ נָדוֹת נָדוֹת יְרָה. G v. Rad/B G. Kittel, δόξα... 244.
In Isa. 12:2 the psalmist offers his הָעִנֵּשׁ to God. דָּנַע, therefore, expresses here something which humans offer to God, although where the MT does not use דָּנַע. But it should be noted that the LXX uses דָּנַע in this sense also in verses where דָּנַע translates Hebrew דָּנַע (for example Jer. 13:16; Ps. 28(29):1).

This use of דָּנַע indicates as well that דָּנַע is strongly linked with God, for it is His דָּנַע which is due to Him. None of these verses furnish a sense of דָּנַע as something independent of God.

4. Eschatology

דָּנַע is at various places used in an eschatological setting. So, for example, in Isa. 4:5 and 24:23, where דָּנַע is used in an eschatological setting, the term is translated with דָּנַע (4:5) and דָּנַע (24:23) in the LXX. Looking at the verses where דָּנַע occurs without being the translation of דָּנַע, one discovers that דָּנַע was understood almost in the same way as דָּנַע in the MT. Many times דָּנַע, when not translating דָּנַע, is used in a primarily eschatological setting (for example: Ps. 16(17):15; Mi. 5:4(3); Isa. 2:10,19,21; 3:18, 11:3; 24:14; 26:10; 28:5; 45:25(24)). Most often it occurs in texts which describe the final judgement or the expectation of the Messiah. But nowhere in those texts is דָּנַע used to refer to something which will actually be revealed. Only in Isa. 60:19 ("(...) JHWH will be your eternal light, and your God will be your דָּנַע.") is דָּנַע really linked with a future event; but there JHWH is the person who will be revealed.

Because דָּנַע is used only a few times as something offered to God, one can hardly say that the usage of it in this verse is typical, as G. v. Rad/ G. Kittel, דָּנַע... 243 do.
5. Δόξα and the temple

Very interesting with regard to God is δόξα translating elements of the sanctuary or the temple. Three times (1.Chr. 16:27; 2.Chr. 3:6; Ps. 111(112):3) the authors of the LXX translate Hebrew terms which denote elements found in the temple or the sanctuary with δόξα. So in 1.Chr. 16:27 the LXX has δόξα instead of רַחַם which is in the sanctuary of JHWH. Instead of using an ordinary word to describe the beauty (MT: רַחַם) of the temple, the LXX uses in 2.Chr. 3:6 the term δόξα. And again in Ps. 111(112):3, where the Hebrew Bible gives a wonderful description of the temple (ברית ברית), the LXX replaces the ordinary term רַחַם which has primarily a secular sense with δόξα (δόξα καὶ πλούτος ἐν τῷ οίκῳ αὐτῶ). In Isaiah the LXX uses the term δόξα three times as translation of terms which are related to the temple. Isa. 6:1 shows clearly how the LXX dealt with texts where the Hebrew Bible describes the presence of God in the temple using elaborate language. Terms used to describe the presence of God were replaced by δόξα. וְהָיָה in Isa. 6:1 is, therefore, in the LXX replaced by δόξα. In Isa. 63:15 δόξα occurs in the LXX for an attribute of the place where God is. Finally, in Isa. 64:11(10) δόξα occurs as well in conjunction with the temple. These usages affect the understanding of δόξα in two different ways: first, δόξα was understood as part of the temple, and therefore linked with God. But secondly, the authors are not using here δόξα τοῦ κυρίου. It is only δόξα that is object of the temple. Hence at this point δόξα itself gains a tiny bit of "independence" from God.

6. Δόξα and the king(s)

In the LXX the term δόξα is used five times in conjunction with a king. It is interesting to note that δόξα in this context occurs in the LXX only in conjunction with earthly kings and

---

[79] The text is corrupt, but this does not really effect the term רַחַם.

[80] MT: יְהֵם תְּמוֹנָה יְהֵם לֹא מְסֹלָה יְהֵם הָאָרֶץ. LXX: θεός ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ οἴκου σου καὶ δόξας σου.
not with דוד המלך. In 1 Chr. 29:25 the Hebrew Bible tells us that the kingdom of Solomon has דוד. The LXX translates דוד with δῶξα. Not even the chosen king of Israel is the theme in Prov. 14:28. There the Hebrew Bible has "ברכתי ובחרתי" which is in the LXX translated as "ἐν Πολλαῖς Θεον καὶ δῶξα βασιλέως". Δῶξα, therefore, is used as translation of דוד in a purely secular setting. The same happens in Jer. 13:11, where δῶξα stands for לוחם ירמיה. Two verses in Isaiah (10:12; 33:17) reflect the same situation. In Isa. 10:12 לוחם ירמיה is used as attribute of the "king of Assur" in the Hebrew Bible. In 33:17 as well, בכור is used as translation of an attribute of a king (ברימר).

7. Δῶξα in a secular sense

Isa. 10:12 and 33:17 show another, very interesting aspect, of δῶξα in the LXX. Sometimes the LXX uses δῶξα in a secular fashion, where בכור was not used in the MT. So, for example, in Prov. 14:28; Ez. 27:7,10 and Jer. 13:18 δῶξα occurs in a secular sense. In Isaiah this understanding of δῶξα occurs five times (3:18; 17:4; 20:5; 22:25; 28:1,4), and seems to contradict the thesis that the LXX always understood it as related to the divine. But one can explain these occurrences as relics of an understanding of the term found in the Hebrew Bible itself. Hence what we can see in the LXX is a very strong tendency towards a "new" understanding of δῶξα. Δῶξα as something relating to the divine world alone was not a theological doctrine when the authors composed their translation. But it was certainly about to become one.

81 See above.
8. δόξα and "holy persons"

δόξα is also used in the LXX as an attribute of "saints" (Ps. 149:9) or "the aged" (Prov. 20:29). So the LXX uses the term also as an attribute of people central to the religious life of Israel. Here again the theme of election may have influenced the LXX translators in their choice of terminology. We have already seen,⁸² that in Isa. 52:14 and 53:2 δόξα is in the LXX used to translate attributes of the Messiah.

9. "εἶς δόξα"

One particular occurrence of δόξα in the LXX is particularly important for comparison with 1QH. In Jer. 13:11 God, according to the LXX, acts "for His glory" (καὶ εἶς δόξαν). The Hebrew term at this point translated by δόξα isΛαμαρα. In Isa. 60:21 and 61:3 this same use of δόξα in the LXX occurs as well.⁸³

VI. Conclusion

δόξα can only be understood with regard to נבורה in the MT. The relationship of these two terms, and the understanding of δόξα can be outlined as follows:

(i) Δόξα is in the LXX the "Greek equivalent" of the Hebrew נבורה in the MT. But the understanding of δόξα in the LXX is not identical with the meanings of נבורה in the Hebrew Bible, for δόξα occurs in the LXX more often than נבורה in the MT.

⁸² See above p. 24.
⁸³ We will see below (p. 40) that especially in 1QH נבורה is used often in the sense of "for the sake of His [God's] glory" (ע"ל נבורה). This might indicate that authors of Qumran texts developed not only ideas which we can find in the Hebrew Bible, but also expressions which occur in the LXX. Furthermore, 1QH developed an expression which occurs rarely in the LXX. As we will see, this is another method of Qumran authors in dealing with the Hebrew Bible and the Versions.
(ii) LXX appears to draw a distinction between the secular sense of רכז מ and its use in connection with God. Only in the latter case does the LXX regularly translate רכז מ with δοξα. That indicates that δοξα, in contrast to רכז מ, was understood as a term which is to be used primarily as an attribute of God.

(iii) In the LXX δοξα is used on occasions where רכז מ does in the MT not occur. Here δοξα is used most of the time purely in relation to God. The occurrence of δοξα in this sense is characterised by the following aspects:

- Δοξα is most importantly and often the translation of Hebrew terms which are used as attributes of God, being understood primarily as part of His nature, or as an expression of the "divine nature or essence". The nature of δοξα is divine.

- Furthermore, δοξα functions on several occasions as a visible divine element, as a visible attribute of God. The nature of JHWH, reflected in δοξα, is in the LXX understood as perceptible.

- Δοξα is used a few times as something which is offered by humans to God, because it is due to Him. Hence, δοξα is understood as something which belongs entirely to God.

But δοξα may also be used in the LXX in a secular sense. This usage is not at all frequent or common, compared with the occurrence of δοξα purely related to God. We should probably best consider it as remains of the secular understanding of רכז מ found in MT, still regarded as appropriate by some of the translators in some circumstances. Whatever else this

---

84 This "primary meaning of the LXX word, however, does not emerge except with reference to God. In this sense, of course, it may simply refer to "God's honour" or "power," like רכז מ (G. v. Rad/ G. Kittel, δοξα, 244).
85 G. v. Rad/ G. Kittel, δοξα, 244.
86 cf. also G. v. Rad/ G. Kittel, δοξα, 244.
87 Therefore, the statement of G. v. Rad and G. Kittel that δοξα as "glory or honour ascribed to", "reputation" was only used less frequently in this secular sense, than רכז מ in the Hebrew Bible (G. v. Rad/ G. Kittel, δοξα, 243) needs to be made more specific: δοξα is not only used "less frequently" in this sense, but the authors definitely tried to give δοξα the meaning of a divine or supernatural element.
shows, it suggests that the process of development whereby δόξα came to be used as a term restricted to God's being and world was not carried through to its logical conclusion, even though the evidence examined here points to a clearly marked drive on the part of the translators to forge powerful hints between δόξα and God.\textsuperscript{88} Δόξα occurs in this sense under the following aspects:

- Δόξα is used in the LXX in connection with earthly Kings, but not with God as king.
- The use of δόξα as an attribute of human beings shows that it could be understood also in a secular sense.
- Very interesting is the use of δόξα as a translation term for elements of the temple. Here δόξα is linked with the house of God. But at the same time it gains independence to a certain extent, for it is the δόξα which fills the temple, not the δόξα τοῦ κυρίου. Δόξα is used here not understood in a secular sense, for it is part of the house of God, but it is also not used as purely divine attribute.\textsuperscript{89}

To summarise: Δόξα in the LXX may be understood as a (visible) attribute of God. It is very largely a divine phenomenon, the δόξα of God. Its nature is divine. The occurrence of δόξα in a secular sense is restricted to certain contexts, and is not determinative of the translator's overall understanding of the word.

\textsuperscript{88} Another factor contributing to this state of affairs may be the lack of any rigid or hard theological doctrine directing the translators, of whom there were sometimes more than one for any given book: this could explain that in one writing of the canonical Hebrew Bible the tendency and the idea of the translators is clearer than in others. A few of the translators might have changed the understanding of דּוֹסֹל more precisely than others.

\textsuperscript{89} The significance of this usage will become apparent in comparison with the Shirot (see p. 120).
Part III: הכבוד in 1QH (Thanksgiving Hymns)

1. כבוד related to God

1.1. כבוד as an attribute of God

In 1QH, as in the OT, the relationship of כבוד and God is one of the most important aspects of the understanding of כבוד.

כבוד occurs 51 times in 1QH. 28 times it has an attached 2.sg.m. suffix referring to God. 20 times the attached suffix is כ (1,10.30; 4.28; 5.20; 6,10.12.14; 7.24; 8.3; 9,17.26; 10,10.11.12.20; 11.6.10; 12,15.22.30). 5 times in the Hymns 13 to 16 the suffix כ (13,11.13; 15,20; 16,3.9). 3 times כ is also used as an attribute of God, but with the 3.sg.m. suffix כ (3,35; 15,17(18,8)). This usage demonstrates that כ is used in 1QH as attribute of God very often, and within the praise of a person who addresses God personally and directly.

1.2. כבוד and the kingship of God

כבוד does not occur in 1QH in connection with the terms מלך or מלכה. But כבוד is used once in connection with the term ה (12:15), and a few times with ח and נבורה. These terms used as attributes of God (cf.: 9:17; 10:10; 11:8; 12:15; 13:11) might be used elsewhere in connection with the kingship of God, but in 1QH they are not used in that connotation in conjunction with כבוד.

---

90 K.G. Kuhn, Konkordanz, 96f.
91 For further discussion of the phenomenon of the two different 2.sg.m. suffixes see E. Tov, Textual Criticism, 108-110.
92 B. Kittel calls "glory" even one of the "standard" attributes (B. Kittel, Hymns of Qumran, 118).
1.3. independently used of God?

The next question we have to answer is whether indications exist that בֶּבְרָד was understood in 1QH also as an "independent" phenomenon, not linked with God anymore. Because the names of God are grammatically not used in connection with בֶּבְרָד, but the word takes only a suffix referring to God, one could argue that בֶּבְרָד gains independence from God, as it does in the Shirot.93

1.3.1. בֶּבְרָד and praise

The function of בֶּבְרָד within the praise of 1QH is important at this point. Because 1QH consists of thanksgiving hymns בֶּבְרָד occurs always in the context of praise.94 If the psalmist uttered his praise to בֶּבְרָד, the term would gain importance and therefore "independence". But in 1QH בֶּבְרָד is mainly used as an attribute of God. As such בֶּבְרָד is grammatically often the object of verbs like מָעַרְד אוֹר etc.,95 but not often the direct object of praise.96

1.3.2. בֶּבְרָד as reason or modus of deeds of God or humans

When בֶּבְרָד is used in construct combinations (18 times) or with an adjective, the word in the construct state or the adjective has the preposition ל (14 times: 1,10; 6,10; 7,15,24; 9,17; 10,20; 11,6; 12,30; 13,11,13: 15,17,20.

---

93 See below p. 101.
94 Despite the fact that the literary form of 1QH is controversial (B. Kittel, Hymns of Qumran, 2), one can say without fear of contradiction that 1QH contains songs uttered to God.
95 Of the 108 occurrences of אָנָחֵלָה מְחַשְּבָה (בֶּבְרָד), whereas the psalmist "witnesses" His בֶּבְרָד. See for further texts pp. 60f.
96 Or other prepositions which have ל.
8,20.22; 9,17.25.26; 10,1098.1199.12; 11,10100.27), or ב (6 times: 3,4.35101; 4,28102; 6,14103; 10,20; 18,8).

This is a significant aspect of the employment of כבורה in 1QH: it is very often used to define the circumstances of a certain event. God's deeds and His כבורה are for the psalmist reasons to praise Him. כבורה has, therefore a secondary function beside God.104 Hence, this is another significant indication that כבורה is used as a term dependent on God.

1.3.3. כבורה used grammatically independently

Only 5 times כבורה occurs in the absolute state (7,15; 8,20.22; 9,25; 11,8). But here, the word is always introduced by ה. This means that, when כבורה is used as dominating term grammatically, it once again depends on another word or clause, signifying that כבורה is a dependent term whose sense is determined by other things.

In all these cases כבורה occurs in connection with terms denoting earthly things of daily life.105 Hence, these might be construed as occasions when כבורה is used independently of God. But even here the psalmist always talks always about the כבורה of God. Most of all he uses the term in imagery describing his relationship with God: 7,15; 8,20.22. In 9,25 God caused glory for the psalmist, hence it is God's glory.106
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In the case of ב, one can even say that most of the times it "preface[s] a divine attribute" (B. Kittel, *Hymns of Qumran*, 168). Exception: 11.8 (בּוֹלָל).
Furthermore, כבוחר is only used twice as subject of verbs (5,20; 11,8, but cf. 12,29). This is another indication that כבוחר was not generally understood as an "independent" phenomenon.

In five more texts כבוחר is used as grammatically independent of God. But in three of these cases the text is damaged, hence a comment is impossible.\textsuperscript{107} In 11,27 the context implies that the כבוחר of God is meant.\textsuperscript{108}

In two more lines, however, כבוחר is grammatically used as an attribute of man. But even here one cannot say that it is understood in a secular sense:

a) 15:17

(... (17) והср (16) במוש כבוחר)

Here the grammatical use of כבוחר is interesting: it occurs with the suffix of the 3.pers.sg.m. which refers grammatically to a human being.\textsuperscript{109} But the setting in which the term occurs is highly eschatological.\textsuperscript{110} Predestination, election, and life in a eschatological future are conditions for receiving כבוחר. Hence, the כבוחר of God is meant, and the understanding is certainly not secular.\textsuperscript{111}

b) 17,15:

ватьהלתכל הבוקרא יבש (ב)רוכב ימה

\textsuperscript{107} 12,29; 13,6; 16,16.

\textsuperscript{108} ארנאתה ותפנות לכלבוצר תור שלום עולם

\textsuperscript{109} It is referring to דרכו in 1.15.

\textsuperscript{110} "(14) (...) only you [God] have created (15) the righteous (...)"

\textsuperscript{111} For the context see M. Mansoor, \textit{Thanksgiving Hymns}, 42 who stresses also the predestination and the consequently new relationship with God of the poet.

For the discussion of election and predestination see p. 35f.

Hence, the translation of J. Maier, "Ehre" (J. Maier, \textit{Qumran-Essener Bdl.}, 57) is in this context dubious. כבוחר is here set in the context of predestination and of the description of gifts from God to man which include "the glory" (cf. M. Mansoor, \textit{Thanksgiving Hymns}, 184; G. Vermes, \textit{Dead Sea Scrolls}, 203; E. Lohse, \textit{Texte aus Qumran}, 167).
Here כבורה occurs grammatically as attribute of בורא. In the scholarly literature on this section of 1QH בורא is either interpreted as "Adam in the state before the fall" by referring to CD 3:20a and 1QS 4:23a,112 or simply as man.113 But M. Mansoor states correctly that l.15 refers somehow to the future,114 and לְעָבְדָיו as inf. hiph. in the construct state strengthens this impression. Furthermore l.14 refers to the members of the community. These are reasons enough to postulate that not Adam, but the member of the community as chosen people who get כבורה after their election, but before the full revelation of God of the end-time, are meant. Hence כבורה is not used here in a secular sense, but in a distinctive eschatological setting,115 and the כבורה is something granted by God to its recipients.

2. כבורה and the concept of the election

In the Hymns the term כבורה is used 14 times within the context of the theme of election.

The event of election is not really mentioned in those verses where כבורה occurs in 1QH, or even in the surrounding context. The election, the fact that the psalmist was chosen by God, is rather assumed by the psalmist. Very often in these texts the author describes an event where God was acting towards the psalmist which is in character similar to an act of election. For this event the psalmist thanks God and praises Him. He does so by uttering the Hymns towards God. כבורה is a direct or indirect consequence of this "election event". כבורה becomes after the election accessible or available for the chosen human.116 The כבורה has,

---

112 Cf. M. A. Kibb, Qumran Community, 35.
113 J. Maier, Qumran-Essener Bd.1, 50; M. Mansoor, Thanksgiving Hymns, 189.
114 M. Mansoor, Thanksgiving Hymns, 42f.
115 See for the eschatology p. 39.
116 See p. 37.
117 11:7f enumerates even more elements which become "recognisable" after election: אָפָא פָּרְכָה (11,7), אָפָא פָּרְכָה of God (11,7), מְשָא of God (11,8) and כְבוֹרָה of God (11,8).
therefore, its origins in God. God decides whether somebody will be elected and whether קברד will be perceptible for the chosen human being.

The text where this conjunction between קברד and the theme of election is most obvious is 10:20. The context of this verse is the psalmist's praise of God (especially 10:14-19): the psalmist tells us what God did for him by giving him knowledge (v.14). Then in line 20 he points out that he is able "to witness" the glory of God (רביםם נכהרבחה). The condition for witnessing קברד is, therefore, election.

In addition, there are five other texts which show the connection of קברד and the concept of election rather clearly. So in 6:12a the psalmist points out that the glory of God will come to all nations. And in v.12b-13a he adds that God's glory will come to "all men of your [God's] council" (למהיל אנש ת/categories). In 6:14 occurs in the same kind of context.

In 11:8 another aspect comes into focus: קברד is still exclusively divine, although the chosen one is able to recognise it after election. In addition the concept of predestination comes into focus here (l.16f*)

The psalmist points out that, although the righteous person is dust and mortal, he will have the קברד, because he is chosen from his mother's womb.

The ability to experience קברד is therefore the predestined consequence of election.119

117 "(7)... and I know that truth is your mouth and in Your hand is righteousness and in Your thought is (8) all knowledge and in Your strength is all power and all glory, with You it is ...."
118 God will "(16)... raise (17) his [the righteous'] glory from (out of) the flesh..."
119 For its eschatological understanding and a precise definition of the term "experience" see below pp. 37 and 39.

A few more lines demonstrate the same aspect, although קברד is not literally mentioned in conjunction with the concept: 7:15; 9:25; 9:26; 11:6; (11:27, 12:15; 15:20).
3. **כבוד as perceptible phenomenon?**

3.1. **Occurrence**

The manner in which the chosen person can experience **כבוד** is also significant. The understanding of the relation of **כבוד** to God comes into focus here very much.

Within the praise of the first Hymn the psalmist talks (1:30) about the **כבוד** of God which can be known (לְהוֹדוּוּ) by all humans. The psalmist tells in the preceding verses that it is the will of God that men should be able to know His glory. And in 6:12a the psalmist points out that "all people will know (רֵאשׁ) Your truth (אמתָה) and all nations Your glory".

Throughout this line the psalmist expresses his emphatic praise. God is so great that all people will know His glory. In 13:13 as well the **כבוד** of God is the object of the verb **ידע**. The psalmist points out that through His divine deeds God makes known His glory everywhere. Again this verse is part of the praise uttered to God. In exactly the same manner **כבוד** is used in 15:20. In contrast to 13:13 the psalmist mentions here literally the deeds of God (מעשים). These deeds will be the reason why all chosen ones "will know" the glory of God.

The means by which elected humans can approach the **כבוד** is made clear in these lines: **כבוד** seems to be understood as a phenomenon which can be approached by humans only in an "intellectual" way. So the experience of **כבוד** by elected humans seems to be understood as a process involving the human mind, for in most of the cases where the "coming together" of **כבוד** and man is spoken of it, it is described with verbs of intellectual process, such as "to

---

120 Glory is the most positive quality of God. **כבוד** expresses the psalmist's esteem, his respect, his love towards God.

121 13:13: "... and by the mysteries of your insight you have allotted to make known Your glory...".
know" (יודע). The experience of חמור for the elect is, therefore, only possible through interior understanding or belief.

Another aspect of חמור in 1QH comes here into focus: in 1QH חמור is always something which comes from God. God gives His חמור to the humans through creation and election.

The individual’s experience of חמור through interior perception or belief is, therefore, spoken of by the psalmist as something received from outside himself.

But one further text of some particular interest remains for discussion. In 10:20, חמור occurs as object of the verb עשת ("to look")122:

(... וֹהָרְבָּהָ שְׁכָוְּרָה אִספֶּרָה (21 נְמַלְאַתִיתִהָ) (20)

This is the first and only time that the psalmist seems to imply that the חמור of God can be physically experienced, for עשת is a verb of sensual perception. This sentiment, when set alongside the general use and understanding of חמור displayed in 1QH, appears exceptional.

Indeed, it seems to have more in common with understanding of חמור found in the Shirot, where we encounter חמור as a supernatural or heavenly reality which can come close to human beings because God so wills it. 10:20 is therefore an exception.

3.2. Summary

For chosen people the חמור (of God) which was received from God is (according to 1QH) only perceptible on the level of interior understanding or belief (we can find only one exception). חמור is generally not understood as something physically perceptible.

4. Eschatology

The difference from the OT concept is marked: there, קבורה is used as an element of the revelation of God: the קבורה of God comes in revelation to the earth. In 1QH, קבורה is already in the world, but only for the chosen ones; and is not yet completely revealed.

The translation is difficult. Most of the translators translate "Zeit" or "time" (E. Lohse, Texte aus Qumran, 159; J. Maier, Qumran-Essener Bd.I, 104; G. Vermes, Dead Sea Scrolls, 198) or with "period" (M. Mansoor, Thanksgiving Hymns, 175). According to W. Gesenius, Handwörterbuch, 719, קֶבֶר means "the end". The latter meaning fits better into the context. A time period implies that the קבורה is not yet present. But we have seen that after the election the chosen ones are able to recognise the קבורה in a certain and reduced way. Therefore, קבורה is already present for them. According to its context, 12:22 is definitely eschatological: at "the end of the times" (revelation) the end of the קבורה will come as well. Hence, the term קֶבֶר should be translated as "end".

In 13:11 as well the term קבורה might be used in an eschatological context. Especially in 13:12 the author talks about the creation of new and eternal things and refers, therefore, to something which is going to come.

12:22 demonstrates the link between קבורה and eschatology:

"(...) and in the end of Your [God's] glory they rejoice [...]"

The "end of the glory" can only be understood as the end of the קבורה as the psalmist knows it: in terms of imagination and hope only. The revelation will bring the end or goal to which that hope points, and give the people the ability to experience the קבורה of God.

5. קבורה and creation

5.1. In general

Many times in 1QH קבורה is used in connection with the concept of creation. In 10:10f (for example) the author asks the rhetorical question: "(10) (...) and who (11) among all Your
great wondrous works (מפעלי) can retain any strength to stand in the presence of Your glory?". The creation reflects the glory of its creator. כבוד is here the divine attribute reflecting the greatness of God in comparison with His creation. And because the creator has כבוד, the creation has it also to a certain extent. The creation reflects the כבוד of its creator. Therefore, the כבוד which the psalmist can already "see" is reason for him to praise and thank God.

5.2. כבוד in the phrase "for the sake of His glory"

Used in this phrase, the connection of כבוד and creation comes to light clearly. כבוד occurs 9 times in this sense. Three times the psalmist thanks God and praises Him for everything that God has done and made. And according to the psalmist, whatever God has done reflects God's glory. In all three lines the term כבוד occurs along with creation language:

1:10: (...) (...)
10:12: כבודה שירתה כל אללה
18:22: ל乐园 מ었습니다 רבותת להגדיר ולהcanf בול לְכָּבוֹדּה}

In three further texts the psalmist gives more specific reasons why he is thanking God. So in 6:10 he points out that "(...) for Your glory (לְכָּבוֹדּה) and for Your sake You have acted to magnify the law and the truth (...)". In 7:24 God established "the light (לְכָּבוֹדּה) "for His glory". And in 11:10 the psalmist thanks God that He (God) "cleansed mankind from the sin" for the sake of His glory (למטן כבודה).

---

126 In 13:2 the text is damaged to an extent which makes any comment on the understanding of כבוד impossible.

127 "(...) (9) you have stretched out the heavens (10) for your glory(...)".

128 "(...) only according to your glory you have done all these things."

129 "(...) but it is your plan to make everything big and to establish everything for your glory."
In 4:28 God helped the psalmist "for the sake of His glory" (בְּעֵדֶר הַכְּבוֹד), and that is the reason why the glory offered by the psalmist to God is now due to God. In 8:5 the motive occurs within the concept of creation: whatever God created reflects His glory.\textsuperscript{131}

The phrases "for the sake of His glory" or "for His glory" are used by the author to indicate that everything what God does (help for the psalmist or creation) is a reason for the psalmist to thank God and to praise God. Because of God's deeds, the הַכְּבוֹד is due to God. הַכְּבוֹד belongs entirely to God.\textsuperscript{132}

6. הַכְּבוֹד and its ability to be declared

Three times in 1QH (11:6; 12:30; 13:11\textsuperscript{133}) the author of the Hymns points out that the הַכְּבוֹד of God is being declared. The Hebrew term which the author uses is always סֶלֶפֶר. So in 11:6 the psalmist says that he "(...) will tell the children of men about Your [God's] glory, (...)"

After the election the declaration of the glory of God to everybody is another form of praise for the psalmist. In 12:30 the psalmist points out that there is nothing else to do for mortals made out of dust but "(...) to declare all Your [God's] glory and to stand in the face of Your anger" (1.30*).

The election is here again a condition, sine qua non. The usage of הַכְּבוֹד in this phrase demonstrates again the "intellectual" way in which the chosen ones deal with הַכְּבוֹד. Again we can presuppose that the elected person "knows" the הַכְּבוֹד. Furthermore הַכְּבוֹד used in this connection is the expression of effusive praise of the psalmist uttered to God. Because he is elected he wants to tell the world of that he knows now: the הַכְּבוֹד of God.

\textsuperscript{131} Used here within the imaginary of the trees in poem 8.
\textsuperscript{132} occurs here always with a suffix referring to God.
\textsuperscript{133} Here the subject of the verb סֶלֶפֶר is not certain. It might have been mentioned at the beginning of the Hymn which is damaged.
7. 채보르 and the "eternity"

6 times 채보르 is used in 1QH in conjunction with the theme or idea of eternity. The intensity of the link between the term and the theme varies. In three lines 채보르 occurs in a construct combination with the term " Worlds. So in 3:4 the word combination 채보르 Worlds occurs. The context of this word combination is not certain, because the line is damaged:

3:4: [ ]

채보르 is also linked with eternity in 11:27. There it occurs in conjunction with the term " Worlds (.initializeApp):

11:26*: (...) (27) 채보르 Worlds (26) 134

In this text the statement of the author is clear enough: 채보르 is thought of as a part of eternity (채보르 is nomen regens), and therefore it is eternal itself.135 채보르 is used in the same sense in 13:6 (채보르 Worlds): glory is part of eternity.136

In addition, a few lines are found in 1QH where the term 채보르 does not occur in combination with Worlds, but where these terms occur together in one single line. Interesting at this point is 12:15. The line is damaged, but the preserved word combinations are significant: they are Worlds and 채보르 Worlds. The logical link between the two word combinations is not clear, because of the missing context. Nevertheless, the "light" which is linked with the 채보르 (as we will see below) belongs to eternity as well. Hence the Worlds and

134 (26) (...) and Your truth shines (27) to the glory of eternity and eternal peace (...)"
135 For the interesting phrase 채보르 Worlds (25) Worlds (24) see below pp. 69ff.
136 In 13:6 the text is damaged. No comments on the context can be made.
the כבורה are understood as characteristic elements of eternity. In 8.20 and 12:29 the links between כלול bởi כבורה and respectively עלצל 배יל is not certain, because the lines are damaged.

Significantly, neither דר nor עלצל רבא is grammatically determined as God's glory or eternity. But the 'place' the psalmist is talking about, eternity, is understood as a place close to God. The association of כבורה and eternity seems to reflect the desire of the psalmist to reach the time after revelation, when he will be able to experience כבורה in full. The modus of the experience of כבורה through a chosen person influences also the understanding of the place of eternity: it is the sphere of God, understood as a metaphysical place, not as the heavenly world is commonly depicted.

8. כבורה, the darkness and the light

In 12:15, as we have seen above, כבורה occurs in conjunction with "light". כבורה is in IQH 4 times used in the context of the theme of darkness and light which is an important concept in writings from Qumran.137

In 9:26 the conjunction between כבורה and light becomes most apparent, since for the chosen one כבורה is the light:

9:26f:

רבכובדשכ והופיצ אורי כ費 כמאור מוחשכ

138(...)

(26)

האירורתה לצו

(27)

See especially p. 103f.; and all secondary sources on "darkness/light".

138...[...] and by Your glory my light (אורי) shines forth, for a light out of darkness (27) You lighted up for m[...] (27)".
The darkness is mentioned in the second part of this phrase: the psalmist was in darkness until God led him to the light (had chosen him). There is certainly a close affinity here between קברד and כִּבְרָד. With election light and glory come to the chosen one. כִּבְרָד, however, is understood as a phenomenon of light.

אַּלְמָא and כִּבְרָד are used in the same manner in 12:15. After election the chosen one has glory and light.

Because the psalmist has been chosen according to 7:23, the psalmist shines forth now in the light which God made for His glory. In 7:23f the consequence of his election is the light as well, which is now an attribute of the chosen one. This light was given by God "for His glory". This line demonstrates that כִּבְרָד could be understood in almost the same way as כִּבְרָד, in such a way that כִּבְרָד might be interpreted as a "light phenomenon".

Summarising, one can argue that כִּבְרָד and כִּבְרָד come to humans only after their election by God. The manner in which the two phenomena can be received from God by the chosen ones differs: כִּבְרָד seems to be understood as an element which can be experienced physically. As such כִּבְרָד can be received directly by the chosen person. With כִּבְרָד the situation is different. כִּבְרָד comes from God and reaches the believer; but it can only be experienced through interior perception.

The connection of כִּבְרָד with כִּבְרָד does not, therefore, indicate that כִּבְרָד was necessarily understood as a visible phenomenon. But the conjunction demonstrates that the chosen person understood כִּבְרָד in his imagination or belief as a phenomenon of light.

---

139 "(23) (...) You helped my soul and raised my horn (24) on high (...)".
140 "(24) (...) and I have shone forth with a sevenfold light which You have established for Your glory."
141 See above pp. 37f.
142 As it will do in the Shirot (see pp. 102f, 111, 113f.).
9. כבורה and its quality

In 1QH the author gives three descriptions of "glory" which are almost definitions. In each of these cases כבורה is the כבורה of God. In 5:20 the psalmist points out within a pure praise uttered towards God that the glory of God is "without measure":

(... לָכַּבְרֹכֶם (21) לְאָזֶר מַרְדָּה (20))

In 9:17 the psalmist states within a comparison of humans and God, that the glory of God "can not be investigated":

(... לָכַּבְרֹכֶם אָזֶר חֶקֶר)

That means that the author of the texts understood the כבורה as normally inaccessible for the humans. And in 10:10 the psalmist praises God again saying that "none can be compared" to God in power and nothing can be compared to His glory:

(...}}{{אָזֶר עַמָּה כְּבוּרָה וָאֶזֶר לֶגֶנֶר כַּבְרֹכֶם)

In other words: the כבורה is understood as a divine element which is only in a certain way accessible for the elect. The writer is able to talk about it, to tell about it, to know it, and to praise it, as we have seen above. People deal with כבורה in imagination; and one cannot say that in this sense כבורה is physically perceptible to them.

But the three lines above tell us also that כבורה is understood as something great and powerful ("no measure"; "can not be compared with anything"). Each of the three verses occurs in a setting of the description of the power of God. Linguistically this is indicated by two terms denoting power which are in the OT often used in that context: נברתامت in 5:20⁴¹, כבורה and in 9:17; and כבורה in 10:10. כבורה is used in almost the same manner as

⁴¹ Here the psalmist points out that the "power of God" cannot be investigated using exactly the same phrase as in 9:17 for כבורה.
they are. כבּורָד thus seems to be understood here as an expression of the power of God. It is not identical with the power of God, but it is an attribute of God, like His power.144

10. כבּורָד and its attributes

Finally two more lines seem to ascribe attributes to כבּורָד itself. 3:35 mentions the truth of God's glory: אמת כבּורָד. The truth of God is strongly linked with the glory of God. Both are certainly elements which belong to the sphere of God.

In 6:14 the psalmist mentions people who will "answer the mouth of Your [God's] glory" (ברך כבּורָד). כבּורָד is here strongly linked with God, although it has grammatically its own attribute.

Also in 12:15 כבּורָד has an attribute. There the psalmist mentions the "splendour of Your [God's] glory" (הודר כבּורָד) which is now, after his election, recognisable by the chosen psalmist.

11. Conclusion

The above investigation offers a clear picture of the understanding of כבּורָד in 1QH, which can be summarised in 7 points:

(i) The understanding of כבּורָד as "glory of God" is the basic sense of the word in 1QH. כבּורָד belongs always to God. It is part of the nature of God. It is an attribute of God.

(ii) But כבּורָד is by no means a divine element in the sense of a "independent" phenomenon. It never loses its connection to God.

144 Also in 11:8 כבּורָד is understood as part of "the strength of God": "(...) in Your strength is all Your power and all your glory (...)" (כבּורָד וכבודה כל בּorreּדה ומל כבּורָד (...)). Both are understood as attributes of God, even as a part of His nature.

145 To give כבּורָד, therefore a "traditional meaning" ("abundance", "honor", "glory") which is extended in 1QH ("victory", "power", "might"), as M.Mansoor (M.Mansoor, Thanksgiving Hymns, 21) suggests, does not reflect the usage and understanding of כבּורָד in 1QH at all. The psalmist talks most of all of "the glory of God" in the sense I am about to out line in this paragraph. And simply to point out that "the richness of kabod in the OT Psalms continues in the Hodayoth" (M.Weinfeld, כבּורָד, 37) is not really satisfying as a description of the meaning of כבּורָד in 1QH.
(iii) קבר is used in these Hymns which contain mainly thanksgiving and praise uttered to God. The function of קבר in that context is always subordinate to God. God is the object of praise; קבר is the reason for it.

(iv) The sense of קבר is embedded in eschatology. In the time before the election of individual people, contact with קבר is not possible. After election and before full, final revelation of God at the end time, the chosen ones are able to know קבר in a certain way. After the revelation, experience of the קבר of God in full may be expected.

(v) Therefore, the condition for humans to experience the קבר of God is their predestined election. Only a person who is chosen by God can "experience" קבר. The knowledge of the קבר of God depends, therefore, entirely on the will of God. The humans can only receive קבר as a gift.

(vi) קבר can only be experienced on the level of interior understanding or belief. It can not be physically experienced.

(vii) 1QH qualifies קבר as follows: קבר is eternal; קבר is a phenomenon of light, and קבר is a powerful element which is part of the nature of God.

Part IV: קבר in the Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice

I. Introduction

We now consider the Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice (Shirot) קבר in this "cycle of 13 Songs" is fascinating, because it is used and understood in a quite distinct way. Aspects which we have already discovered in the OT have been modified or are missing entirely.

---

146 A. M. Schwemer, Gott als König, 47 [translation of author].
New aspects of understanding have been added in the Shirot. The understanding of כְּכֵרָד in the Shirot differs from the Hebrew Bible, the LXX, and even 1QH.

In comparison with the OT and other Qumran material, the question of the authorship of the Shirot is important. An answer to this question will help to clarify the relationship between the writings before dealing with differences in detail. The opinions in the scholarly literature are contradictory. I think that at this stage of knowledge of the Shirot a final conclusion is not possible, but following our investigation of the understanding of כְּכֵרָד and related terms, a preliminary theory can be outlined. One can see that the Shirot show as many similarities with 1QH as differences. At some points the Shirot seem to follow 1QH. On other occasions we will see that 1QH stays much closer to OT usages of certain terms than the Shirot do. It might, therefore, be difficult to postulate a pure Qumran authorship of these poems, as C. Newsom did. But at the same time, one can not deny that the Shirot share similarities with 1QH and, in particular, they deal with the OT material in a manner which is typical for Qumran writings. Hence, the Shirot do not seem to be composed entirely independent of Qumran, as C. Newsom advocated later. The most satisfactory way of defining the authorship of the Shirot is to say that the present form of the Shirot was produced in Qumran, but the "basic form of these songs reflects an older priestly tradition."

Another element in the investigation of the understanding of כְּכֵרָד in the Shirot is the character of the text of the Shirot itself. The setting of כְּכֵרָד is essential for its understanding. The Shirot is a liturgical text which was composed to be used in cultic celebrations. As such, the Shirot is mainly a description of the heavenly priesthood and especially of the praise to God which takes place in the heavenly world. It contains the description of the

147 C. Newsom, Songs, 4.
149 D.K. Falk, Prayers, 130.
150 B. Nitzan, Qumran Prayer, 276.
151 B. Nitzan, Qumran Prayer, 290, 294.
praise of the heavenly beings in the heavenly world. The earthly worshippers are singing the Songs in unison with the heavenly beings,\textsuperscript{152} and are joining in this way the heavenly praise.\textsuperscript{153} Hence the Shirot has a cultic function,\textsuperscript{154} as we will see on many occasions. It is a liturgical text.\textsuperscript{155} The author of the Shirot tries to involve the earthly worshippers, who are using the Shirot for a cultic event, in the praise of the heavenly beings. That means that "those who recite it [the Songs] enjoying a special status within the heavenly entourage of the servants of God"\textsuperscript{156}. The earthly worshippers are enabled to join the praise, because they are purified and honoured.\textsuperscript{157}

יכנור, therefore, has its place in the description of the heavenly world, the world of lively praise and worship. But it has also to be seen as something which is in a very particular way linked with the earthly worshippers.

It is, therefore, not really surprising that particular uses of יכנור are related in specific ways to the structure of the Songs. As we will see later, the usage of יכנור reflects in particular the structure of the Shirot which was developed by C. Newsom.\textsuperscript{158} That structure presents itself as follows:

1. Part 1: Song 1

This Song gives an introduction: the "heavenly world" and God's rule in this world is introduced

2. Part 2: Songs 2-7a

The author describes the events, especially the praise, in the heavenly world.

\textsuperscript{152} B. Nitzan, \textit{Qumran Prayer}, 278.
\textsuperscript{153} A. M. Schwemer, \textit{Gott als König}, 48, 76.
\textsuperscript{154} B. Nitzan, \textit{Qumran Prayer}, 276; A. M. Schwemer, \textit{Gott als König}, 47 calls the Shirot "liturgische Ordnung für die 'Opfer'-Gottesdienste der Sabbate des ersten Vierteljahres".
\textsuperscript{155} B. Nitzan, \textit{Qumran Prayer}, 280.
\textsuperscript{156} J. Strugnell, The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran - 4Q Serek sirot 'Olat Hassabbat, \textit{Vetus Testamentum Supplements} 7 (1960), 318-45, 320.
\textsuperscript{157} B. Nitzan, \textit{Qumran Prayer}, 276.
\textsuperscript{158} B. Nitzan, \textit{Qumran Prayer}, 288.
3. Part 3: Songs 7b-12

The heavenly world is described in detail.

4. Part 4: Song 13

Song 13 contains a conclusion of the whole text.

Following the structure of the text, one discovers that קָבָרָה is differently used in the different parts of the text. In Song 1 the author introduces not only the heavenly world and the rule of God in this world, but at the same time he introduces his understanding of קָבָרָה. He gives its basic sense which the word will keep throughout the text of the Shirot. In the following parts the author develops this sense by emphasising different aspects of קָבָרָה, and by adding new elements to his understanding of it. Song 7 has within the entire text of the Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice an important function. According to the content Song 7 seems to be the climax of the entire text. C. Newsom calls this “the centrality” of Song 7. Hence, it is most interesting that the usage of קָבָרָה changes, precisely in the middle of the Song 7. This might also be an indication that the word קָבָרָה is an important term in the Shirot. Consequently, this investigation follows the structure of the Shirot.

II. קָבָרָה

In Song 1 (Part 1)

קָבָרָה occurs 6 times in this Song, and is always understood as a word restricted to the description of a supernatural reality. קָבָרָה is always connected with God. So it is used in the word combination קָבָרָה דְּמֶלַל in 4Q400 1 ii 8.

---

161 Some examinations of important related terms of קָבָרָה including a comparison with the OT and 1QH will already be included in this investigation.
162 For further details on this usage see pp. 73ff.
is also used as an attribute of qualities of God. In 4Q400 1 i 5/6 the author mentions the "judgements of His glory" (משנתי כבוד), in 4Q400 1 i 6 "the insight of His [God's] glory" (ברעיה כבוד). In 4Q400 1 i 9 occurs כבוד which was again understood as an attribute of a quality of God. כבוד is also used in this Song as an attribute of purely heavenly elements which exist in the heavenly world: (4Q400 1 i 4) and (4Q400 1 ii 9). In this introduction to the Songs, the author introduces, by describing the heavenly world and the rule of God in that world, his understanding of כבוד as well. The most important aspect of this is the connection of כבוד with God. This connection will prove to be, throughout the investigation of the understanding of כבוד in the Shirot, the striking point.

In Part 1 of the Shirot, then, is understood as part of the nature of God without being identical with Him. It is restricted to the heavenly world of praise and worship.

III. כבוד in Song 2-7a (Part 2)

In Part 2 (Songs 2-7a) of the Shirot, כבוד keeps the sense which we have discovered above. Nevertheless, the precise emphasis in its use develops subtly.

---

161 At this point it is interesting that, according to C. Newsom, Songs, 99, "the phrase לעבלו כבוד is almost certainly to be taken as a positive counterpart to the phrase לעבלו לברעה (1QH ii 19), both modelled on Isa. 26:11, "כבוד Lev była ברעה ובע"."  
164 Possibly אולדרם.  
165 Whether the word כבוד was part of a word combination at the beginning of 1. 8 cannot be stated, because the end of 1. 8 is damaged. For כבוד קרושיס see also in 1QH 4.25.  
166 See p. 50.
1. related to God

Investigating the understanding of כבור in the Hebrew Bible, the LXX, 1QH, and the Shirot we have shown that the decisive question is in what way כבור is related to God. Is כבור used in the different texts as a substitute for God, as an attribute of God, or independently of God? This question is also vital in Part 2 of the Shirot.

1.1. כבור as attribute of God

Many times in this part of the Songs כבור occurs in direct connection with God: 4Q400 2 1,167 4Q400 2 3, 4Q400 2 5; 4Q401 14 i 7; MasShirShabb ii 10, MasShirShabb ii 12, Mas-ShirShabb ii 13; MasShirShabb ii 20; 4Q403 1 i 3; 4Q403 1 i 4. 4Q403 1 i 8, 4Q403 1 i 25, MasShirShabb ii 24 // 4Q403 1 i 10; 4Q403 1 i 28/29; 4Q403 1 i 31, 4Q403 1 i 33 // 4Q405 4-5 1; 4Q403 1 i 36 // 4Q405 4-5 4; 4Q403 1 i 38). The connection between כבור and God is grammatically usually indicated through an attached 3. sg. m. suffix to כבור referring to God (כבורה). Hence, grammatically, כבור is an attribute of God, but certainly not a substitute for the divine Name.

In a few lines this question of the precise sense of כבור comes up very significantly. In Mas-ShirShabb ii 13 and 4Q403 i 168 כבור occurs literally in connection with a term denoting "God": אל כבור. Hence, כבור is here not understood as substitute for God. Another very interesting line is 4Q403 1 i 33 where the phrase אלוהות כבורה 169 occurs as object of the

---

167 In the text הפלס כבורה the word הפלס has to be rendered adverbially (see C. Nesom, Songs, 112). The direct object of the infinitive הפלס is, therefore, only the glory of God.

168 For the textual problem see C. Newsom, Songs, 189.

169 It can be doubted very much that this phrase has to be translated as "His glorious royalty" (A.M. Schwermer, Gott als König, 90), for the emphasis lies obviously on כבורה.
imperative כבור is used as attribute of God. This line gives us a clearer idea how כבור was understood in the Shirot. כבור has a "divine" denotation in the sense that it is understood as something which is as closely as possible related to God without being identical with Him ("divine element"). But כבור occurs never with the divine name or its substitutes. Grammatically it gains, therefore, a little independence of God, but it is still understood as an attribute of God.

1.2. כבורה and the forms of address for God

Since the meaning of כבורה depends so much on its relationship with God, an investigation of the relationship of כבורה and the forms of address for God will be decisive for the understanding of כבורה. How is כבורה linked with the forms of address for God in the different writings? Is כבורה involved in the understanding of the divine name? How did the ancient versions, 1QH, and the Shirot understand and use the divine name and other forms of address?

Hence we will examine the connection of כבורה with the term שמ, which is linked quite often in the OT with God and used as an object of human praise.

1.2.1. כבורה and שמ in the OT

Because this combination of words occurs in the OT, some attempt must be made to discover the meaning of כבורה within that combination. At the same time, a study of how the ancient versions (especially LXX and Vulgate) translated these words may throw light on the way

---

170 See for this p. 106.
171 We have already seen above that δεξα is not used in the LXX Pentateuch as substitute for the divine name (see pp. 18f.).
they were understood in antiquity, and help to elucidate their use by the authors of 1QH and the Shirot.

a) Isa. 43:7

BHS: כל הנכרא שמי ולכבודו בראתיך

LXX: ..., (7) πάντας ἰδίων ἐπικέκληται τῷ ὄνομαί μου. ἐν γὰρ τῇ δόξῃ μου κατεσκευάσα αὐτῶν καὶ ...

BSL: Et omnem, qui invocat nomen meum, in gloriam meam creavi eum, ...

In Isa. 43,7 כל and שמי do not occur grammatically in one word combination. But the understanding of both words is very important and gives an insight into the relationship between OT and the versions.

The apparatus of BHS notes one obvious difficulty: the relationship between כל and the suffix of נבוא. If כל denotes "all", the suffix of the 3. pers. sg. doesn't make sense. One solution is to translate כל as "everybody" to give the term a singular meaning. LXX solved this problem in a special way. It understands כל הנכרא שמי as the end of v.6. כל are then all the sons and daughters of that verse. After 7a LXX puts a full stop. At the same time LXX separates the two verbs of 7a. Thus the relationship of the part. pass. and the finite verb no longer presents a problem. But the LXX destroys the union (chiasmus, s. below) between verse 7a and 7b. δόξα and ὄνομα become separate, although in the BHS they are strongly connected (waw copulative and chiasmus). On the other hand the meaning is very close to

__172__ נבוא is part. nif. pass.. In this case the participle occurs in the nifal toleratium in the sense of "to allow something to happen to oneself, generally with a notion of effective action" (P. Jouon/ T. Muraoka, Grammar of Biblical Hebrew I, 150). Hence, שמי נבוא denotes "nach dem Namen jemandes genannt werden, d.h. seiner Familie, seinem Volk beigezählt werden Jer 43,7; 48,1" (W. Gesenius, Handwörterbuch, 724). Therefore the translation of the phrase is: "everybody who was called by His name".
the text of the BHS (not as in the BSL, s. below). Calling and creating are done by God. So ἐννοεῖ and διάκρισι are both (as in the BHS) signs of the quality of the relationship between God and His children. Both belong to God and are used as signs for the close relationship of creator and creature as well as as indications of the power of God.

Also the LXX added ὅσοι and has for the suffix ב the word ἐν. This means that her, as in the BSL, the לְכָּבוֹד is the means by which the creation was carried out by God. But in the BHS denotes "for my glory" or "for the sake of my glory". Here the usage and understanding of לְכָּבוֹד was changed in the LXX: from the reason for what happens to the simple description of the event.

The BSL as well changes the sense. So כָּל denotes in the BHS "all", whereas "omnem" is acc. sg. m. (everybody); this means that BSL put the emphasis on the person, the individual (only the person who called God's name was created in glory). So, both LXX and BSL tried to solve this ambiguity of the HHS (ברא and הָיָה כָּל with the suffix of the 3. sg. m.). Another change was made in the BSL: אֲרוּפָה is part. nif. pass., whereas "invocat" is 3. sg. present tense; BSL changed here the meaning. It is not God anymore who called someone, but it is the human being now who calls God's name!

With regard to כְּפָר which stands in the BHS with the preposition ב meaning "in my name", the BSL uses "nomen meum" as acc. object. This change brings the action of the call into another light. The "name" is not anymore the element which gives the call the authority, but it is now according to the BSL the object of the call.

Although ב is in the BHS often used to introduce the object after verba dicendi (E. Kautzsch/ A.E. Cowley, Hebrew Grammar, 374; C Koehler/ W. Baumgartner, Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon. v.1, 105), it is in this case rather understood in the sense of "in" (i.e. "with", possibly "on behalf of"), because of the parallelism with הֲוַיִּבְשֹׁר הָרָאָתִי, and the fact that כָּל is already and definitely the object.
Concerning the structure of the sentence, BSL changes important aspects. MT offers a chiasmus:

וכל הנכון בשמם
ולכלים בראות

Both of these clauses have therefore the same importance. Therefore the emphasis lies on the two words שמם and בכבוד. BSL breaks this chiasmus to stress something else: the connection between בכבוד and שמם is destroyed, because in BSL man has to call the שמם of God, and God therefore creates the man! This causal connection is absolutely missing in the BHS. In BHS God is the active person and the emphasis lies on the relationship between God and all of His children: He called all of them by His name and He created them all for His glory. This sentence is one huge assertion of the belief that God's children belong entirely to God. BSL proclaims a condition and destroys therefore the union of שמם and בכבוד.

While שמם and בכבוד in BHS signify God as the responsible father of His children, BSL draws a distinction and separates them: "glory" is an attribute of God, it is a divine attribute which is connected with the act of creation, rather the sign of power than of warmth and responsibility of God. In the BSL the meaning of the שמם of God changed: now the call of "God's name" is described as condition of the gift of the close relationship of creator and creature. Only those men who call Him have been created "for His glory" and stand therefore in this special relationship.

In comparison, the meaning of "name" and "glory" in the LXX is not identical, but close to BHS. BSL keeps the meaning of the "glory", but changes the usages of "the name" of God entirely.

A slight emphasis on the second half of the chiasmus may be detected, for הנכון in the first half is a participle, hence the subject, God, is not named. But on the other Hand a participle passive "indicates the person or thing in a state which has been brought about by external actions" (E. Kautsch/ A.E. Cowley, Hebrew Grammar, 356). Hence this difference seems to be caused rather by the "poetical freedom" of the author, than by the intention to emphasise בכבוד more than שמם.
b) Isa. 59:19

BHS: ...ירירה ממוסר באה וירוי ו蓚ורש שדים ותכרור...

LXX: (19a) καὶ φοβηθήσονται οἱ ἄκος δυσμενῇ τῷ σῶμα κυρίου καὶ οἱ δι' ἀνατολῶν ἁλίου τῷ σῶμα τῷ ἐνδοξον...

BSL: Et timebunt qui ab occidente, nomen Domini: et qui ab ortu solis, gloriam eius:...

In this verse the BSL follows BHS. But the LXX makes a major change concerning יכדר in v.19b: LXX added τῷ σῶμα and therefore changed the use of יכדר into an adjective of τῷ σῶμα (ἐνδοξον, not Ἰσόζσ). This means that LXX created a parallelism between the "name of JWH" and the "name of the glory". In BHS the people fear directly the glory of God; but the writer of LXX points out that they fear the "glorious name", which presents the "glorious name" as an "independent" phenomenon. Even more, τῷ σῶμα τῷ ἐνδοξον is used parallel to τῷ σῶμα κυρίου. Hence, in the Greek text, ἐνδοξον seems almost to be used the same way as κύριος. But as translation ἐνδοξον is not used as a substitute for the Tetragram. The "glorious name" is, therefore, understood as a very important phenomenon, and almost identical with the "name of JWH" itself.

c) Ps. 66:2 (65:2)

BHS: ...וּמְרַדְּכָבָר שְׁמֵם כְּבָרָד (v.2)

LXX: πολάτε δό τῷ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, δότε δόξαν αἰνέσει αὐτοῦ.

BSL: Psalmum dicite nomini eius: date gloriam laudi eius.

175 Ἰσόζσ here even without possesive pronoun referring to JWH!
The usage of כבורה and שם in the BHS is very interesting: as construct combination and attribute of God they seem to be used as substitutes for God himself. The praise of man is uttered to כבורה and not, for instance, to דירוה.

In this verse significant change have been made. LXX tries to work with a difficult text, ignores the first כבורה, and adds οἵνεκε ἀντίον at the end of the verse. In any case, the LXX avoids the phrase "glory of His name"! "The name" is still an attribute of God, but "the glory" is not classified as God's glory any more, but rather as something that a human being can give.

The BSL seems to be a literal translation of the text of the LXX. No "gloria" appears in connection with "nomen", but it occurs in the second part without "nomen". "Laudi eius" is added as in the LXX.

xCBוpאν is in the BHS an object of human praise. LXX and the BSL avoid the word combination "glory of His name" and use the terms separately. Furthermore, in both versions "His name" is the object of the praise, whereas "glory" is not an attribute of God any more and is presented here as something which men can utter to God. "Glory" might here be understood as something less firmly linked with God.

d) Ps. 72:19 (71:19)

BHS: יְבָרֵךְ שֶם כֶּבְרוֹר לְעֹלָם

LXX: καὶ εὐλογητὸν τὸ ὄνομα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα...

BSL: Et benedictum nomen maiestatis eius in aeternum:...

176 "And blessed (?) be His glorious name for ever."
Here occurs for the first time in LXX the full phrase: τὸ ὄνομα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, which is identical with the phrase in the BHS.

In this verse the BSL avoids the phrase "name of glory" again. שם כבורה is changed: "nomen" has a possessive pronoun (referring to God) but כבורה is not translated with "gloria", but with "maiestas". This might connect the meaning of the sentence to the concept of the kingship of God.

e) Ps. 79:9 (78:9)

BHS: יזורה אלהינו ישוענו אלהיversible כבורה-שמך

LXX: βοήθησον ἡμῖν, ὁ θεὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν· ἔνεκα τῆς δόξης τοῦ ὄνοματός σου

(κύριε,) ... BSL: Adiuva nos Deus salutaris noster: et propter gloriem nominis tui Domine libera nos:

Most interesting in this verse is that כבורה-שמך was literally translated with τῆς δόξης τοῦ ὄνοματός σου. The LXX does not avoid the word combination in this phrase. And even more interesting is the observation that not even the BSL changes the phrase (gloriem nominis tui).

f) Conclusion

In the BHS Isaiah כבורה and שם do not occur in a construct combination. Here they are signs of God's power and His close and responsible relationship to men.

In Isa. 43:7, δόξα and ὄνομα are not used in exactly the same way, but their meaning is very similar. BSL uses "gloria" like BHS uses כבורה, but "nomen" is here used as an object of human praise.
In Isa. 59:19, the BSL follows BHS. In the LXX, ἐννοήζω is used in the same way as κύριος, but it is not a substitute of the divine name.

As far as the phrase כברר-שם/ךברר in the Psalms is concerned (where it is always the object of human action), the development in the versions is most interesting:

Once (Ps. 79:9 (78:9)) both versions translate literally. Once (Ps. 72:19 (71:19)) LXX follows the BHS literally, but the BSL offers only "nomen" as object of the blessing, but avoids "gloria" in this function. Once (Ps. 66:2 (65:2)) both versions avoid the phrase "glory of His name" as object of human praise. Only "His name" is used this way, whereas "glory" is grammatically used independently of God.

This means that only once the LXX uses ἐννοήζω almost as a substitute for the Tetragram. With respect to כברר-שם or כברר in the Psalms the BSL seems to develop its own usage of both terms. The LXX offers this usage only once (similarly BSL). A further indication for a new development in the BSL is its usage of "nomen" in Isa. 43:2 as object of praise, where כברר does not have this meaning.

כברר is therefore interpreted in these versions as something which is not the object of human praise.

1.2.2. כברר and כברר in 1QH

כברר and כברר do not occur grammatically in a word combination in 1QH. There are only three occasions where they occur in the same line.

In 1,30 the psalmist wants to proclaim the glory of God, to declare God's miracles, and to praise the name of God. Glory and name of God can be objects of human actions, whereas God himself seems never to be an object of that (see 11,6). As attributes of God both terms have the same quality.
In 11,6 God's glory and His name are mentioned together:

אברכה שםך (I will praise your name)

ואמרך כבודך (and I will declare your glory)

This occurrence shows, as in 1,30, that "name" and "glory" are qualities of God which can be objects for man to praise or to declare.

In 18,8 both terms occur, but the line is damaged to an extent which makes a comment on their usage impossible.

In comparison with the occurrence of the word combination in the Hebrew Bible, the LXX, and the Vulgate, the following conclusions appear firm:

שם and כבוד are in 1QH in these cases always attributes or qualities of God. Both are the object of the Psalmist's praise.

In the BHS the phrase כבוד-שם or כבוד-שם and כבוד is always the object of human praise. We have seen that especially BSL, but also LXX avoided "glory" as the object of human praise, and used the term quite "independently" of God in places where human beings are praising Him. In both version "His name" functions as an object of human praise. 1QH, however, does not follow the custom of BHS in using שם and כבוד in one construct combination, but it interprets שם and כבוד separately in much the same way as the BHS understands the whole phrase: firmly linked with God (JHWH) and as attributes of God and object of praise.

Furthermore, the relationship of 1QH and the versions is most interesting. 1QH and the versions avoid the phrase כבוד-שם or כבוד-שם and use the terms "glory" and "name" separately. But it does not follow the new interpretation of the terms (especially "glory") which we have noted in the versions. כבוד in 1QH is always linked with God, and, even if only three times, the object of human praise.
1.2.3. שָׁם in the Shirot

Itself occurs 11 times in Sabbath Shiroth (4Q403 1 i 10; 4Q403 1 i 17; 4Q403 1 i 19; 4Q403 1 i 21; 4Q403 1 i 23-24; 4Q403 1 i 29; 4Q404 2 2; 4Q405 3 ii 6; 4Q405 13 3; 4Q405 13 4-5; MasSS ii 24). Only 4 times שָׁם occurs in the same line as כָּבוֹד (4Q403 1 i 10; 4Q403 1 i 21; 4Q403 1 i 29; MasSS ii 24).

4Q403 1 i 21: (רֵּלֶּךָ בָּשָׁם [ אֲלֵיהוּ כָּבוֹד בָּשָׁם] לְבוּשָׁהוּ) has a gap between שָׁם and כָּבוֹד where the text could have had אֲלֵיהוּ. Unfortunately the textual situation is so uncertain that one can not decide for sure whether the missing term was כָּבוֹד or not. In the other cases שָׁם and כָּבוֹד occur grammatically within a construct combination:

4Q403 1 i 10:

(...) (רֵּלֶּךָ בָּשָׁם כָּבוֹד אֲלֵיהוּ) (...)

4Q403 1 i 28/29:

(...)(רֵּלֶּךָ לָבוּשָׁת (29) בָּשָׁם כָּבוֹד) (28)

MasSS ii 24:

[ (רֵּלֶּךָ בָּשָׁם כָּבוֹד אֲלֵיהוּ לְבוּשָׁהוּ) (...)

That means that in the Shirot the word combination שָׁם כָּבוֹד occurs 3 times. Within the construct combination שָׁם is always in the construct state with prefix ב. כָּבוֹד is in the construct state as well or has a suffix. As such, both terms depend either on a following word in absolute state or on a 3. sg. m. suffix attached to כָּבוֹד. In two of these texts the word in absolute state is אֲלֵיהוּ. In those cases שָׁם כָּבוֹד is the dominating word, and therefore is an attribute of God. In 4Q403 1 i 29 where כָּבוֹד has the suffix this suffix refers to
God. That means that in all three cases the author of the Shirot is talking about the "name of the glory" of God.\(^{77}\)

Also the comparison with BHS, LXX, BSL, and 1QH is most interesting:

The Shirot uses the terms the same way as the BHS. Both terms are used in one construct combination. שֵׁם כָּבוֹד is in both writings depending on God (suffix referring to God, or in the Shirot even the term אַלֹהֵינוּ). In both cases the phrase is an object of human praise.

The Shirot does not follow the new development of the understanding of שֵׁם כָּבוֹד and שֵׁם שֶּם כָּבוֹד in the versions and 1QH.\(^{78}\)

1.2.4. כָּבוֹד and שֵׁם כָּבוֹד as object of בָּרֶךְ

The above investigation of כָּבוֹד in connection with שֵׁם leads to another phenomenon which is linked with the meaning of כָּבוֹד in the OT, the versions, 1QH, and the Shirot, and which requires examination. We have seen above that שֵׁם used in connection with כָּבוֹד is often the object of the verb בָּרֶךְ. How does this observation influence the understanding of כָּבוֹד in the different writings?

1.2.4.1. OT

שֵׁם and בָּרֶךְ occur 14 times in combination in the OT. The terms are mostly included in a phrase which can be outlined as follows:

nomen rectum/suffix - שֵׁם(בָּרֶךְ) - (direct object) - בָּרֶךְ

\(^{77}\) Naturally, avoiding the divine name, as often in Qumran.

\(^{78}\) Because the versions prefer to use שֵׁם with suffix as object of the praise and interpret כָּבוֹד rather "independently", and the Shirot uses כָּבוֹד very much in conjunction with שֵׁם, it is rather unlikely that there was an intention to use כָּבוֹד as substitute of the divine name. שֵׁם itself seems to acquire this function.
The phrase occurs in three different forms, as well as in a few unique usages.

a) In the first category the phrase has always the following structure:

ברר - בָּשָׁם - (object or subject of the phrase) - form of לְרַואֶה

This phrase occurs in the OT 4 times (Dtn. 21:5; Ps. 118:26; 129:8; 1.Chr.16:2). The "pure" form can be found only in Dtn. 21:5 (ולְרַואֶה בָּשָׁם לְרַואֶה), whereas in Ps. 118:26 the subject of the phrase was inserted between verb and construct combination (ברר אֶלֶּה בָּשָׁם לְרַואֶה). In Ps. 129:8 and 1.Chr. 16:2 an object (introduced by the preposition לְאָה) was added into the phrase, again between the verb and the construct combination.

b) In the second category the structure looks quite similar, but the terms have changed:

suffix - nomen rectum - בָּשָׁם - preposition - בָּר

The phrase with this structure occurs in the OT 4 times (Ps. 72:19; 103:1; 145:21; Neh. 9:5).

c) In the third category, the structure of the phrase could be described as follows:

suffix - בָּשָׁם - בר

In the OT are three texts compatible with this scheme (Ps. 96:2; 100:4; 145:1).

Use of the verb בר in connection with בָּשָׁם can be classified as follows: the phrase occurs 10 times in explicitly poetical texts, mostly psalms. Three times the text is not a poetical text as such (Dtn. 21:5; 1.Chr. 16:2; 23:13), but liturgical or legal.
The subjects of the phrase are without exception human beings. In no text does בּוּ occur on its own. It has either a preposition (a)) or a suffix (b)), or is nomen regens in a construct combination (c)).

a) בּוּ occurs 5 times with the preposition ב (Dtn. 21:5; Ps. 118:26; 129:8; 1.Chr. 16:2; 23:13). It is important for the question of the object of the verb יִדְרַשְׁר that in four of these texts בּוּ is nomen regens of a construct combination in which יִדְרַשְׁר is the nomen rectum (בּוּ יִדְרַשְׁר). Only once בּוּ occurs as בּ שְׁמָר (1.Chr. 23:13). This means that בּוּ with the preposition ב in connection with the Tetragram is an established word combination.

Again the question arises how the preposition should be translated. Is it an indication of an object, or should it be translated as "in" (in the sense of "on behalf of")? In two of the texts the situation is clear: in Ps. 129:8 and 1.Chr. 16:2 the verb יִדְרַשְׁר has explicitly a direct object (see below). That means that the preposition ב has to be translated as "in". Because of the part. pass. pi. in Ps. 118:26 the translation must be "in" as well, because the passive already implies an object. Only in Dtn. 21:51 and 1.Chr. 23:13 the situation is uncertain. Here the preposition could be translated as an indication of an object.

בּוּ occurs as well, but only once, with the preposition יִדְרַשְׁר (Ps. 103:1) where it is not connected with the divine name.

b) בּוּ is used four times with a suffix which refers always to God (JHWH): Ps. 96:2; 100:4; 145:1; 1.Chr. 23:13.

In all these cases the meaning of ב "in" in the sense of "on behalf of", with the authority of", ב is not used as indication of an object.

Most interesting is therefore Job 1:21, because here occurs the constructus combination יִדְרַשְׁר בּוּ without the preposition ב.

As it has to be in the phrase יִדְרַשְׁר בּוּ (see above).
c) מָשֵׁי is also used in a construct combination with שְׁרֵפָּה (in Ps. 145:1) and, as we have seen above, with מַלְאָךְ (in Ps. 72:19 and Neh. 9:5). All of these terms occur with a suffix which refers to God (JHWH). And whenever מָשֵׁי and מַלְאָךְ occur as a word combination, מָשֵׁי has no preposition. This means that the constructus combination מָשֵׁי מַלְאָךְ is always the direct object of the verb מְבַרְר. As in all the other phrases we analysed earlier, the object of the verb מְבַרְר within the phrase is the problematic point. Here the term מָשֵׁי is highly involved.

If one compares the 13 texts where the phrase occurs with the scheme I have presented above, one finds that three different kinds of objects occur.

In the first group of texts a direct object occurs between verb and the term מָשֵׁי. So in Ps.129:8 the preposition מֵא with the 2.pl. suffix (בְּנֵא) and in 1.Chr.16:2 the term מֵאֶח with the preposition מְאָה.

In the second group מָשֵׁי occurs either with a suffix and is direct object (Ps. 96:2; 100:4; 145:1), or within a word combination which is the direct object (Ps. 72:19; 145:21; Neh. 9:5).

In this group it is interesting that the nomen rectum of the construct combination which is the object is never the Tetragram.183

182 Depending on the context the 3.sg.m. suffix (Ps.96,2; 100,4; 1.Chr.23,13) or the 2.sg.m. suffix is used.
183 The only exception is again Job. 1:21. There מְבַרְרַיו מָשֵׁי occurs, but here the word combination is at the same time the subject (מְבַרְרָה is passive) of the phrase. But this still leaves the problem whether in Dtn. 21:5 and Ps. 118:26 (where no direct object occurs in the phrase) the word combination מְבַרְרִי מָשֵׁי could be the object or not. We have still two examples where a translation as object would not be impossible. But there are, indeed, several facts which seem to indicate that the preposition is meant as "in". מָשֵׁי has to be translated as "in" when the phrase has a direct object, which happens twice (Ps. 129:8 and 1.Chr. 16:2). A direct object is either indicated by מָשֵׁי (Ps. 103:1) or מָשֵׁי is used in a construct combination without preposition and the whole combination is the direct object (Ps. 72:19; 145:21; Neh. 9:5), or it is used with a suffix and as such a direct object (Ps. 96:2; 100:4; 145:1). In none of those texts where the term מָשֵׁי (as part of a construct combination or with a suffix and in both cases without preposition) is a direct object does it occur in connection with the Tetragram. So it is rather unlikely that the authors of the text understood the word combination מְבַרְרִי מָשֵׁי as object of מְבַרְר.
In the third group the verb כָּלֵר does not have an object (especially Dtn. 21:5; Ps.118:26 where only the "modus" of praise is given: בֵּשָם יְהוָה).

But one problem remains, indeed: 1.Chr. 23:13. Here occurs בָּשָמַר. This term could be used as an object, or the preposition ב could be understood as "in" in the sense of "on behalf of". The meaning of the phrase is difficult to interpret. The only hint we have is that in all of the other cases ב means "in".

And there is another verse in the OT that is important at this point: Ez. 3:12. This verse is important because the phrase כָּלֵר כָּבָרִיָהוּ occurs in the context of angelic praise. The כָּבָרִיָהוּ does not occur here, and כָּבָרִיָהוּ is certainly not understood as a substitute for the divine name since it occurs in combination with it, and this is one of the two verses in the OT where the text says something about the words of angelic praise. This again might be a point where the Shirot, describing the angelic praise of the heavenly beings, developed an idea of the OT which occurs there only once. The exact phrase of Ez. 3:12 does not occur in the Shirot, but by contrast a similar expression influenced by the distinctive theological ideas of Qumran. כָּבָרִיָהוּ is, however, certainly used as attribute of JHWH in Ez. 3:12.

---

184 Grammatically it is the extended motif כָּלֵר כָּבָר יְהוָה which is the "primary Israelite formula for blessing God" (W.S. Towner, "Blessed Be JHWH" and "Blessed Art Thou, JHWH: The Modulation of a Biblical Formula", Catholic Biblical Quarterly 30 (1968), 386-399, 386.

185 Another verse is Isa 6:3, but the wording of this verse is interesting for the present context.

186 As also B. Nitzan points out (B. Nitzan, Qumran Prayer, 277).

Furthermore it is interesting that the formula כָּלֵר יְהוָה occurs in 1Q11 in 5,20f; 10,13, 16,8, certainly at some points with changes: the Tetragram is replaced and sometimes the personal pronoun הָיוֹ הוֹ is added.
1.2.4.2. Comparison with 1QH

םֶש occurs twice in 1QH in connection with the verb בָּר (2,30; 11,6):

2,30:

(... וַאֲבָרָךְ שָׁמַךְ (...)

11,6:

(... וַאֲבָרָךְ שָׁמַךְ (...)

The usage of the two terms in 1QH is compatible to a certain extent with scheme c) (i.e.: suffix - רָבָא - בָּר). Both of the phrases in 1QH occur in poetical texts. The subject in both of the texts in 1QH is the psalmist.םֶש occurs always with the 2. sg. m. suffix (שָׁמַךְ). The suffix refers clearly to God. It is used without a preposition. Here a most interesting fact should be noted: in 1QH the term is certainly used as direct object of the verb בָּר, because of the lack of a preposition, the structure of the phrase, and the closer context. Again an author of Qumran seems to have developed the use of a term in the OT. Furthermore, the terms of reference of שָׁמַךְ in these two lines in 1QH are very significant, since they seem not to be represented in the OT, the term שָׁמַךְ being used here as the direct object of human praise. As such, "name" seems to stands for God himself. The term שֶש is used instead of the divine name or other substitutes for this name. It is also of note that this type of usage occurs only twice in 1QH. This is again an indication that 1QH did not intend to use בָּר as substitute of the divine name.

187 In 17,20 שֶש occurs with the term רְבָרָךְ. Therefore this verse cannot be included in the investigation, although the meaning of this phrase is quite similar to the sense of phrases where שֶש occurs with the verb בָּר. 188 In the fragments 4,17 (שָׁמַךְ וַאֲבָרָךְ) and 38,2 (רְבָרָךְ שָׁמַךְ וַאֲבָרָךְ) the situation is quite similar, only the particular verb form changes. But usage and meaning are the same.
1.2.4.3. Comparison with the Shirot\[190\]

In the Shirot לְנָּא occurs 9 times directly connected with the verb יָנָּא. Concerning the structure of the phrase\[190\] in which the two terms occur in the Shirot almost the same observations as for the usage of the terms in IQH can be stated. They occur in the phrase:

(direct object) - nomen rectum/suffix - לְנָּא(ַבָּו) - יָנָּא

In the Shirot, the terms לְנָּא and יָנָּא occur in the setting of praise uttered to God. Whereas in the OT and in 1QH the subject is always a human being, in the Shirot the subject is always one of the "chief princes", so a heavenly being. By chanting the Songs the earthly worshipper joins the praise of the heavenly beings and becomes, therefore, a "subject" of the phrase as well.\[191\]

Concerning the verb יָנָּא the situation is as follows: in the Shirot the verb occurs always as יָנָּא (3.sg.m.impf.pl.). This usage reflects the narrative character of the Songs describing events in the heavenly world and the deeds of the chief princes. This use of the verb demonstrates also that the earthly worshippers are not so much involved in the praise which is described in the Songs as they are in the texts of the OT or 1QH. In the Songs the 3.pers.sg. is always used, whereas in the OT and 1QH the imperative, the cohortative or the 1.sg.m./pl. is used most frequently.

Investigation of the term לְנָּא provides important results. We have already seen that לְנָּא occurs in the OT 5 times with the preposition ב. In 1QH לְנָּא in connection with יָנָּא never occurs with preposition. In the Shirot the term occurs always and only with the preposition ב.

\[190\] For the special usage of יָנָּא in this phrase see A.M. Schwermer, Gott als König, 86-94. In contrast to A.M. Schwermer we will focus here on the usage of יָנָּא in this phrase. A very brief discussion of the "Benediction Form" may be found in D.K. Falk, Prayers, 146-148.

\[191\] A. M. Schwermer, Gott als König, 45, 89f. calls the phrase "liturgische Formel". Cf. p. 49.
(11 times). We have seen that whenever יְבִשָּׁה occurs with the preposition ב in the OT it is also part of a word combination with the divine name (only one exception: 1.Chr. 16,2). In the Songs this word combination does not occur at all.

Furthermore, יְבִשָּׁה does not occur in the Songs with a suffix which refers to God. It is always part of a construct combination.

An equally important observation follows. We have seen that יְבִשָּׁה occurs twice in the OT in connection with םַר פַּר and twice with כַּבְרוֹד. In these four cases the nomen rectum has also a suffix which refers to God. The situation in the Shirot is different. There the term יְבִשָּׁה occurs only once in connection with the term פַּר (4Q403 1 i 23-24), which has the 3.sg.m. suffix referring to God. And as we have seen above, three times the term יְבִשָּׁה occurs with the term כַּבְרוֹד (4Q403 1 i 10; 4Q403 1 i 29; MasSS ii 24), but in only one of these texts the nomen rectum (כַּבְרוֹד) has a suffix (4Q403 1 i 29). Twice the phrase כַּבְרוֹד אָלָדְרָם occurs (4Q403 1 i 10; MasSS ii 24). So, instead of the suffix, אָלָדְרָם כַּבְרוֹד has the term אָלָדְרָם as nomen rectum. And even more striking is the contrast to its usage in the OT and 1QH, since יְבִשָּׁה occurs within the above described phrase with different terms:

4Q403 1 i 17: (...) יָבִישׁ כֶּשֶׁם חוֹר הַמֶּלֶךְ לְכַלְוָל

4Q404 2 2: (...) יָבִישׁ כֶּשֶׁם נְבָרָה אְלָיִם

192 And possibly 4Q405 3 ii 6.
193 And possibly 4Q405 13 4-5.
This constitutes a major difference in usage and understanding of ש ש and ברל between the OT, 1QH, and the Shirot. We have seen that in the OT the term ש ש occurs either with the Tetragram, or with ש הר and ברל ברל with suffix referring to God, or only with a suffix. *The Tetragram does not occur in the entire text of the Shirot.* It was replaced not only (as in 1QH) by ש ש with a suffix referring to God, but also with different terms with suffix, or with אלעבד. The words which occur in connection with ש ש and ברל ברל in the Shirot do not occur in that connection either in the OT or in 1QH. Here again we need to examine the object of ברל. This matter proves straightforward.

In the Songs the verb is always followed by the construct combination in which the term ש ש is the nomen regens. After this combination follows the direct object of the verb introduced by the preposition ל ("all those who..."). The objects are always beings with certain qualities, but they are never the word combination in which the term ש ש occurs. This means that in the Songs the word combination in which the term ש ש occurs is never the object of the verb ברל, whereas in the OT and in 1QH the term ש ש with suffix or even a construct combination with ש ש does stand as the direct object. The object of ברל in the OT and 1QH is the "name of God", or a word combination like "the name of His glory"; but never beings (human or heavenly).

The result of this investigation into the Shirot is threefold. First, with regard to the term ש ש itself, one may state confidently that it is not used as a substitute for the Tetragram. It is always dominated by a nomen rectum. It is this nomen rectum, as we have seen above, which does duty for the divine name.

In this case the intention of the author could have been simply to avoid the word הרל.
Secondly, our understanding of כבורה becomes clearer. כבורה occurs three times in the Shi-rot in this word combination, where the grammatically dominating term is either אלוהים (4Q403 1 i 10; MasSS ii 24), or כבורה with suffix referring to God. This usage indicates that כבורה is firmly linked with God in these phrases. But it also receives a certain importance as a phenomenon, because it is used in these phrases. Furthermore, in those cases where כבורה does not occur in the phrase, other terms are employed as dominating terms without a connection to God. This indicates that the phenomenon כבורה becomes very important as a divine phenomenon. The fact that כבורה is a divine phenomenon gives it a kind of independent function in comparison with other heavenly phenomena. But it is still linked with God.

Thirdly, the object of the blessings is now heavenly beings or, by extension, the earthly worshippers chanting the Songs, whereas in the OT and 1QH the object was the name of God and the subject the beings. That means that the name of God, maybe even God Himself, became in the Shirot less prominent than it or He was especially in the OT texts considered here. This might be also a reason, why כבורה in the Shirot begins to gain more "independence" and its own weight. This seems to be a decisive difference between the usage of the term כבורה in the OT and 1QH on the one hand and the Shirot on the other hand.

1.2.5. כבורה and the divine name in 4Q403 1 ii 3 and Ez. 1:28

Again the question of the relationship between כבורה and the divine name arises because of the parallelism of 4Q403 1 ii 3 and Ez. 1:28. 4Q403 1 ii 3 reads:

[מראא חכמך כבורה לראאש ממלות רותח...]}
Ez. 1:28* has at the decisive part of the text:

חָרָה מְרַאָה דָּמָת כַּבֹּר יְהוָה

Grammatically C. Newsom is absolutely right in commenting that in the Shirot text כַּבֹּר governs לָרָאשֶׁי מְמַלֶּכֶת רְחֵיה, and in Ez. 1:28 כַּבֹּר governs יְהוָה. But this does not necessarily mean, even if 4Q403 1 ii 3 depends on Ez. 1:28, that כַּבֹּר is a substitute for the divine name, because כַּבֹּר here depends grammatically on another term or phrase. These terms or phrases might be exchanged. כַּבֹּר, however, is not part of such an exchange. Therefore, the author of the Shirot used the phrase he knew from Ez. 1:28 for his purposes, talking about the spirits, not JHWH; but he certainly did not replace the divine name by כַּבֹּר.

1.3. כַּבֹּר and the kingship of God

1.3.1. מַלֶּכֶת and כַּבֹּר

Elsewhere כַּבֹּר is used as an attribute of God in conjunction with מַלֶּכֶת. The word combination occurs throughout the Shirot (Part 1, 2, and 3). Here again the question arises whether כַּבֹּר was understood as a substitute for God or the divine name.

To answer this question, we must investigate the occurrence of this word combination in the OT and 1QH.

כַּבֹּר and מַלֶּכֶת in the OT only 10 times occur together in one verse. And it is even more significant that only in Ps. 24 do the two terms occur grammatically in a word combination.

---

1. C. Newsom, Songs, 233
2. I. K. 3:13, Isa. 8:7, 14:18, Ps. 24.7, 24.8, 24.9, 24:10; 102.16; Est. 5:11, 2 Chr. 1:12.
3. For the discussion of the "Jahwe-König-Psalmen" in view of the Shirot see especially A M. Schwermer,
The word combination מֶלֶךְ הָכְבֹּר occurs 4 times in this psalm (v.7,8,9,10), and in v.8 and 10 the psalmist defines the מֶלֶךְ הָכְבֹּר.

v.8: מֶלֶךְ הָכְבֹּר יְהוָה צְדוֹק וְנֶבֶר יְהוָה נֶבֶר מַלְאֵךְ

v.10: מֶלֶךְ הָכְבֹּר יְהוָה צְבָאָה וְיָהוָה מֶלֶךְ הָכְבֹּר סֶלֶח

Grammatically, מֶלֶךְ occurs always in the construct state, כְּבֹר occurs in the absolute state with article. In both verses the following nominal clause defines who the מֶלֶךְ הָכְבֹּר is. In both verses the psalmist points out that the מֶלֶךְ הָכְבֹּר is JHWH. In v.8 he describes JHWH by giving Him the attributes of צְדוֹק (strong) which occurs only here in the entire OT, and נֶבֶר (powerful, mighty) which is a common description.

What is the sense of כְּבֹר in these verses? We note that מֶלֶךְ is parallel to יְהוָה. Therefore, כְּבֹר seems to be understood as an attribute of מֶלֶךְ, as צְדוֹק and נֶבֶר are understood as attributes of יְהוָה. Given the parallel structure of the sentence מֶלֶךְ הָכְבֹּר seems to be a substitute for יְהוָה with its attributes. Grammatically מֶלֶךְ is the substitute for the Tetragram, not כְּבֹר.

For understanding of כְּבֹר, two important factors come into play at this point. First, כְּבֹר in the word combination מֶלֶךְ הָכְבֹּר is not understood as a substitute for the divine name. It is, quite literally, an attribute of God. It begins, however, to gain a certain "independence" from God, and grammatically from the divine name. This observation may illuminate the

Gott als König, 58ff. This discussion is beyond the scope of this study. Here we will only focus on those verses where מֶלֶךְ and כְּבֹר occur together.
usage of מִלְכָּה and כֶּבֶרֶד in the Shirah, since we have shown that כֶּבֶרֶד in those Songs becomes more and more "independent" from God. It is not necessarily understood as a substitute for God or His name, but it claim attention as a theologically significant aspect of God in its own right.

Secondly, the occurrence of מִלְכָּה and כֶּבֶרֶד in the OT most obviously suggests that the author of the Shirah developed ideas or understandings of OT expressions which occur there only a few times, or even only once, and which are difficult to interpret. As we will see below in detail, the Shirah uses כֶּבֶרֶד 9 times in connection with מִלְכָּה.

We must now point out that כֶּבֶרֶד never occurs in 1QH in connection with מִלְכָּה: the authors of 1QH did not use the word combination מִלְכָּה כֶּבֶרֶד. This, too, strongly suggests that 1QH in its understanding of כֶּבֶרֶד stands much closer to the general modes of expression of the OT than do the Shirah. The use of כֶּבֶרֶד in 1QH is throughout far less innovative than in the Shirah.

By contrast, כֶּבֶרֶד is used 9 times in the Shirah in connection with מִלְכָּה. 6 times the word combination מִלְכָּה כֶּבֶרֶד occurs. This definitely substantiates the view that the author of the Shirah develops usages of כֶּבֶרֶד which occur rarely in the OT, and which are there difficult to interpret. Consequently, the following passages must be carefully reviewed:

MasShirShabb ii 11/12:

(...)

The discussion whether or not the Shirah continue "die alte 'Tempeltheologie' und die Interpretation der alten Gottesepitheta" (A. M. Schwermer, Gott als König, 59) in general lies beyond the scope of this study. But it certainly has to be considered very carefully. And one can only agree with the statement that the language in the "Jahwe-König-Psalmen" leads to the language of the Shirah (A. M. Schwermer, Gott als König, 60) in the above described the Shirah developed ideas of the OT which occur there only occasionally.

In the Shirah God is called 55 times מִלְכָּה (A. M. Schwermer, Gott als König, 48). In this writing the concept of the kingship of God is, therefore, vitally important.
The word combination מֶלֶךְ הָכֹבוֹד in the Shirot in a certain manner is always the object of thanksgiving or praise. The thanksgiving and praise of the Shirot is due to the King of glory. מֶלֶךְ הָכֹבוֹד is here, as in the OT, identical with God. But in contrast with the usage of the word combination in the OT מֶלֶךְ הָכֹבוֹד is here more "independent", because the statement that the thanksgiving, and therefore the content and aim of the Shirot, is due to the מֶלֶךְ of the glory (כֹּבֹד the with article in the absolute state) gives the כֹּבֹד an enormous weight.

Furthermore, the word combination occurs here without the defining divine name. מֶלֶךְ הָכֹבוֹד stands here on its own. מֶלֶךְ הָכֹבוֹד simply is used for "God". There is no real indication that הָכֹבוֹד on its own is used here as a substitute for God or His divine name. But because of the importance of the word combination, כֹּבֹד appears here, more so than in the OT, to be an important word with its own particular significance. Because the whole word combination and especially the term מֶלֶךְ הָכֹבוֹד mean or refer to God.

\[gains\text{ }independence\]

In 4Q400 1 ii 8 and 11QShirShabb 5-6 6 מֶלֶךְ הָכֹבוֹד are the only preserved words of the line.
as a phenomenon which is still linked with God. This independence is gained rather with regard to other heavenly phenomena than with regard to God: כבוד gains its own and independent function in the heavenly world. Only with respect to this independent function, we may sense a tendency to weaken the link between כבוד and God.

Both terms are also used in a word combination in 4Q400 2 5, but grammatically in a different way. כבוד is here the attribute of "the King of godlike beings":

כבוד מלך אלוהים טсанר במעוזי תומרו.

The heavenly beings declare the glory of this King. This verse demonstrates as well that כבוד was not understood as completely "independent" of God, but as divine phenomenon it has certainly its own weight and importance.

In 4Q403 1 i 13 // 4Q405 3 ii 3 כבוד and מלך כבוד occur as well, but grammatically not in a word combination.

1.3.2. מלכותו כבוד

Because "the frequent use of מלכות and the numerous references to God as king indicates the importance of that image of God in the Shirot", we now investigate the sense of כבוד in conjunction with מלכות.

Both terms occur in 4Q403 1 i 25:

ברך אלוהי הטובו יזrogen [מה] מלך מלכות כבודו [גצת]

See for this line p. 93.
C. Newsom, Songs, 204.
is here certainly the "glory of God" (suffix referring to God). The object of the praise is here the מלכות of the glory of God. According to the grammatical usage (dominating מָלָכָה and connected with God only through the suffix) and the wording of the line ("כֵּרוֹד as the last noun of the word combination followed only by the suffix) the intention of the author is obvious: the emphasis of the word combination lies on "כֵּרוֹד. This is the impression the reader inevitably receives. "כֵּרוֹד, therefore, is here understood as a phenomenon which is still attributively linked with God, but no longer entirely bound up with God. It has its own important place in the heavenly world, the heavenly kingdom of God. For the heavenly beings, and the earthly worshippers כֵּרוֹד is a very important element of the heavenly world which gains independence from all the heavenly objects, because it is still a divine phenomenon. But כֵּרוֹד in this line would be misunderstood, if one postulated that it is used as substitute for God or His name. We have seen that כֵּרוֹד is an important element of the heavenly world of God, but not identical with God. Linguistically it is also unlikely that כֵּרוֹד was used as substitute for the divine name. Rather the author of the Shirot used כֵּרוֹד as a visible and audible phenomenon in the heavenly word. In that world of praise it becomes one of the most important elements, because it is a perceptible and "divine" (i.e. still related to God) phenomenon. It is, therefore, extremely unlikely that the author of the Shirot intended to use it as substitute for the divine name.

In 4Q405 23 ii 11-12 מלכות כֵּרוֹד occurs in the same sense. Only the aspect of praise is missing, but that does not weaken our definition of the understanding of the term. The same can be said about 4Q405 24 3, although the proceeding text giving the word combination in
this line is not preserved. And at 4Q401 14 i 6 a similar reading (מַלְכָּתָה נְכָרְדָה) occurs in which נְכָרְדָה has the same sense. 204

Three times in this part of the Shirot occurs the word combination נְכָרְדָה מַלְכָּתָה: 4Q403 1 i 32; 4Q403 1 ii 10; and 4Q405 23 i 3. 205 This usage of נְכָרְדָה strengthens our thesis above about the understanding of נְכָרְדָה. Here the emphasis of the statement lies on the kingdom of God as a classical theological concept of the OT. נְכָרְדָה is part of this kingdom. Once more נְכָרְדָה is understood as an important phenomenon of the heavenly world. Because grammatically it is here no longer linked with God, one could argue that it is understood as completely "independent". But as part of the kingdom of God which is full of God and as close to Him as anything can be to its creator, נְכָרְדָה is still, albeit less closely, connected to God.

1.4. נְכָרְדָה and לְדוֹר

So far, we have investigated two aspects of נְכָרְדָה in the Shirot: its connection with the name of God, and its conjunction with the concept of the kingship of God. With both of these aspects, another term comes to mind which is significant at this point: לְדוֹר. לְדוֹר occurs often in the Shirot, and others important points for the understanding of נְכָרְדָה. It is used in conjunction with the phrase: nomen rectum - כְּשָׁם - בָּרָךְ. It seems to be that לְדוֹר within this word combination was used as equivalent of the term נְכָרְדָה, or even of the Tetragram.
Therefore, the meaning of דָּרוֹא in the Shirot may throw light on understanding of בּוֹרָא in the Songs. 207

1.4.1. Usage in the OT

דָּרוֹא is used only 23 times in the OT; so it is not a very common word. Its translation is not always certain, but in general and most frequently it might be best to translate with "majesty". The way in which דָּרוֹא is used in the OT reflects its importance for the understanding of בּוֹרָא in the OT, 1QH and the Shirot. Both terms are used in a very similar way.

1.4.1.1. דָּרוֹא as attribute of God

Almost in any text where the term דָּרוֹא occurs in the OT it is somehow related to God himself. Only the degree of this relationship differs, very often because of the context in which it occurs. Broadly speaking, there are two different ways in which דָּרוֹא is used as attribute of God. The term דָּרוֹא is used 8 times208 as a direct attribute of God himself. The דָּרוֹא is a quality of God. Grammatically this is expressed by adding to the term the 3.sg.m. suffix which refers to God209, or the text where דָּרוֹא occurs is a poetical text which is uttered to God, so the uttering person gives God this quality.210

207 Because we are examining the understanding of a term other than בּוֹרָא to find out more about בּוֹרָא itself, it is essential at this point to consider the OT and 1QH.

1 Chr 29:11; Ps 8:2, 96:6, 104:1b, 145:5, 148:13, Isa 30:30, Hab 3:3b

Especially Isa 30:30 is interesting at this point because the context is God's judgement of Assyria, and His promise to Zion. The usage of דָּרוֹא as attribute of God and the fact that the term is linked with the theme of the temple are connected here. The second observation is that the acting person in the context (cf. v. 27a) is not called "God", but "the name of God". Isa 30:30 is a text, therefore, where "the name of God" and the דָּרוֹא are somehow linked.

In Ps 104 1 דָּרוֹא is used within a description of God. The whole description uses kingdom language as, for example, does Ps 45:4.

For the special usage and combination of the term in Ps 145:5 see below

208 Isa 30:30; Ps 8:2, Hab 3:3b

209 1 Chr 29:11; Ps 145:5; 148:13.
1.4.1.2. Attribute of the place where God exists

The term רוח is not always used as attribute of God in order to "characterise" God. Five times רוח is used to describe the place where God is, the area around God. In this sense רוח has a supernatural reference again.

1. Chr 16:27; Ps. 96:6; and Job 37:22 represent this group perfectly well. The term רוח occurs as an attribute of the divine area. The other texts (Ps. 8:2; 148:13; Hab. 3:3b) show another important element which is important for understanding of רוח in the Shirot. רוח is not only used within a description of the area around God, but with regard to a distinction between heaven and earth. In these three texts (Ps. 8:2; 148:13; Hab. 3:3b) the רוח does either "cover the heaven" (Hab. 3:3b), or it is "above heaven" (גשם רוח, Ps. 8:2), or even "above earth and heaven" (ז锦标 יא רוח, Ps. 148:13). Clearly, רוח was used by the authors of these texts to refer to something which does not belong to this world (and according to Ps. 8:2 and 148:13 was located above heaven), but which is very closely related to God - maybe an attribute of God or of the area where God exists. רוח was envisaged as something which is around God, which is part of the area around God, the place where God exists. The place described here in the OT is strongly redolent of the descriptions of the heavenly world in the Shirot. Once more, the Shirot have developed ideas or concepts of the OT regarding רוח, into which רוח was then integrated.

---

1 Chr 16:27, Ps 8:2, 96:6; 148:13; Job 37:22, Hab 3:3b
Ps. 96:6 says: "Majesty (רוח) and glory/honour (רוח) are before Him, strength and beauty are in his sanctuary," a place where God is and where the רוח is described. The psalmist calls that place in 6b מקר. This might be a clear indication of temple language or, at least, of the fact that the place where the רוח is was somehow connected with the temple as holy place. Again this observation shows that the term רוח was used in this semantic field of kingship, temple, God, divine place, and sometimes in one text relating to more than one of these themes. The situation in 1 Chr 16:27 is similar, but the place is there called מקר (27b). Job 37:22b says: [...] around God is frightening majesty (רוח).
Furthermore, in all three texts רָוָד is used in a comparison. דֶּרוֹד is described as an element of the area of God. By contrast, the author always names another element, linked with God, but which stays on earth, and which is somehow accessible to human beings. This element is in Ps.8:2 the name of God.213 The name of God is on earth (בראשית, 2a). the דֶּרוֹד of God is above in heaven (תְּהִלְתּוֹ, 2b). Both terms (on a different level) are objects of human praise in this psalm of the revelation of the glory of God in the creation. This seems to mean that the name of God and glory of God are on the earth, accessible to the humans. The דֶּרוֹד seems, on contrary, to be understood as an element which is inaccessible to humans. This text clarifies a little the relationship between the themes "name of God", "glory of God", and "majesty of God".

In Ps.148:13214 the name of God (בראשית, שם) and דֶּרוֹד occur again within the same verse. And it seems that again דֶּרוֹד is above heaven and inaccessible for humans, but the name of JHWH is exalted (שם) and seems still to be available in this world. However, the use of the two terms is similar: and in this text the distinction between the heavenly דֶּרוֹד and the earthly שם is not absolutely clear-cut, as it was in Ps. 8:2.

In Hab.3:3b215 דֶּרוֹד belongs to the divine area, whereas God's praise (תְּהִילָתָו) fills the earth. דֶּרוֹד is again a quality in heaven. The glory of God reflects what is available to people on the earth216.

213 "JHWH our Lord, how majestic is your name in all the earth, you have set your majesty above the heaven".
214 "Let them praise the name of JHWH, for exalted is his name particularly, his majesty is above earth and heaven "
215 "His majesty (דֶּרוֹד) covers the heaven, and His praise filled the earth "
216 This might reflect again the thought of the creation which still has the glory of its creator. But other elements of the being of God like דֶּרוֹד are not accessible for humans
In Job 40:10b דָּוָד seems to be a quality of God as well. In the second speech of God in the book of Job (Job 40:6-41:26) God shows Job the greatness of himself and uses therefore in verse 6 the terms דָּוָד and דָּוָד חָי to indicate the difference between God and human beings: God has the quality of דָּוָד, people don't have it.

1.4.1.3. In conjunction with the Temple

Very often the term דָּוָד occurs in conjunction with the temple. So Zech.6:13 says that Je-shua will build the temple again, which will be made "majestically" (דָּוָד). In Ps.96:6 the terms דָּוָד and דָּוָד חָי occur in the same verse as בְּמִשְׁפָּר ("Majesty and honour are before him; strength and beauty are in his sanctuary". Ps.96:6). The דָּוָד is here explicitly located in the temple. So, the presence of God seems to bring, to cause the דָּוָד. David's Psalm of Thanksgiving in 1.Chr.16:8-36 indicates exactly the same conjunction in nearly the same words as Ps.96:6: "Majesty (דָּוָד) and honour/glory (דָּוָד) are before him; strength and joy are in his place (בְּמִשְׁפָּר)" (v.27). So, again the presence of God brings or causes the דָּוָד. Although it is never said that JHWH is with his דָּוָד dwelling in the temple, it seems plausible to connect דָּוָד with the temple. Reasons for this include the use of the term in conjunction with the temple, its use in description of the place where God exists (especially the mention of the שְֹמַר in this context in Ps.96:6), and the fact that the context of its occurrence is often characterised by temple language. For the people at Qumran, therefore, the term דָּוָד probably had an association with the temple. The frequent use of the term in the Shirot could, therefore, be intended to give the readers or singers of the texts the impression that a place

"With majesty and honour/glory clothe yourself."
like the temple is meant. While the place described in the Songs is not identical with the temple, however, for the worshippers in Qumran it must have been understood as a holier place which had high authority. קָבָלָה (of God) used so much in this setting is, therefore, in the Shirot understood as an element of this holy world which is still (at least linguistically) linked with the temple of the OT. Hence, קָבָלָה is certainly the קָבָלָה of God.\textsuperscript{218}

1.4.1.4. In conjunction with the kingdom

זֶרֶד is also often used in conjunction with the kingdom (of God). In Zech.6:13a\textsuperscript{219} זֶרֶד occurs in a kingdom setting (the enthronement of Jeshua who will sit on his throne (בָּשַׂר) and rule (מָלֵך)). Most obvious is the kingdom language in 1.Chr.29:25: the verse is part of the narrative of the enthronement of Solomon and is used to describe king Solomon. Ps.21:6 is a psalm of "God's help for the king". The whole psalm is characterised by the kingdom language. In verse 6b the psalmist says that God will bestow majesty (זֶרֶד) and honour/glory (זֶרֶד) on the king.\textsuperscript{220} The term זֶרֶד is again used alongside kingdom language. Also in Ps.45, a song for a royal wedding, the term זֶרֶד is used alongside kingdom language.\textsuperscript{221} In Ps.104:1 a very important usage occurs: here זֶרֶד is used as attribute of God (see above) within a "description" of God which is characterised through the kingdom language. In Ps.145, a psalm of blessing uttered to the "God and King" (cf. v.1), זֶרֶד occurs in the context

\textsuperscript{218} The precise differences between the ways זֶרֶד is used in the OT and the Shirot, which are of importance of themselves, cannot be discussed here.

\textsuperscript{219} See above.

Ps.21:6: "His glory is great through your help; majesty and honour/glory you bestow on him."

It is interesting that according to v.6a the king has glory (קָבָלָה) which he received from God. The term קָבָלָה is obviously not only used vis-a-vis God. Both term זֶרֶד and קָבָלָה are used in the same way: both are given by God to the king.

\textsuperscript{220} Ps.45:4 "Gird your sword on your thigh, mighty one; your majesty (זֶרֶד) and your honour/glory (זֶרֶד)."
of the concept of the kingship of God as well. In Da 11:21 the term רָוֹד is used negatively: someone who does not have the רָוֹד is not the real king.

The worshippers in Qumran would have been aware of this meaning and understanding of the term רָוֹד as well.

1.4.1.5. Attribute of chosen ones

רוֹד is used with another very interesting and important meaning which is also related to the concept of the kingship of God (cf. 3.). 9 times רָוֹד is given as the quality of a human being, given by God. By giving רָוֹד, God authorised the person who receives it. A place or person where רָוֹד is has been chosen and authorised by God. Through the divine רָוֹד they received a certain measure of the divine character. One could say that the chosen ones have כָּבוֹד (because of the relationship of creator and creation) and רָוֹד (because of election).

Naturally this idea is used often with regard to the chosen king of Israel.

So, in 1 Chr 29:25 Solomon was authorised as king of Israel by God and has, therefore, the רָוֹד. In Ps 21:6a the king receives glory (כָּבוֹד) from God and, in 6b, רָוֹד. In Ps 45:4 the רָוֹד is used as a quality of the king. In the text of the enthronement of Jeshua (Zech 6:9-15) the enthronement is induced by God so that the king has the רָוֹד. Twice (Jer 22:18 and Da 11:21) the term is used negatively: a person who does not have the רָוֹד is not authorised to be the king of Israel. He does not have the רָוֹד. The situation in Num 27:20 is a little different: in this text God tells Moses "to give him [Joshua] some of

Examples in v.11a כָּבוֹד, in v.13a מַלְכָּת כָּל, מַלְכָּת מַלְכֶּה, in v.13b מַלְכָּת מַלְכֶּה.

your [Moses's] דָּוָד; Joshua becomes the authorised successor of Mose and receives the דָּוָד. In Hos.14:7 the author tells us (through the image of the "olive tree") that Israel will obtain the דָּוָד. The chosen Israel has דָּוָד. Finally, in Ps.111:3 the דָּוָד is the quality of the creation of God. Here, I think, the link between the terms דָּוָד and כָּכַבְרָד is obvious: the creation has כָּכַבְרָד because it is created by God. But only once in the OT is it said that the creation has also דָּוָד. The כָּכַבְרָד seems to be more closely related to this world (maybe even accessible for the humans), whereas one can talk about דָּוָד, but it is not really part of this world (the דָּוָד itself is inaccessible to men).

These senses of דָּוָד and כָּכַבְרָד were certainly known to the writers of Qumran. The question is, therefore, how they used them in their writings.

1.4.2. 1QH

According to K.G. Kuhn225 the term דָּוָד occurs only once in the Qumran texts which are taken into consideration in his Concordance: in 1QH 5,32.

Compared with the OT, this text very interesting. דָּוָד occurs here in a typical "Klagelied des Einzelnen". The psalmist is desperate. His friends have left him. So in 5,32b the psalmist says about himself: "And the light of my contenance was dimmed into darkness, and my דָּוָד was turned into gloom. Here the term is entirely different from its use in the OT: in the OT it never occurs in a "Klagelied des Einzelnen"; and in 1QH 5,32 it is neither attribute of God nor of the place where God exists, and it is certainly not used with temple or kingdom

224 Hos. 14:7: "His shoots shall spread out; his דָּוָד shall be like the olive tree, and his fragrance like that of Lebanon." Here occurs again the poetical figure of the trees, just as in 1QH 8 in connection with the כָּכַבְרָד.

225 K.G. Kuhn, Konkordanz, 55.
language. It is not used as attribute of a chosen king, leader, or people. In this text דָּרוֹר is simply a quality of the psalmist. As an attribute of a human being, it expresses well-being and even wealth of that person. 226

In 1QH דָּרוֹר has nothing to do any more with the kingdom or temple theme. It is very significant that דָּרוֹר which occurs in the Hebrew Bible so often almost disappears in 1QH. This fact becomes even more astonishing when we consider that דָּרוֹר occurs in the Hebrew Bible quite often in settings which are similar to the settings דָּרוֹר (כּוֹב) occurs in (for example in connection with the kingdom or the temple). But 1QH shows no interest in דָּרוֹר linked with the kingdom or the temple, but in דָּרוֹר (כּוֹב) which is occasionally used in connection with kingdom or temple in the Hebrew Bible too.

1.4.3. Shirot

Compared with its occurrence in 1QH, it is surprising that in the Shirot דָּרוֹר occurs in 17 lines. In comparison with the OT this is also a large number of instances. Why is the word דָּרוֹר so important in the Shirot?

The examination of the term in the Songs is challenging because first of all the textual situation of the fragments is very often difficult. Five lines where דָּרוֹר occurs are damaged to an extent which makes every comment on them impossible. 227 Secondly, while דָּרוֹר seems to be

---

226 It is very interesting that in the translations of 1QH different terms are used for the word. One can even see the irritation experienced by the scholars in trying to find a proper equivalent for it. M. Mansoor, Thanksgiving Hymns, 139 translates with "fresh colour", G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, 180 translates with "radiance". J. Maier, Qumran-Essener Bd I, 80 translates with "meines Angesichts Licht", and E. Lohse, Texte aus Qumran, 133 translates with "Wurde". However, it is obvious that דָּרוֹר can in this text not be translated with "majesty", because in the context it has to be a term which is linked with the human body and with light probably "radiance" or "des Angesichts Licht", but not "fresh colour" or Wurde

227 4Q401 37 3, 4Q405 24, 11QSS 5-6 2, 11QSS f 6, 11QSS j-d-g-p 9. Difficult also: 4Q403 1 i 45 (overlap 4Q405 6 6), 4Q404 5 3 (overlap 4Q403 1 i 45)
used within the categories we have discovered for its usage in the OT, at the same time its meaning has been changed. The context of its occurrence is different. And, thirdly, a new usage may be discerned in the Songs.

1.4.3.1. In conjunction with the kingdom (of God)

Four times the term דוד is used alongside the concept of the kingdom. In 4Q400 2 3 the holiest of the holy ones (קריש, 4Q400 2 1)

"[...] declare the majesty of His kingdom (מלכותו) according to their knowledge and exalt [His glory in all] the heavens of His realm."

דוד is clearly an attribute of the kingdom of God. In 4Q403 1 i 17 (overlap with 4Q405 3 ii 6 and 4Q405 3 ii 7) we have the combination of מלך and דוד:

"The fourth among the chief princes will bless in the name of the majesty of the King all who walk in uprightness with seven words of majesty; and he will bless those who establish majesty with seven wondrous words." 230

דוד occurs with kingdom language (מלך), and it is an attribute of God the King. The "majesty of the King", however, seems to have a strong authority. In 4Q403 1 i 32 דוד, נבון, and מלך occur:

C. Newsom translates here: "His royal splendor". It is certainly better to follow here also in the translation the terminology known from the OT, for that might reflect better the relationship between Hebrew Bible and the Shirah.

This line is also informative for the meaning of נבון in the Songs. The author says here that God's kingdom has heavens, and in these heavens is the נבון of God.

The textual situation of this line is ambiguous. Only the first occurrence of דוד is according to Newsom certain.
"(31) [...] O you chiefs of the praises of (32) all the godlike beings, praise the splendidly praiseworthy God (מלכותה בראשית). For in the splendor of praise is the glory of His realm (מלכותה). [...]"

So the term רוד occurs here again linked with the kingdom of God. In 4Q403 1 i 38 רוד occurs 3 times ((...). The translation is not certain. The second רוד is clearly an attribute of the elim (כלי אל הרוד למלכתו). The third רוד belongs to God the King (למלכתו). That means that the term רוד is twice in the Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice the attribute of God the King.

In other words: the term רוד in the Shirot is linked with the concept of the kingdom of God, connected with God as the King, and appears also as an attribute of the kingdom of God. What are the differences between this concept in the OT and the Shirot? The difference here is that the kingdom of the Shirot has lost its earthly royal character and has been transferred into a mystical heavenly and angelic world. However, the author of the Songs is still using kingdom language, in particular רוד, in conjunction with God. By using this language for the description of the place of the heavenly world and its events the author makes clear that the place he is talking about is the place where God is. He proposes a place where God is the King, where the godlike beings ("servants of God") are located. That place is disconnected from the earthly kingdom. The kingdom of Israel, which was mentioned so frequently in the OT in conjunction with the term רוד, does not occur anymore. In addition, this place is filled with heavenly beings and heavenly objects. These objects remind the reader immediately of

---

Translation of lines 31*-32 according to C. Newsom, Songs. 212. Concerning the translation I would suggest translating מלכותה rather as "kingdom" than as "realm". A better translation of אלוהים שבlongleftrightarrowו more might be "the godlike beings of the praiseworthiness of the majesty ".
the objects of the temple. The author uses that terminology quite often as well. Consequently, the heavenly world described in the Songs has this atmosphere of kingdom and temple.

דָּרוּרָא is only used in conjunction with God the King and His kingdom. It is part of the heavenly world. It is still inaccessible to the human worshippers, but it is not understood as isolated as in the OT: the heavenly world of the Songs is lively; many beings, buildings, and heavenly objects are there; in the OT the דָּרוּרָא is located in heaven which is a place where only God is; that place is filled only by the presence of God (it seems), and is normally inaccessible to men, and even indescribable.

כֵּоборот is used in exactly the same setting, but it gains, as we will see later, another quality.

כֵּоборот is the perceptible supernatural or even divine phenomenon. But in the Shirot it is part of this kingdom and temple-like heavenly world.

1.4.3.2. דָּרוּר as part of an action of heavenly beings

In the Shirot, דָּרוּר is very often connected with an action ("declaration" or "blessing") of heavenly beings. People are never mentioned in this connection with דָּרוּר. Thus דָּרוּר was still regarded as something inaccessible to human beings. Only the heavenly beings, especially beings of a higher position or dignity, seem to be able to deal with the דָּרוּר.

In particular 4Q400 2 3 represents this group perfectly well. There, the holiest of the holy ones (קרישר, 4Q400 2 1) declare "the majesty of His kingdom". Only beings who are very close to God declare His דָּרוּר; and even they don't seem to know it entirely (cf.: "according to their knowledge"). Also in 4Q403 1 i 32 the דָּרוּר is object of the praise of "the chiefs of the praises of all the godlike beings".
Now, two texts of the fragment 4Q403 1 i belong to this group as well, but they have another interesting element in addition. So in 4Q403 1 i 20 (overlap with 4Q405 3 ii 11\textsuperscript{232} and 4Q405 13 4\textsuperscript{233}) the text says that the chief prince "... will bless all who confess Him\textsuperscript{234} with seven words of majesty...". The new element is the phrase שבעה דברי רורד. This phrase shows that the "seven words of majesty" can be said by the worshippers confessing God. Therefore, these words seem to be accessible for beings other than the chief princes, but it doesn't seem to be the "ורד itself" which they posses. In 4Q403 1 i 17\textsuperscript{235} the phrase is used as well. Here the fourth among the chief princes blesses those who "walk in uprightness with seven words of majesty". Here again the persons who are blessed by the chief prince have the seven words of majesty.

In 4Q403 1 i 17\textsuperscript{236} occurs in addition to the phrase שבעה דברי רורד another element which is important for the understanding of רורד and also כברוד. In 4Q403 1 i 17 the fourth among the chief princes blesses

"in the name of the majesty of the King" (בשם רורד המלך).

This phrase is extremely important for the question of כברוד and the name of God. It is interesting that this phrase occurs only in the fragment 4Q403 1 i, because there the blessings and praises of one "chief prince" after the other is described. So the fourth (4Q403 1 i 17) and the fifth (4Q403 1 i 19) among the chief princes are blessing "in the name" of a majesty. The phrase, therefore, seems to be a common phrase to introduce the blessing of the heavenly

\textsuperscript{232} It is very interesting that the text of 4Q405 3 ii 11 (ורד לאלרי פַּלָּא חמש) overlaps with the end of line 20 and the beginning of line 21 of 4Q403 1 i 20. This shows that the textual situation is not certain.

\textsuperscript{233} 4Q405 13 4 reads בָּשֶׂעַ דְּבָרִי רוֹד כֶּבְּרָד חַמְשֵׂים. The textual situation, especially the relationship between 4Q405 13 4 and 4Q403 1 i 20-21, is difficult. C. Newsom, Songs, 189 indicates an overlap, but does not occur in 4Q403 1 i 20-21 (C. Newsom, Songs, 188).

\textsuperscript{234} C. Newsom, Songs, 194 adds without obvious reason רוֹד as object of the confession. It simply doesn't occur at that point in the manuscript.

\textsuperscript{235} Translation see above.

\textsuperscript{236} Translation see above.
beings. The phrase is an expression of authority: the name of the "majesty of the King" gives
the blessing of the chief princes the divine authority. In comparison with the OT, the word
combination הוהי המלך seems to have replaced הוהי המלך, and seems certainly to be
a substitute for the Tetragram. This again might be a hint that use of כבורי as substitute for
the Tetragram is unlikely.
In 4Q403 1 i 19 the situation is the same:
"the fifth among the chief princes will bless in the name of His marvellous
majesty (הוהי נ彖אותי) all..."[17].
Again one of the chief princes is blessing with the authority of God's הוהי: beings who are
close to God are "using" the הוהי. The receivers of the blessings, however, do not acquire the
והי.

2. כבורי as attribute of qualities of God or elements which are closely related to God

כבורי is here in Part 2 of the text (in contrast to Part 1) rarely used as an attribute of elements
which are closely related to God: only in 4Q403 1 i 8[18] and 4Q403 1 i 13 // 4Q405 3 ii 3[19].

Not very often is כבורי used as an attribute of qualities of God: see 4Q403 1 i 18[20].

These occurrences demonstrate again that כבורי was not understood as a substitute for God,
but as a term which denotes a quality or part of the nature of God.

[17] Transcription and translation according to C. Newsom, Song, 194.
[18]播报ת כבורי
[19]播报ת דבריך כבורי נ彖אותה
[20]ליהבם כבורי
3. כנור as attribute of elements of the heavenly world

I mentioned above that כנור is used differently in the several parts of the Shirot, reflecting exactly the structure of the Shirot which was developed and uncovered by C. Newsom. The fact that in Part 2 of the Shirot כנור is not used as attribute of elements of the heavenly world suggests again that כנור was used differently in the different parts of the Shirot.

4. כנור as object of praise or thanksgiving

4.1. Occurrence

Most important and most frequent in Part 2 of the Shirot is a new usage of כנור as object of praise or thanksgiving (4Q400 2 1, 4Q400 2 3, 4Q400 2 5, 4Q400 3 ii 8/9; 4Q401 14 i 7; MasShirShabb i 10, MasShirShabb ii 12, MasShirShabb ii 13, MasShirShabb ii 20, 4Q403 1 i 3, 4Q403 1 i 4, 4Q403 1 i 8, 4Q403 1 i 25, 4Q403 1 i 31, 4Q403 1 i 33 // 4Q404 4-5 1 (דומם); 4Q403 1 i 36 // 4Q405 4-5 4, 4Q403 1 i 38). This is often combined with כנור as an attribute of God. The object of praise or thanksgiving is, therefore, always God's כנור, indicated by using the 3.sg.m. suffix ( 4Q400 2 1, 4Q400 2 3, 4Q400 2 5, 4Q400 3 ii 8/9; 4Q401 14 i 7, MasShirShabb i 10 (דומם), MasShirShabb ii 12, MasShirShabb ii 13, MasShirShabb ii 20, 4Q403 1 i 3, 4Q403 1 i 4, 4Q403 1 i 8, 4Q403 1 i 25, MasShirShabb ii 24 // 4Q403 1 i 10, 4Q403 1 i 28/29, 4Q403 1 i 13 // 4Q405 3 ii 3; 4Q403 1 i 31, 4Q403 1 i 33 // 4Q405 4-5 1, 4Q403 1 i 36 // 4Q405 4-5 4, 4Q403 1 i 38).

see above pp. 49f.

So for example in Song 6, in all the lines where כנור occurs (except 4Q403 1 i 13 // 4Q405 3 ii 3) כנור is used as attribute of God, but at the same time as object of praise or thanksgiving (MasShirShabb i 10, MasShirShabb ii 12, MasShirShabb ii 13, MasShirShabb ii 20, 4Q403 1 i 3, 4Q403 1 i 4, 4Q403 1 i 8, 4Q403 1 i 25).

We have already see above (see pp. 73ff.), that in this text the understanding of כנור is most suggestive. It shows that כנור was understood as something which could also be returned by the worshippers to God.
This sense of the כבוד of God as an object of praise is possibly the most challenging aspect of understanding כבוד in the Shirot. It is surprising that the praise as "topic" of the Songs, described as extensive and absolute, is uttered to the כבוד of God, and not simply to God, as one would expect. Should כבוד be here understood as a substitute for God Himself? כבוד (of God) as object of praise has, especially for the earthly worshippers following the celebration of the Shirot, enormous weight at this point. Perhaps it is the intention of the author that כבוד be understood as something more than an attribute of God. Indeed, here again כבוד seems to be understood as an important divine phenomenon, demanding its own weight in the heavenly world, but still linked with God. Maybe a tendency to understand כבוד completely "independent" of God might come to light here, but כבוד is still grammatically linked with God.

4.2. Exceptions

There are only two exceptions in this part of the text where כבוד is used as an attribute of God, but not as object of praise or thanksgiving (Song 6: MasShirShabb ii 24 // 4Q403 1 i 10; 4Q403 1 i 28/29; 4Q403 1 i 13 // 4Q405 3 ii 3). Two lines need to be examined in detail.

a) In 4Q403 1 i 13 // 4Q405 3 ii 3 another sense of כבוד in the context of praise comes to light:

כבוד דרור על כל מלך מלכים מתבשש ברבר ברויה [ברויה] מלואות 244

כבוד is an attribute of the "seven wondrous words" which enable the worshipper to praise God the King. כבוד is here not primarily an attribute of God, but it is offered by the

244 "will bless all who exalt the King with seven words of His marvellous glory...".
worshippers towards God the King. That means that כבך is not only part of the nature of God, but it can also be returned to God by the worshippers through worship. And as such it is understood neither as an attribute of God nor as substitute for God. כבך is at this point an "independent" element which is part of the praise and which might be uttered to God, because it is due to Him.245

b) Also 4Q403 1 i 32 is an exception. In the line כבך is again linked with praise, and in this line the author of the Songs states, for the first time, something about the quality of the כבך:246

(...)(...)247

This is the first time that the author of the Songs says something about the כבך itself. The כבך is the glory of God's realm, hence, the כבך of God, because everything which was made by God in that heavenly world has God's glory (at least to a certain extent)248. The line is again part of a "call to praise"249.

In this call to praise the author wants to emphasise that the more the worshippers praise God (in the heavenly world, or on earth, by singing the songs in unison with the angels), the closer they are to God, because they come nearer to the heavenly world or become even a part of that place.250 Here again the author tries to give the earthly worshippers singing the Songs the idea, that singing the praise described in the Songs lets them participate in the events of that

245 It is interesting that in Isa 43:7 the BSL changed the usage of כבך which occurs in the BHS exactly as the Shirat do in respect of כבך here (see pp. 54f.).
246 To call the content of the line a statement about the quality of the כבך is also justified by the grammatical construction of the sentence: the author is using a nominal clause which is usually used to describe a situation/status (cf. E. Kautsch/ A.E. Cowley, Hebrew Grammar, 450f.).
247 "For in the splendour of praise is the glory of His realm"

248 C. Newsom states that the כבך clauses in the Psalms "recite the mighty acts of God in creation and/or in the salvation of Isreal" (C. Newsom, Songs, 215). So the description in this line depends again on the relationship of creator and the creation. The latter has qualities of the former to some extent.
249 C. Newsom, Songs, 215.

If the splendor of praise is the glory of the realm, the praise brings those who are uttering to the glory, and therefore to His realm, closer to God.
heavenly world and therefore enables them to be closer to God. כבד, however, is understood as an attribute of the kingdom of God, as an element of the heavenly world. כבד is owned by humans to a certain extent, and כבד brings the earthly worshippers closer to God.

5. Additional usages of כבד

5.1. כבד and creation

In 4Q402 4 15 // MasShirShabb i 6 the author is talking about "His [God's] glorious work" (ממשה כבד). Again כבד is closely related to God. The creation has the כבד of its creator. The quality of the creator is transferred into the creation. Many of the usages of כבד in this scroll can be explained this way: in fact, every time כבד is an attribute of something which is made by God or which belongs to God,²⁵¹ such is the case.

5.2. כבד and the angels

כבד (or derivatives) is also used within the angelology of the Shirot. While this topic is far too complex to be discussed in detail at this point, it has nevertheless to be stated that כבד is not only used as an attribute of elements of the heavenly world, but also occasionally as an attribute of angels. In 4Q400 3 ii 8/9, for example,²⁵² the form חככברון stands for the "angels" who are glorious. This usage of the term כבד shows that the author employed the word for different purposes. One can say that in the Songs different parties have different

²⁵¹ Linguistically the concept of the relationship of the creator and the creation is indicated also by the term משמש. Because, despite of the fact that משמש is "the third most common verb in the OT" (E. Jenni/ C. Westermann, Theological Lexicon, 944), it especially "describes Yahweh's creative activity in all its dimensions" (E. Jenni/ C. Westermann, Theological Lexicon, 949; cf. also W. Gesenius, Handwörterbuch, 622).
quantities of כבורה: God has it as part of His nature; the angels have it as well, but depending on God it is His כבורה which fills them; and the worshippers have כבורה insofar as they are created by God and they can return it to God.

6. Summary

As our investigation so far has shown, the author of the Shirot uses כבורה in the different parts of the Shirot in different ways. In Part 2 of the Shirot the sense of כבורה lies emphatically on its relationship to God. The characteristics of כבורה are as follows:

(i) The grammatical use of כבורה especially indicates that it is very often an attribute of God. It is closely related to God, but not identical with Him. כבורה has certainly a "divine" quality or nature.

(ii) In connection with שם, כבורה is used in the Shirot as in the Hebrew Psalms: as an attribute of God and the object of human praise. כבורה is not used as a substitute for the divine name. In connection with the phrase שם כבורה the כבורה is a divine phenomenon. As such it claims an independent function in the heavenly world. But it is still linked with God.

(iii) In connection with the kingship of God, כבורה is not used as substitute for God Himself or His name. As something linked with God the King, כבורה begins to have an independent function in the heavenly world, rather than being a entirely "independent" phenomenon. Only as far as it gains this function in the heavenly world, we might sense a tendency to weaken its link with God. This tendency is certainly not carried through to the point where כבורה becomes anything like an independent entity.
(iv) The usage of נְבָרָד in BHS, Versions, and the Shirot demonstrates that נְבָרָד is very much part of the heavenly world as a divine phenomenon accessible for heavenly beings and earthly worshippers. Again, we found it unlikely that נְבָרָד was used as substitute of the divine name.

(v) In Part 2 of the Shirot נְבָרָד is rarely used as an attribute of heavenly elements like the heavenly sanctuary or furnishings. Its conjunction with God is more to the fore here.

(vi) As a divine phenomenon, נְבָרָד is often used as an object of praise. This demonstrates that while נְבָרָד is still linked with God, נְבָרָד demands its own weight in the heavenly world. נְבָרָד is thus used as something which can be uttered towards God.

(vii) Within the concept of creation נְבָרָד is described as coming from God, but also being an attribute of the creation. God has it in full: the angels to a massive degree; and the earthly worshippers to a smaller extent.

(viii) נְבָרָד is never used as substitute for the divine name.\(^{251}\)

IV. נְבָרָד in the Songs 7b-12 (Part 3)

How is נְבָרָד to be understood in the third part of the text of the Songs? Here as well, many aspects of the meaning of נְבָרָד which we have discovered already in Part 1 and 2, occur as well. But the emphasis on נְבָרָד lies here at another point, and the author adds also new layers of meaning.

\(^{251}\) In the Shirot, נְבָרָד does not really have a function within a systematic theology. It is rather used “in love to God” and as encouragement for others (the people of Qumran) to join this “love”. The function is, therefore, rather pedagogical than intellectual, logical or systematical. It doesn’t seem to be the intention of the author of the scroll to describe or define the term itself, but to explain to worshippers the need, aim and function of praise of God on the Sabbath days. The term נְבָרָד with its particular history is a very convenient one to use for such a purpose.
1. כבור related to God

1.1. כבור as attribute of God

As in Part 1 and 2 כבור keeps its most important sense as a supernatural element connected with God, as a divine phenomenon. In consequence, כבור is used in this part of the Songs very frequently as part of the nature of God (for example: 4Q403 1 ii 25; 4Q405 13 2 par; 4Q405 23 i 3 (indirect attribute); 4Q405 23 i 7; 11QHirShabb 5-6 6; and several times in 4Q405 ii).

כבור is certainly not used as a substitute for God or His name.

1.2. כבור and the kingship of God

1.2.1. מלך כבורה

For the usage of מלך הכבורה in the word combination כבורה in 4Q403 1 ii 25; 11QHirShabb 5-6 6 (מלך הכבורה) see above. In 4Q405 23 i 9 כבורה is used in almost the same word combination (מלך הכבורה). Here as well כבורה is not a substitute for God or His name, and כבורה demands as a divine phenomenon its own weight in the heavenly world. We may also sense here a tendency to weaken the formal link with God.

1.2.2. מלך כבורה

In 4Q403 1 ii 10; 4Q403 1 ii 10 כבורה is actually used in a construct combination with (מלך מלכות כבורה). In 4Q405 23 i 3 כבורה is again used in connection with "the

---

See p. 50.

A.M. Schwemer, Gott als König, 111 calls this even "den zusammenfassenden Höhepunkt der Gottesprädikationen".
kingdom". Here God's "glorious royal thrones" (canf אֲרוֹןָה יֵבָאוּן) are mentioned. 256

For the description of meaning and function of כַּבֹּד in this connection see above. 257

2. כַּבֹּד as attribute of qualities of God and exclusively heavenly elements

As an attribute of one of God's qualities כַּבֹּד occurs in 4Q405 23 i 12 (can כַּבֹּד).

Another aspect of the meaning of כַּבֹּד occurs in this part of the Song which we discovered only in Part 1, and not in Part 2. כַּבֹּד is used as an attribute of elements which are directly connected with God and the heavenly world, and as an attribute of exclusively heavenly elements (for example: 4Q403 1 i 45 par; 4Q405 14-15 i 1 (רוה); 258 4Q405 14-15 iv 5; 4Q405 14-15 i 6 (דָּבְרֵין); 4Q405 20 ii - 21 - 22 2 (רוה); 259 3 (מַשְׁבִּית); 4Q405 (רוה כַּבֹּד); 4Q405 23 ii 9 (רוה כַּבֹּד)). This use of כַּבֹּד as something purely heavenly is a fundamental aspect of the term in the Songs, and it shows clearly that כַּבֹּד was understood also as a phenomenon with its own functions and as an attribute of heavenly elements which have כַּבֹּד by virtue of their creation. In this usage כַּבֹּד claims its own and

256 This word combination certainly refers to God as the King and the temple where God as King dwells. The author of the Songs obviously developed the OT word combination כַּבֹּד כַּבֹּד (Jer. 14:21) and כַּבֹּד כַּבֹּד (Jer. 17:12), referring to Jerusalem and the Temple, by combining it with the word combination כַּבֹּד כַּבֹּד (cf. 1 Chr. 22:10; 28:5; 2 Chr. 7:18; Est. 1:2; 5:1) and כַּבֹּד כַּבֹּד (Dtn. 17:18; 2 Sam. 7:13; 1 K. 9:5; Hag. 2:22). This reflects perfectly well the way the author of the Songs is interpreting ideas of the OT: he develops figures which occur in the OT only a very few times. כַּבֹּד, however, is certainly understood as something connected with the kingdom of God and the temple.

257 Cf. pp. 72ff. and 97ff.

258 Text is damaged. Context is missing.

259 The כַּבֹּד or כַּבֹּד occur in the Shir'ot 12 times. They are understood basically as a heavenly, not material place which is not really a room or building, but similar to a temple of the presence of God. כַּבֹּד is full of the כַּבֹּד of God. The connection with כַּבֹּד demonstrates that כַּבֹּד is as well part of the heavenly and templelike world where the כַּבֹּד are.
important function in the heavenly world. Even a tendency weakening the link between חָבֹר and God may be detected here.

3. חָבֹר as used independently of God

חָבֹר as an phenomenon with its own and important function in the heavenly world comes also into focus in lines where חָבֹר is used grammatically independently of God (4Q403 1 i 45 // 4Q404 5 4 // 4Q405 6 6; 4Q405 in connection with אָרְרֵם אָרְרֵם 360; 4Q405 14-15 i 6 in connection with the רְבִּירִים; 4Q405 15 ii - 16 4/5; 4Q405 18 4; 4Q405 19ABCD 2 // 11QShirShabb j-d-g-p 2 (חָבֹר; חָבֹר) (חָבֹר; חָבֹר). The frequency of this in the Songs indicates its importance. חָבֹר is not used here in a secular sense, because it is still part of the heavenly world and the sphere of God. But especially this usage shows a which demands its own weight and importance in the heavenly world. Here we can sense a tendency to weaken the link between God and חָבֹר. But still, חָבֹר is part of the heavenly world, hence not "independent" of God in full.

4. חָבֹר as attribute of heavenly elements which are linguistically linked with the earthly world

This is an entirely new aspect of the of חָבֹר in the Shirot. The author develops חָבֹר as an attribute of elements of the heavenly world in a very distinct way. He mainly describes the heavenly world, where praise takes place. Interestingly and distinctively, חָבֹר appears grammatically in connection with terms which denote phenomena actually existing on the

360 For details about אָרְרֵם and אָרְרֵם see pp. 103f.
earth as well. Therefore, the author gives the term a close connection to the earth by using it as an attribute of "earthly elements". The intention of the author at this point might be to help the earthly worshippers to understand the meaning of כְּבוֹד, and to encourage them to join the praise in the heavenly world.

But the really new aspect of the sense of כְּבוֹד used this way is that it receives the quality of perceptibility. Although כְּבוֹד is still understood as a phenomenon connected with the heavenly world and God himself, it is now understood also as something which can be experienced (4Q403 1 ii 3 ([...]), מָרָא הַכְּבוֹד כְּבוֹד לְאָדָם מַלְכַּת רְחוּבָּה; 4Q403 1 ii 10 (כְּבוֹד בָּדַע), מָכַלְּק (כְּבוֹד), 4Q405 18 4 (כְּבוֹד בָּדַע), 4Q405 19ABCD 2 // 11QShirShabb j-d-g-p 2 (כְּבוֹד), 4Q405 19ABCD 6 (כְּבוֹד); 4Q405 23 i 8 (כְּבוֹד). And keeping in mind its basic significance as part of the nature of God, this nature becomes partially perceptible. Furthermore, it is very interesting that the author of the Shirot uses כְּבוֹד in this sense when it is grammatically not the attribute of God. Hence, this usage indicates as well a tendency to weaken the link between כְּבוֹד and God.

It is necessary to discuss a few lines where כְּבוֹד occurs in the above sense in more detail:

---

See for the discussion of this text pp. 72ff.

Commenting on 4Q403 1 ii 3 C. Newsom, Songs, 233 points out that it is the attendant spirits "who constitute the visible appearance of the Glory" (ibid.). The conjunction of כְּבוֹד and לְאָדָם might (although itself is a very ambivalent term) be a point where the visibility of כְּבוֹד is constituted. But there the two terms are not even grammatically linked. 4Q405 14-15 i 1 where the terms occur grammatically linked, is damaged; and in 4Q405 14-15 i 5 (כְּבוֹד מַלְכַּת (...)) כְּבוֹד is again not connected grammatically with לְאָדָם. Only in 4Q405 23 ii 9 one can state that כְּבוֹד is used a connection with לְאָדָם which indicates its visibility. Hence the connection of כְּבוֹד with לְאָדָם is not a very strong argument for postulating an understanding of כְּבוֹד as a perceptible phenomenon.

The term מַלְכַּת denotes as well something which exists on earth though it has certainly, according to the OT tradition, a religious meaning. For further occurrences of this word combination see pp. 73ff., 99.

כְּבוֹד in conjunction with the kingdom of God is an exception, because of the religious relevance of the concept.
4.1.", "other_language":null,

In 4Q403 1 i 45 // 4Q404 5 4 // 4Q405 6 6 aebra is used in conjunction with aebra:

This line and the preceding one make up praise to God. aebra and aebra are used there to describe the wonderful place of the heavenly world where this praise takes place. This is one of the rare occasions where the author indirectly states something about the quality of the aebra itself: the aebra is "light". aebra is used here as medium of praise. One can easily see at this point, how the author of the Songs uses terms denoting earthly phenomena to describe aebra.

This connection between aebra and aebra occurs also in 4Q405 14-15 i 5:

Here as well the word combination of aebra and aebra is used within a description of the heavenly world, i.e. the "vestibules where the king enters".

This use of aebra with aebra shows that it was understood in much the same way as aebra. Indeed, a striking feature of aebra in the Songs is that its quality is linked with "light". By

264 The term aebra means in the Qumran literature "light" (S. Aalen, ידוע, 166). The phenomenon of "light" has in the theology of Qumran quite a significant function: it is important for the "concepts of salvation (as glorification) in the eternal light of the hereafter (IQS 4:7f) and of eternal destruction (IQS 2:8; 4:13)” (S. Aalen, מṁ, 167). Furthermore, aebra is often used in connection with a "ethical dualism of light and darkness" (ibid.). Especially the Scroll of the war 1QM (1QM 1:1-17; 13:2-16) describes the sons of the spirits of light and the sons of the spirit of darkness. This concept has been discussed in the modern literature (cf. J. VanderKam, Qumranforschung, 86-88; E.P. Sanders, Judaism, 249f.; Y. Yadin, Scroll of the war, esp. 242 (with literature)).

S. Aalen, ידוע, 167 mentions also that especially in IQH aebra is described as something which comes from God and leads to salvation (IQH 7:25; 9:26f; 18:1-6). Interesting is the statement of S. Aalen, ידוע, 167 that the "enlightenment" of man "does not mean a substantial change in man" (ibid.). We have see above that the election changes the status of man and is the condition to "experience" aebra. Maybe the election is also the condition of the "enlightenment". In this case the "enlightenment" itself would not change man indeed.

265 According to C. Newsom (Songs, 224) aebra has to be taken "with the preceding phrase rather than with aebra" (ibid.), and aebra has to be read as aebra. For comments and arguments see C. Newsom, Songs, 224.
using these two words so closely together the author implies that שֶׁבֶרֶד is visible in the heavenly world, and he suggests that the earthly worshippers understand שֶׁבֶרֶד as a "visible phenomenon". 266

4.2. 4Q405 18 4
Another text where שֶׁבֶרֶד is used in conjunction with something earthly, and where the author implies that שֶׁבֶרֶד is a element which can be experienced, is 4Q405 18 4. There the author points out that the debirim "make haste at the sound of the glory (מִקְרָא הַשְּבָרֶד)". This text indicates that שֶׁבֶרֶד could be sometimes made to refer to something which can be experienced by the heavenly beings in the heavenly world. Hence, this usage implies that it is audible also for humans on earth when they join the worship. 267

4.3. 4Q405 19ABCD 2 // 11QShirShab j-d-g-p 2
In 4Q405 19ABCD 2 // 11QShirShab j-d-g-p 2 שֶׁבֶרֶד is used again in conjunction with a term denoting in the first place an earthly element: שֶׁבֶרֶד. This line again implies that the שֶׁבֶרֶד is visible.

In 4Q405 19ABCD 6 שֶׁבֶרֶד is used in exactly the same way. At this place it is grammatically connected with שֶׁבֶרֶד. 268

---

266 Here as well he uses שֶׁבֶרֶד only in this sense when שֶׁבֶרֶד is not an attribute of God.

267 According to C. Newsom, Songs, 292 the usage of שֶׁבֶרֶד with article in this line, might be the "earliest attested of the 'substitutes' for the divine name" (cf. also J. Strugnell, Angelic Liturgy, 338 who refers to 4Q405 20ii-21-22 7). But the article alone cannot be the reason to assume a substitute for the divine name. שֶׁבֶרֶד occurs also in (always in connection with אֶלֶּחָד): MasShirShab ii 12 (p.6); 4Q403 1 i 31; 4Q403 1 ii 25(p.11); 11QShirShab 5-6 6. And even there שֶׁבֶרֶד is not used as substitute for the divine name (cf. pp. 73ff., 99).

268 שֶׁבֶרֶד is also used in Ez. 43:11 referring to the temple.
4.4. 4Q405 20 ii-21-22 6-14

In 4Q405 20 ii-21-22 6-14 עבור occurs 5 times in the context of praise and as an attribute of elements of the heavenly world, which do also exist on the earth, so that עבור is used again as if it were visible: l. 7: מושב עבור במשכן אלוהים רעיה; l. 10: עבור מדכון, l. 11a: ברקשת עבור, l. 11b: עבור מדכון.

5. עבור as object of praise

הדבר is here understood as an object of praise (for example: 4Q403 1 ii 25, 11QShirShabb q 4, 4Q405 20 ii21-22 7 (object of joy)). But this usage is not very frequent in this part of the text. The author of the Songs changed this usage to some extent. According to the intention of the text of Part 3 עבור occurs now quite often in the context of praise and blessing rather than directly as the object of such an action (for example: 4Q405 1 i 45 par; 4Q405 20 ii-21-22 3/6-14).

The reading of עבור follows the suggestion of C. Newsom, Songs, 303f. The word preceding עבור is very difficult (cf. C. Newsom, Songs, 304f.), but not decisive for the question above. The important question about עבור in this line concerns its connection with something which also exists on earth, rather than whether what thing is at this point an "angelic epithet" (C. Newsom, Songs, 312).

Cf. Ez. 10:6, where עבור is used to describe the happening in the temple while God is present there. The usage of עבור in connection with עבור at this point demonstrates the ambivalent understanding of the word עבור: the author of the Songs uses this word combination implying that עבור can be experienced; on the other hand, the term has already a divine connotation because of its use in the Hebrew Bible (i.e. in Ez. 10:6 in conjunction with the temple and God). Furthermore, it is very interesting that, in contrast to Ez. 1:4,27f. where the "fiery substance" is identified with עבור (c. Newsom, Songs, 315), "in the Shirat the feriness of the Glory is interpreted as the appearance of fiery angelic spirits" (ibid.). This is a very important difference in understanding of עבור between OT and the Shirat.

Also C. Newsom, Songs, 316 mentions that this line is part of the description of the "visible glory" (ibid.). According to C. Rowland, Visions, 143, n.14 these "color terms" (בלעזרה וברקשת) "are images of the rainbow image which further describes the גלעד (the radiance of the Glory) in Ez.1:28 (...)" (C. Newsom, Songs, 316f). This parallelism with the image of the rainbow shows clearly that עבור was understood in the Songs as a visible phenomenon.

לשם as object of preference indicated grammatically by the preposition ל.
6. Summary

It is evident that כבורה in this part of the Shirot differs at times from its uses in Part 1 and 2, although many of the senses of the word which we have discovered in Part 1 and 2 still occur. כבורה in Part 3 presents itself as follows:

(i) כבורה is used as an attribute of God and as part of His nature. כבורה is a "divine phenomenon".

(ii) In connection with the kingship of God כבורה claims as "divine phenomenon" its own function in the heavenly world. Hence, it is still linked with God.

(iii) In contrast to Part 2 of the Shirot, כבורה occurs in Part 3 as an attribute of heavenly elements. Here כבורה claims even more an independent function, and even a tendency to weaken the link between כבורה and God may be sensed.

(iv) כבורה is in this part of the Shirot also used grammatically independently of God. Here the tendency of understanding כבורה as not only an independent phenomenon of the heavenly world, but also as independent of God becomes obvious. This understanding is still only a tendency, because כבורה is still part of the heavenly word which was created by God and is His sphere.

(v) כבורה changes entirely in Part 3 of the Shirot, when it is used grammatically independently of God and comes to be understood as a perceptible phenomenon. Used in this way, it claims even more its own importance and weight. Its link to God exists only through its remaining a part of the sphere of God in the heavenly world.
(vi) Striking is the fact that בָּהֲרוֹד in Part 3 of the Shirot is no longer used to refer to an object of praise. This as well indicates its "independent" nature, because when used as object of praise it was always an attribute of God.

(vii) Throughout this part of the Shirot בָּהֲרוֹד is, furthermore, not used as substitute for God or His name.

V. בָּהֲרוֹד in Song 13 (Part 4)

Song 13 has to be considered separately because the author gives in this part a summary: first a description of the angelic highpriests, and then a systematic list of the contents and structure of the heavenly temple. He concludes with a statement of the importance of their praise.

1. בָּהֲרוֹד related to God

1.1. בָּהֲרוֹד as attribute of God

Also in this part of the text of the Songs בָּהֲרוֹד is used often (4 times) as an attribute of God:

4Q405 23 ii 3/12; 11QShirShabb 2-1-9 1/6.

Once 4Q405 23 ii 13 it is used to qualify as an attribute of God (בָּהֲרוֹד).

In 11QShirShabb 2-1-9 3 בָּהֲרוֹד is used along with the idea of the relationship of creator and creation. Unfortunately the text is damaged.273 But one can state that the deeds or works of God (בָּהֲרוֹד מְצַמֵּר)274 have glory.

271 (בָּהֲרוֹד מְצַמֵּר רְבֵא[רו]) (...)

274 Again the root מְצַמֵּר is used in this context which suggests that the author of the Songs is using the concept of creation of the OT for his purposes (cf. p. 96[23]).
1.2. מֵלֶכֶת מֶלֶךָ and מֶלֶכֶת כְּבָרוֹד

מֵלֶכֶת מֶלֶךָ occurs in this Song quite often in connection with מֶלֶכֶת כְּבָרוֹד. In 4Q405 23 ii 11/12 it occurs in the word combination מֵלֶכֶת כְּבָרוֹד מֶלֶכֶת. In 11QShirShabb 2-1-9 4/5 the word combination מֶלֶכֶת כְּבָרוֹד is present again. And in 11QShirShabb 2-1-9 6 כְּבָרוֹד the "throne of the glory" of God (קִמָּאָה כְּבָרוֹד) is mentioned.

For the impact of this usage on the meaning of כְּבָרוֹד see above. 275

2. כְּבָרוֹד as attribute of the palace or temple

In 11QShirShabb 2-1-9 7 כְּבָרוֹד is used as a attribute of the palace (דהָכָל כְּבָרוֹד) which is located in the heavenly world. The use of כְּבָרוֹד in this particular way must have given the people singing this text the impression that כְּבָרוֹד is the dominating term of the word combination. So even here, כְּבָרוֹד has its own and independent function in the heavenly world.

3. כְּבָרוֹד used independently of God

It is interesting that כְּבָרוֹד is not used in this Song independently of God.

4. כְּבָרוֹד as attribute of heavenly elements which are linked with the earthly world

Also in the last Song כְּבָרוֹד is used in a way which implies that it was understood as a perceptible phenomenon. In 4Q405 23 ii 8 the author talks about the "the glorious appearance of scarlet" (כְּבָרוֹד מַרְאֵי שְׁכִּין).

275 See pp. 97f.
5. כבורה as object of praise

כבורה is also in this Song linked with praise and blessing. So "His glorious work" blesses God in 4Q405 23 ii 12. In 11QShirShabb 2-1-9 7 the fact that in the heavenly world exist glorious palaces of God (דחקל כבורה) is reason to praise God.

6. Summary

Song 13 concludes the Shirot. The importance of praise is mentioned. כבורה occurs quite often. Most important in this Song is its exclusive use as an attribute of God. On the one occasion where it is used in conjunction with a heavenly object, it is not used independently of God. And as we have seen above, כבורה is never at any point used independently of God.

VI. Conclusion

In this investigation into the meaning and usage of כבורה in the Shirot we have determined the sense of כבורה in each part of the Shirot. The final step of this study is a attempt to characterise the sense of כבורה with regard to the entire text of the Shirot.

As we have seen investigating the sense of כבורה in the Shirot, the usage of the term changes noticeably between the 4 Parts of the text. In order to characterise the sense of כבורה in the entire text I will first outline the most decisive usages of כבורה before drawing a final conclusion.

(i) On many occasions, especially in respect of the terms כבורה occurs with, כבורה is described as a phenomenon of a heavenly world. כבורה belongs to a world which in the Shirot

276 The thanksgiving is introduced in I. 5.
is described like a temple or a palace. cervor is part of this holy place. Any other aspect of
understanding of cervor depends entirely on this description.

(ii) cervor is very often used as an attribute of God. It is not identical with God. cervor has a
"divine" quality or nature.

(iii) cervor is not used as substitute for God or the divine name. It claims its own importance
and function, possibly by loosening its direct grammatical link with God; but it is not used as
an expression which does duty for God.

(iv) cervor is linked with the concept of creation. Here in the first place it is used as an at-
tribute of God the creator. But the creation has also some of this cervor, because it was
created by God. Hence cervor becomes, to a certain extent, also an attribute of the heavenly
beings and the earthly worshippers who join their praise.

(v) On several occasions, especially in Part 2 of the Shirat, we have seen that cervor claims as
divine phenomenon an independent function in the heavenly world. As such it is still linked
with God.

(vi) As a divine element cervor is often used as object of praise. Here as well it demands its
own weight and importance in the heavenly world, but keeps its link with God.

(vii) On other occasions, quite frequently in Part 3 of the Shirat, cervor not only claims its
own function in the heavenly world, but even displays a tendency to become a heavenly phe-
nomenon which has its own weight and which is "independent" of God. But this understand-
ing is even then not fully developed, for cervor remains still linked with God as part of the
heavenly world which He created. But this link is now a weak one.
(viii) כבורה is, especially in Part 3 of the Shirot, understood as a *perceptible phenomenon*, accessible for heavenly beings and earthly worshippers joining the praise.

(ix) כבורה is of concern for the earthly worshippers. כבורה brings them closer to the world which is described in the Songs, and therefore closer to God.

These characteristics of כבורה demonstrate quite well how כבורה is understood in the Shirot. כבורה is an important phenomenon of the heavenly world which is described in the Shirot. It is very much understood as an divine phenomenon, linked with God, but not identical with Him. כבורה does not loose this link. As such it claims to be an important phenomenon of the heavenly world with its own function. But we can also see a strong tendency to give כבורה even more importance and to weaken its link to God. This, however, was not carried through to the point where כבורה acquires a quality of selfdetermination. Although כבורה is several times used independently of God, it is not understood in a secular sense as often in the OT, for it is always part of the heavenly word which was created by God and which is the sphere of God. This is the means by which כבורה as a perceptible phenomenon can bring the earthly worshipper closer to God: it is perceptible and divine.

Hence כבורה as a divine phenomenon is not entirely defined through its grammatical direct dependence on God, but is always linked with Him; כבורה is an important phenomenon of the heavenly world, and has its own particular function there.
Part V: Comparison

A. Comparison of the understanding of "כָּבְרָד in 1QH and the Shirot

Comparing the understanding of "כָּבְרָד in 1QH and the Shirot, one is amazed that the word is used and understood so differently in the two writings found at Qumran. Therefore I will try to outline the most important differences in their understanding of "כָּבְרָד in 8 points:

(i) The key to the understanding of "כָּבְרָד in both writings is its relationship to God. In 1QH כָּבְרָד is always and very firmly linked with God: it is the place of God. כָּבְרָד has a secondary function alongside God. In the Shirot, כָּבְרָד is used on many occasions as a divine phenomenon which claims to have its own and important function in the heavenly world. As such it is often used (grammatically) independently from God. כָּבְרָד begins to be something which is (almost) independent of God. The function of כָּבְרָד is not any longer secondary alongside God. But this independence has not been worked out in full. כָּבְרָד as part of the heavenly world which was created by God and which is His sphere, is still linked with God. Therefore we can still call it a divine phenomenon. But this link became weaker. כָּבְרָד as phenomenon is far more important for the "theology" of the Shirot than it is in 1QH. Many of the following differences confirm this observation.

(ii) In 1QH כָּבְרָד occurs in a text containing Hymns uttered directly to God. The כָּבְרָד of God Himself and the כָּבְרָד of God in His creation is understood as reason for the praise of the psalmist. In the Shirot the כָּבְרָד (of God) is very often understood as the object of the praise of the heavenly beings, and stands therefore more "independently" from God than in 1QH.
(iii) The connection of כבוד and the concept of election is understood differently in the two writings. In 1QH, election is the condition for experiencing כבוד. In the Shirot, the concept is not important for the heavenly beings, for they are part of the sphere of God. Earthly worshippers, however, have to be purified to join the heavenly praise. This last is not the same as election: in case of election, God's initiative gives humans the opportunity to experience כבוד, whereas in case of the Shirot this dependence on election is not expressed.

(iv) In both writings כבוד is linked with ארון. But in 1QH the connection indicates that כבוד was understood as a phenomenon of light, only to be experienced through interior understanding, whereas in the Shirot this connection leads to the understanding of כבוד as a visible phenomenon. Furthermore, כבוד is used with light in 1QH always as an attribute of God; in the Shirot, it is used independently of God. This confirms observation (i).

(v) In 1QH כבוד can only be experienced through interior understanding or belief. In the Shirot on many occasions כבוד is understood as a phenomenon which can be experienced physically. The Shirot seems almost to have developed the one exception in 1QH where כבוד was used as object of a verb of sensible perception!

(vi) In both writings כבוד is integrated in an eschatological time concept. In 1QH the כבוד mentioned by the chosen psalmist can still not be imagined in full; the time is still not fulfilled. Only final revelation will allow the chosen ones to experience the כבוד of God in full. In the Shirot the situation is different. כבוד is part of the heavenly world which is described as the present kingdom of God. So כבוד is already part of the fulfilled time, and therefore perceptible in full. Hence one could argue that 1QH and Shirot understand כבוד in
the same way, the difference lying in the involvement of the earthly worshipper. The Shirot כבורה suggests that the earthly worshipper joining the heavenly praise is able to experience כבורה in full. According to 1QH this is not possible.

(vii) The concept of creation (the creation has also the כבורה of its creator) in the two writings has a different function. In 1QH the psalmist sees in the creation the כבורה of God - and this is a reason for him to praise God. In the Shirot, the concept of creation is on many occasions the only link between God and כבורה.

(viii) In 1QH כבורה is part of eternity, and can only be experienced through one's interior understanding. So כבורה belongs to a world of "knowledge and belief" which is different from the earth, but which is also the sphere of God. Hence in 1QH this "sphere of God" is understood as a metaphysical place. In the Shirot כבורה is part of the sphere of God which is described as the lively heavenly world full of beings and objects.

B. Comparison of the understanding of כבורה/διὸξα in the MT and the LXX with 1QH and the Shirot

(i) The most interesting aspect of the understanding of כבורה/διὸξα in the writings which we have considered is its relationship to God. This relationship is developed differently in the various writings and has, therefore, different facets.

In the MT כבורה is understood in two different ways: it is either used in an entirely secular sense, or it is the כבורה-יורוה. The second understanding is certainly the more important one.
The understanding of δόξα in the LXX is in the first place a development of the understanding of נבורה understood in relation to God: the LXX interpreted δόξα as purely divine phenomenon. Nevertheless, we can also find occurrences of δόξα where it is used in a secular sense. But these occasions have to be considered as remains of the understanding of נבורה in a secular sense represented in the MT. Hence, the process of giving δόξα a different meaning as נבורה in the MT was not carried through systematically. But the dominant tendency to understand δόξα is this way is very obvious.

In the two writings from Qumran, נבורה is never understood in a secular sense. In 1QH נבורה is always the נבורה of God, hence a divine attribute. נבורה has also a secondary function alongside God. In the Shirot, נבורה as a heavenly phenomenon is never used in a secular sense. The understanding of the link between נבורה and God is ambivalent. נבורה is used often as a divine phenomenon which sometimes even claims its own and independent function in the heavenly world. But it is still linked with God. We may also detect a tendency to understand נבורה as a heavenly phenomenon which functions independently of God. However, as part of the heavenly world of God, נבורה seems always to be linked with God.

1QH and the Shirot do not have an understanding of נבורה/δόξα in any secular sense. They only use one aspect of the understanding of נבורה displayed in the MT.

The LXX tried generally to avoid the secular sense of the word; and 1QH appears to have developed in full this tendency of interpretation attested by the LXX. The Shirot develops the interpretation attested by the LXX as well, but reaches a level which goes far beyond that found in LXX. So 1QH and Shirot display tendencies in the treatment of נבורה which are similar to those apparent in LXX, but which go further and in different directions.
(ii) For the understanding of בְּנֵר in connection with בִּשָּׁנָה and the verb בָּרַר in 1QH and the Shirot, and the comparison with MT and the versions see above. 

(iii) The question of the secular sense of the word is also important for understanding the usage of ἀξία as an attribute of human beings.

In the MT, בְּנֵר is frequently used to denote human "honour" or "reputation". The authors of the LXX even extended this usage. 1QH still uses בְּנֵר grammatically as an attribute of human beings (twice), but the context proves that בְּנֵר is here not understood in a secular sense. In the Shirot, it never expresses a secular concept, for it is always part of the heavenly world.

So only in the MT and the LXX בְּנֵר ἀξία was used in conjunction with humans in a secular sense. The writings of Qumran no longer use בְּנֵר in this sense, but only as supernatural phenomenon.

(iv) In all writings the question whether בְּנֵר ἀξία was understood as a perceptible phenomenon was very striking. In the MT the situation is ambivalent: בְּנֵר is a phenomenon of the presence of God which might be directly or indirectly perceptible.

In the LXX we encounter a change: ἀξία is now understood as a perceptible divine attribute.

In 1QH בְּנֵר can be experienced, but only through interior understanding or belief. In the Shirot בְּנֵר is often understood as a (divine) phenomenon which can be experienced physically.

Pp 69ff.
Here we discover a major difference between MT and LXX: LXX attempts to solve the ambivalence of the MT and develops the understanding of דְּדוֹאָה as perceptible phenomenon. 1QH develops the understanding in its own way, by giving דְּדוֹאָה the sense of something that can be experienced, but not physically. The idea that humans can only approach דְּדוֹאָה indirectly recalls the statement of MT that the chosen people "believed" the thunderstorm to be the appearance of God. Both ways of approach happen through belief. But in 1QH the manner of experience is more direct.

It is therefore most interesting that the Shirot understands דְּדוֹאָה rather like the LXX דְּדוֹאָה: as a perceptible phenomenon. But in the LXX, דְּדוֹאָה is also understood as a divine attribute, whereas in the Shirot, דְּדוֹאָה is never linked grammatically with God, even when it is used as perceptible phenomenon.

The ideas already presented in the LXX are developed by the Shirot further. 1QH develops MT carefully trying to solve the ambivalence offered by MT. It is very interesting to note that at this point the understanding of דְּדוֹאָה/דְּדוֹאָה seems to be more developed in the LXX than in 1QH.

(v) The concept of election in the writings is important to a different degree. In the MT the theophany happens in front of the chosen people Israel or a chosen person (like Moses or Aaron). Election is not described as a condition, a sine qua non of the "experience" of דְּדוֹאָה.

In the LXX the situation is the same: election is not described as a condition for the experience of דְּדוֹאָה. Only in one verse (Nu. 27:20) the idea of a personal election as a condition for acquisition of דְּדוֹאָה comes into focus. 278
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In 1QH election is almost a theme of the writing. Without election, human beings cannot imagine the מְסַגֶּל of God. The election is the act of God's choice of a particular person, who can then perceive through interior understanding the מְסַגֶּל.

In the Shirrot, election has only a subordinate function concerning the heavenly world. There everything is chosen per definitionem. The idea that earthly worshippers join the heavenly world after their purification might be a development of the idea in the MT that the theophany appears only to chosen people like Moses or Aaron.

LXX offers here little change from the MT. 1QH supports the theory that authors of Qumran tend to develop ideas of the OT which occur there only rarely, and which are difficult to interpret. Nu. 27:20 is difficult, because מְסַגֶּל/δικαίωτα is rarely used as something which is given from one human being to another. 1QH develops at this point an aspect of election, described as the handing over of δικαίωτα from one chosen person to another.

(vi) Another aspect of מְסַגֶּל/δικαίωת in comparison with each other is of interest: are מְסַגֶּל/δικαίωת described as something which is given by humans to God?

In the narratives of the theophany in the MT the מְסַגֶּל comes always from God to the people. In Ezekiel, God shows His מְסַגֶּל to a human being. In some of the poetical texts it is said (for example in Ps. 29:1; 66:2; 96:7) that מְסַגֶּל is given to God by humans. That means that we have within the MT a tradition where the מְסַגֶּל is exceptionally understood as something which comes from God to human beings, as well as a tradition which speaks of the opposite: מְסַגֶּל given to God, by worshippers or devotees.
The LXX developed the second tradition by using δῶξα in this sense in places where the MT does not have כְּבַרְרָה at all.

Strikingly, 1QH does not follow the second tradition of MT, but understood כְּבַרְרָה as a reason for the praise of God uttered by human beings. Hence 1QH develops only one aspect of the first tradition.

The Shirot develops independently a new understanding: כְּבַרְרָה as the object of praise.

(vii) Also significant is the appearance of כְּבַרְרָה/דֶּבֶשֶׁ in conjunction with a holy place. In the MT the theophany (appearance of כְּבַרְרָה) takes place in the tent or on a mountain. Often the כְּבַרְרָה is also linked with the temple in Jerusalem. Furthermore, כְּבַרְרָה, not necessarily the כְּבַרְרָה, is in the MT an attribute of sacred paraphernalia.

In the LXX, δῶξα is used similarly. The usage of δῶξα as attribute of objects of the temple is more frequent than in the MT. Δῶξα, therefore, gains in the LXX a little bit more "independence" from God.

1QH does not have this notion at all. It seems to avoid the idea of כְּבַרְרָה at a holy place. The Shirot, however, developed the idea which was already stronger in the LXX: δῶξα as something bound up with the temple, grammatically not linked with God, by giving כְּבַרְרָה, understood almost independently of God, a very important function in the heavenly world. This world is described as if it were a temple or holy palace. The Shirot develops here an aspect of the understanding of כְּבַרְרָה/דֶּבֶשֶׁ which we find in the MT, but which is already in the LXX developing somewhat in the direction of the Shirot.
(viii) Interesting as well is the conjunction of הָלָכָה/כָּבָרוֹד with the kingship of God. In the MT only in Ps. 24 כָּבָרֹד and מָלַךְ occur together. In the LXX δόξα occurs only in connection with earthly kings. In 1QH כָּבָרֹד never occurs in conjunction with מָלַךְ. Finally in the Shirot, the conjunction of כָּבָרֹד and God as King is common and central to the thought of the document.

Hence, the conjunction of כָּבָרֹד and מָלַךְ indicates again that especially the Shirot develops significantly ideas which occur in the OT only once.

(ix) כָּבָרֹד and eschatology

In the MT כָּבָרֹד was used often in an "eschatological setting". The future revelation was understood as the revelation of the כָּבָרֹד דֶּרֶךְ. But according to the "eschatological concept" of the OT the presence of כָּבָרֹד does not depend on a presence defined as an eschatological "present age". From the perspective of the authors, כָּבָרֹד דֶּרֶךְ has been revealed before, and therefore a future revelation is expected as a sign of JHWH that He is still with His people.

In the verses of the LXX, where δόξα occurs in an eschatological setting translating כָּבָרֹד, δόξα is used like כָּבָרֹד. In those texts where the authors are influencing the meaning of δόξα actively, by using it as translation for Hebrew terms other than "glory", they are much more careful in giving it an eschatological meaning.

In 1QH the eschatological present age is the condition for experiencing the כָּבָרֹד of God.

In the Shirot this present age has already begun in the heavenly world, and to some extent also for the purified earthly worshipper.
The writings of Qumran have a new eschatology. Both developed the eschatology of MT and LXX. The latter should probably be to be located between MT and the Qumran writings.

(x) דָּרוּד in the sense of "for the sake of (His) glory"

At this point another aspect of the relationship between the writings comes into focus: on some occasions, the authors of 1QH develop an idea of the Hebrew Bible or the LXX which occurs only a few times, or even only once, in one of those two texts. So in the Hebrew Bible דָּרוּד is only used in the phrase "and for the sake of his glory". Also in the LXX this usage occurs only once (Jer. 13:11). In 1QH, by contrast, this usage is quite common, as we have seen above. The Shirot does not have it.

(xi) דָּרוּד and the theme of darkness and light

As we know, this theme for the authors of Qumran is an important theological idea, and we can find it several times in 1QH linked with דָּרוּד. In the LXX, however, only in Isa. 60:19 did the authors link δόξα with this theme, where it is not really developed theologically. Thus the authors of 1QH developed an idea which is found in the LXX only once.

Afterword

This study has demonstrated how דָּרוּד and δόξα were used in the Hebrew Bible, the Septuagint, 1QH, and the Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice. We have discovered the meaning of

279 A detailed examination of the usage of "gloria" in the Vulgate was beyond the scope of this study. The Vulgate has only been considered when appropriate. But our investigations have, on specific points, tended show
these terms in these writings. This afterword does not intend to describe usage and meaning of בָּרוּךְ and סְדַּקָּא again, or to re-present the different senses of the terms in the different writings: this has already be done in detail (cf. summaries and conclusions). But this is an occasion to emphasise the most important aspect of the sense of בָּרוּךְ and סְדַּקָּא, to point out some of the consequences which the results of the examination of the terms have for the understanding of the history of the writings themselves and for the comparative studies of the writings, and to expound the difficulties with which studies like this have to deal. We shall also look forward to points where further scholarly work needs to be done.

Apart from the fact that בָּרוּךְ or סְדַּקָּא, in all these texts, are theologically significant terms, one aspect of their usage and meaning dominates their sense: the frequent connection of בָּרוּךְ and סְדַּקָּא with God. Their meaning as phenomena which are closely related with God is present in all the writings which we have considered in this study. The exact level of development of their meaning in the different writings differs, sometimes to an enormous extent; but the most decisive and significant meaning of בָּרוּךְ or סְדַּקָּא is the "glory of God". בָּרוּךְ and סְדַּקָּא used in this phrase have a "divine" character, understood as an attribute of God, or even as a part of His nature. But the exact relationship of the terms with God differs considerably. In the writings which have considered the manifestation of this relationship changes.

But apart from the pure descriptions of the usage and meaning of בָּרוּךְ and סְדַּקָּא in the writings, the terms in their "divine" connotation are certainly significant for the relationship between people described in the texts and their God, or for the relationship between God and the persons who wrote the texts, who read them, or who used them on some-liturgical

the importance of the Latin translation of בָּרוּךְ for the understanding of בָּרוּךְ especially in the Qumran writings.
occasions. The usage of הבור and δόξα reflects to some extent quite clearly the relationship of God and the believers. In the Hebrew Bible הבור is (mainly) either a phenomenon which occurs in theophany, and therefore at a moment when God confirms His faithful relationship with His people, or it is, in poetical texts, something the worshipper can direct worship and praise towards. In the Septuagint, δόξα is used in much the same way, but even more frequently. In 1QH the הבור of God is mainly a phenomenon the worshippers direct their praise towards, and in the Shirot הבור is even understood as something which brings the worshippers closer to the sphere of God and therefore to God Himself. Hence, the הבור and δόξα (of God) are in all these texts significant aspects of the relationship of God and the believers. So even if the precise usage and sense of הבור and δόξα differs in the writings, the link between God and believer in all those texts which we have considered is very much to the fore.

In addition, this investigation has not only cast light on הבור and δόξα, but has proved also to be significant for the question of the authorship of some of the considered texts. In 1QH we have seen that the grammatical use of הבור changes at certain points in the text; this fact may well strongly support the view that at least two authors were involved in the composition of the text. Concerning the LXX, we know that a number of translators were occupied with the problems of translating several books. With respect to δόξα, we detected a certain process of development of the understanding of the term on the part of some translators; but this process was not everywhere apparent. This fact demonstrates that different translator may have held different opinions concerning the sense of δόξα. At least with regard to δόξα, they did not follow a rigid theological doctrine.
Furthermore, the investigation of δόξα in the LXX has shown that the Septuagint is not simply a translation of the Hebrew Bible, but also represents a very significant theological reflection of the Hebrew text.

We also compared the use of דנבי and δόξα in the different writings. We based these comparisons on examinations of the terms in the different texts. The comparisons were undertaken from several different standpoints, and produced results which are important for understanding the relationship between the different writings. For instance, when we compared the usage and sense of דנבי/ δόξα in 1QH and the Shirot we found out that דנבי is understood considerably differently in these texts, although both writings have been found in the caves of Qumran. We have also noted that 1QH and Shirot obviously used, interpreted, and developed the דנבי of the Hebrew Bible in their own particular ways. But to get a complete picture of the understanding of a term which is used in the Hebrew Bible and in these writings of Qumran, it was not enough to compare usages and meanings of the term in these texts alone. We found also that the sense of דנבי in the two Qumran writings is closely related to its usage in the Ancient Versions. In fact, on several occasions 1QH or the Shirot are apparently developing usage of δόξα in the Septuagint, or even of "gloria" in the Vulgate, usages which were not found in the Hebrew Bible. So we came to the conclusion that a precise definition of the sense of a theologically significant (Hebrew) term cannot only focus on its usage in the Hebrew Bible and the texts of Qumran, but has also to take into consideration its usage in the Ancient versions. To make statements about the history of a term which is theologically significant in the Hebrew Bible and the Scrolls it is necessary to examine its usage in the Hebrew Bible, and the Versions, and the texts of Qumran. With respect to דנבי/ δόξα, we saw that it is difficult to give a history of the terms דנבי/ δόξα by merely evaluating the data of their usage in the different writings, for the authors of 1QH and the
Shirot do not simply follow the Hebrew Bible, or develop in their writings the same single aspect of a term found in the Hebrew Bible or in one of the Versions. Rather, they work with aspects of the usage of כְּפֹרָה and δοξα which we find in the Hebrew Bible, the LXX, and the Vulgate and compose an entirely new understanding of כְּפֹרָה. Thus one major conclusion may be drawn with some confidence from the comparative part of this study: the authors of 1QH and the Shirot used and developed aspects of the כְּפֹרָה which we find in the Hebrew Bible, the Septuagint, and the Vulgate.

Investigating the meaning of כְּפֹרָה and δοξα, linguistically the "word field" of the terms proved to be important for the understanding of the terms. We have seen that the examination of related terms helped to clarify how כְּפֹרָה or δοξα themselves were understood. But we have also seen that differences of understanding of these related terms between the different writings which we considered do not always reflect the differences of the usages of כְּפֹרָה and δοξα between exactly the same texts. At some points the "tradition of understanding" or the "history of understanding" of כְּפֹרָה and δοξα seems to define the relationship of the writings in a different way than the tradition or history of their related terms. This means first, that the conclusions which are based on (linguistic) investigations, and which have the aim of defining the sense of כְּפֹרָה/ δοξα as such, have to be drawn very carefully. But secondly, this investigation has clearly and definitely shown aspects of the sense of כְּפֹרָה/ δοξα which are significant. And keeping in mind the complex and complicated (linguistic) circumstances, these aspects offer quite a precise picture of the senses of כְּפֹרָה/ δοξα in the different writings. That said, only the extension of a study like this to all available contemporary texts of the time of Qumran and before, and similar detailed investigations of theologically
significant terms in all these writings, will help to clarify our understanding of the relationship of these writings themselves.

In particular, the examination of נבואר (or translations of it) as interpreted by the Aramaic Targums will be essential to understand how "the glory of God" was understood at a time shortly before Jesus Christ came to the earth. This further investigation is beyond the limited scope of this study, but needs to be done in order to get the full picture of נבואר and its meaning.
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