

true that he, like many another; was interested in spreading his views, but whether he went about preaching, as Jesus did, is not known. He made his followers take very strict ascetic vows, quite contrary to all that we find in the life of Jesus or in the attitude of the early church. There is no statement in the Qumran literature that he ever performed miracles of healing, and certainly no suggestion that he ever raised anyone from the dead. There is no evidence that he ever thought himself to be the Messiah. The Qumran sect seems to have expected that ultimately two Messiahs would come, a priestly Messiah and a kingly Messiah, but there is no proof that it expected that either of them would be the same person as the Teacher of Righteousness. There is no evidence that the Teacher of Righteousness ever said that he would return to earth on the clouds of heaven. There is no evidence that the Teacher ever said, or that anybody else ever thought, that there would be any special significance to his death. There is no real evidence that the Teacher of Righteousness was crucified. In fact it is not even stated that he was put to death, in any of the material that has come to light thus far. There is no evidence that the Teacher of Righteousness was raised from the dead, or that anybody ever thought he had been raised from the dead, though there is reason to think that he may have been dead many years when the last of the scrolls was written. There is no evidence that the Qumran people ever thought that the Teacher of Righteousness could do something that would save an individual. Their only hope lay in following his teaching. Their faith was in what he had said, not, as in the case of Christianity, in him personally or in anything he had done or could do. The followers of the Teacher of Righteousness formed a closed group, which no one could join without years of probation and the taking of very strict vows. This is entirely different from the procedure followed in the establishment of Christianity,

as even a superficial glance at the Book of Acts will clearly show.

Mr. Allegro claims that the texts prove that the Teacher of Righteousness was crucified. However, this is purely an inference, and, in the opinion of most scholars, an unjustified inference. Nowhere do the texts say that he was put to death, merely that he was "gathered in", a phrase which could just as well refer to death from natural causes. Even if Mr. Allegro's claim that the Teacher was crucified should eventually prove to be true, there is still no slightest evidence that he or anyone else attached any atoning significance to his death.

What a great number of differences between Christ and the Teacher of Righteousness! None of the distinctive points of Christianity are found in him at all.

It is true, of course, that some of the teachings of Jesus can be paralleled by statements in the scrolls. For that matter, many of them can be paralleled in the teaching of the Rabbis, known to us as the Talmud. Along with the similarities are also found very considerable differences. Such parallels may in some cases enable us to understand His meaning better, but they do not in any way detract from His claims about Himself. He was the Son of God, come down to die for our sins. Through faith in Him we can be saved. The beginning of Christianity was a miraculous interposition of God into human life, opening the way for lost humanity to find eternal life.

The Dead Sea Scrolls give wonderful evidence of the dependability of our Old Testament text. They tell us some previously unknown facts about life in Palestine in the first century A.D. and before. But they neither add to nor detract from the unique achievements of the Son of God, who died that we might live.

~~(Reprinted from the Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation, December, 1957)~~

Note: This article is substantially the same as one I wrote for the Journal of the Amer. Sci. Aff'n, Dec. 1957.

Mr. JOSEPH BAYLY, Editor SENT
for HIS Magazine 2/9/59
1519 North Astor
Chicago 10, Illinois

The Relation of the Dead Sea Scrolls to Christianity

ALLAN A. MacRAE, Ph.D.
President, Faith Theological Seminary
Philadelphia 17, Pa.

FILE?

Although there have been many interesting developments in Biblical archaeology in the last few years, no other is quite as outstanding as the discovery and study of the so-called Dead Sea Scrolls. ~~In my column on archaeology some months ago I outlined the history of the discovery and told something of the bearing of the scrolls.~~

Since that time evidence as to the genuineness of the scrolls has constantly been increasing until today most scholars are ready to admit that they came from the time of Christ and from the two centuries immediately preceding. The evidence for this is so extensive that it has become almost impossible to believe anything else. Although many scholars originally greeted their discovery with great scepticism, only one outstanding professor is still standing by his original position. This man, Professor Zeitlin, of the Dropsie College, gives frequent lectures in Philadelphia and New York attacking the genuineness of the discoveries. At the Twenty-fourth International Congress of Orientalists, held in Munich, ~~in 1957~~ he spent over an hour presenting his claims that they are from the Middle Ages and worthless as far as giving evidence of the time of Christ is concerned. However, hardly another outstanding scholar agrees with him. The scholarly world has largely passed him by.

~~Some noted in the past~~ The Dead Sea Scrolls are of great interest for the striking evidence that they give of the remarkable accuracy with which