

# The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective

*A History of Research*

*Edited by*

**DEVORAH DIMANT**

BRILL

The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective:  
A History of Research

# Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

*Edited by*

Florentino García Martínez

*Associate Editor*

Peter W. Flint

Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar

VOLUME 99

# The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective: A History of Research

EDITED BY

DEVORAH DIMANT

WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF

INGO KOTTSIEPER



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON  
2012

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The Dead Sea scrolls in scholarly perspective : a history of research / edited by Devorah Dimant.

p. cm. -- (Studies on the texts of the desert of Judah ; v. 99)

Includes index.

This volume consists of 27 surveys of research into the Dead Sea scrolls in the past 60 years, written by 26 authors.

ISBN 978-90-04-20806-3 (hardback : alk. paper) 1. Dead Sea scrolls--Historiography. 2. Dead Sea scrolls--Bibliography. 3. Biblical scholars--Biography. I. Dimant, Devorah.

BM487.D449585 2012

296.1'55072--dc23

2011046382

ISSN 0169-9962

ISBN 9789004208063 (hardback)

ISBN 9789004218918 (e-book)

Copyright 2012 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.

Fees are subject to change.

For Reinhard Gregor Kratz  
תַּכְּמֵלֵב וְנִבּוֹן דְּבַר וַיְדִיד אֲמַת



## CONTENTS

Contents .....	vii
Preface .....	xi
Frequently Cited Works .....	xiii
Abbreviations .....	xv
Introduction .....	1
<i>Devorah Dimant</i>	

### DEAD SEA SCROLLS SCHOLARSHIP IN AMERICA

The Identification and History of the Qumran Community in American Scholarship .....	13
<i>Sidnie White Crawford</i>	
Research on the Sectarian Scrolls in North America .....	31
<i>Eileen M. Schuller</i>	
Biblical Scrolls Scholarship in North America .....	49
<i>Eugene Ulrich</i>	
“Rewritten Bible” in North American Scholarship .....	75
<i>Sidnie White Crawford</i>	
Qumran Research in the United States: The Non-Sectarian Texts .....	79
<i>James C. VanderKam</i>	
American Scholarship on Jewish Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls .....	101
<i>Alex P. Jassen</i>	
The Aramaic Texts and the Hebrew and Aramaic Languages at Qumran: The North American Contribution .....	155
<i>Moshe J. Bernstein and Aaron Koller</i>	
The Scrolls and Christianity in American Scholarship .....	197
<i>John J. Collins</i>	
Canadian Scholarship on the Dead Sea Scrolls .....	217
<i>Eileen M. Schuller</i>	



## DEAD SEA SCROLLS SCHOLARSHIP IN ISRAEL

- Israeli Scholarship on the Qumran Community ..... 237  
*Devorah Dimant*
- Israeli Research on the Ideology of the Qumran Community ..... 281  
*Bilhah Nitzan*
- Israeli Scholarship on the Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert ..... 297  
*Emanuel Tov*
- Qumran Research in Israel: Rewritten Bible and Biblical  
 Interpretation ..... 315  
*Michael Segal*
- The Liturgical Texts from Qumran in Israeli Research ..... 335  
*Bilhah Nitzan*
- Trends and Themes in Israeli Research of the Halakhah  
 in the Dead Sea Scrolls ..... 345  
*Aharon Shemesh*
- Israeli Research into Hebrew and Aramaic at Qumran ..... 363  
*Steven E. Fassberg*
- Excavations in the Judean Desert and at Qumran under  
 Israeli Jurisdiction ..... 381  
*Hanan Eshel ז"ר*

## DEAD SEA SCROLLS SCHOLARSHIP IN EUROPE

- Qumran Research: Contribution of the École Biblique  
 et Archéologique Française in Jerusalem ..... 403  
*Émile Puech*
- Qumran Research in France ..... 433  
*André Lemaire*
- Dead Sea Scrolls Scholarship in the United Kingdom ..... 449  
*George J. Brooke*
- Research of Qumran Scrolls in the Netherlands ..... 487  
*Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar*
- A History of Qumran Scrolls Research in Spain ..... 511  
*Florentino García Martínez and Julio Trebolle Barrera*

Qumran Research and Biblical Scholarship in Germany .....	529
<i>Jörg Frey</i>	
Basic Research, Methods and Approaches to the Qumran Scrolls in German-Speaking Countries .....	565
<i>Annette Steudel</i>	
Qumran Research in Italy .....	601
<i>Corrado Martone</i>	
Qumran Research in Nordic Countries .....	611
<i>Sarianna Metso</i>	
Qumran Research in Eastern and Central Europe .....	621
<i>Ida Fröhlich</i>	
Index of Sources .....	645
Index of Names and Subjects .....	669
Index of Modern Scholars .....	675



## PREFACE

Surveys of the major developments in research on the Dead Sea Scrolls have been written since the start of this new field of inquiry. Early milestones along the way were Józef Milik's *Ten Years of Discovery in the Judaean Desert* (1959) and Frank Cross's *The Library of Qumran* (1958). Later on, Geza Vermes published *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Perspective* (1977), and more recently James VanderKam presented *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (1994), now in a second revised edition (2010). However, these surveys present Scrolls research as a single homogeneous thread, even when they note opinions outside the consensus. Many of the peculiarities of the research on its tortuous journey since its inception in the 1950s are thereby lost. Moreover, the Dead Sea Scrolls are so novel and special, and the story of their discovery is so unique, that many details of their interpretation and publication depended on various circumstances not always recorded in the standard surveys. Lastly, with the passing of most members of the first international team of editors, a mass of information and knowledge is forever lost. The present volume was conceived from the urgent need to preserve whatever information has been garnered and kept by scholars of the second generation, who had the benefit of close personal contact with the members of the original international team. In addition, it was felt that light could be shed upon the somewhat erratic and at times confusing developments in Qumran studies by a sober evaluation together with clear bibliographical references. The idea to survey Qumran scholarship through the lenses of the respective countries involved sprang from the conviction that each of them reflected the events surrounding the discovery and research of the Scrolls in its own way. Accordingly, scholars were asked to survey Qumran studies in their respective countries. The authors were given a free hand to present their surveys according to their own perspective and assessment. A wide variety in the approaches to the task is indeed a characteristic of the present collection. Since each survey covers a particular area and theme, we decided to preserve the contributions in their integral form, including bibliographies, even at the price of some repetition, rather than provide one overall bibliography. In this way, each survey retains its value as a guide and

may be used separately. The authors are to be thanked for their cooperation and willingness to contribute to this enterprise.

The idea for the present volume was born in the exchanges I had with Annette Steudel of the Akademie der Wissenschaften zur Göttingen. Together, we made the initial contacts with the various authors. Due to other commitments, she was unable to take part in the editorial work but her support and reading of the final version of the book are highly appreciated. My special thanks and appreciation go to Ingo Kottsieper, also of the Akademie der Wissenschaften zur Göttingen, for offering to typeset the book. He generously gave of his time and effort to the project, and words are inadequate to express how deeply grateful I am to him. Thanks are due also to the English editor Murray Rosovsky and the copy-editor Janice Karnis for their excellent, professional work. The contributions were edited during my tenure in 2010-2011 as a Fellow at the Lichtenberg-Kolleg of the Georg-August-Universität Göttingen. The Lichtenberg-Kolleg provided me exceptional work conditions, and without its material support this volume would not have seen the light. My warmest thanks also go to Reinhard Kratz of the Theologische Fakultät, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen. He initiated my invitation to the Lichtenberg-Kolleg and thus engendered the extraordinary opportunity I was given to prepare the book for publication. Our frequent exchanges and his interest in the project were a constant source of support. Thanks are also due to my colleague and friend Emanuel Tov, my neighboring Fellow at the Lichtenberg-Kolleg, whose good advice and attentive ear were always available to me. Finally, I am indebted to Florentino García Martínez for accepting this volume for the series he directs, *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*, published by Brill in Leiden.

The volume follows the *SBL Handbook of Style* with several adaptations. Allowance is made for particular orthographic and citation practices in French, German and Spanish, and in the Nordic and Slavic languages. The Qumran Scrolls are indicated according to the accepted names and rules: long scrolls are presented by columns and number of lines (e.g. the *Temple Scroll* XII, 3; the *Community Rule* V, 1). Smaller fragments are indicated by their serial number in the cave in which they were found, number of fragment, column (if survived) and line (e.g. 4Q180 1 2-3; 4Q387 2 iii 4-5).

Devorah Dimant  
July 2011, Göttingen

## ABBREVIATIONS OF FREQUENTLY CITED WORKS

Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*

Cross, Frank M., *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies: The Haskell Lectures 1956-1957* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1958)

Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3d ed.

Cross, Frank M., *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies: The Haskell Lectures 1956-1957* (3rd rev. ed.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995)

Delcor, *Qumrân, sa piété*

Delcor, Matthias, ed., *Qumrân, sa piété, sa théologie, son milieu* (BETL 46; Leuven: University Press, 1978)

Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*

Dupont-Sommer, André, *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1950)

García Martínez, Steudel and Tigchelaar, *From 4QMMT to Resurrection*

García Martínez, Florentino, Steudel, Annette and Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C., eds., *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* (STDJ 61; Leiden: Brill, 2006)

Hilhorst, Puech and Tigchelaar, *Flores Florentino*

Hilhorst, Anthony, Puech, Émile and Tigchelaar, Eibert, J.C., eds., *Flores Florentino. Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007)

Kugler and Schuller, *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty*

Kugler, Robert A. and Schuller, Eileen M., eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty* (SBLJL 15; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999)

Milik, *Dix ans*

Milik, Józef T., *Dix ans de découvertes dans le désert de Juda* (Paris: Cerf, 1957)

Milik, *Ten Years*

Milik, Józef T., *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (trans. John Strugnell; SBT 26; London: SCM Press, 1959)

Paul et al., *Emanuel*

Paul, Shalom M. et al., eds., *Emanuel. Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septua-*

- gint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003)
- Schiffman, Tov, and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years*  
Schiffman, Lawrence H., Tov, Emanuel and VanderKam, James C., eds.; Executive ed., Marquis, Galen, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with the Shrine of the Book, 2000)
- Schiffman and VanderKam, *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*  
Schiffman, Lawrence H. and VanderKam, James C., eds., *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2 vols.; Oxford: University Press, 2000)
- Trebolle Barrera and Vegas Montaner, *The Madrid Qumran Congress*  
Trebolle Barrera, Julio and Vegas Montaner, Luis, eds., *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18-21 March 1991* (2 vols.; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992)
- VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*  
VanderKam, James C., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994)
- VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 2d ed.  
Vanderkam, James C., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010)

## ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
<i>AbrN</i>	<i>Abr-Naharain</i>
AbrNSup	Abr-Naharain: Supplement Series
<i>AcOr</i>	<i>Acta Orientalia</i>
AGSU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums
AHAW	Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften
<i>AJAJ</i>	<i>American Jewish Archives Journal</i>
<i>AJSR</i>	<i>Association for Jewish Studies Review</i>
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
<i>ANRW</i>	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i> , eds., Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase (Berlin 1972-)
ANTJ	Arbeiten zum Neuen Testament und Judentum
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
<i>ArOr</i>	<i>Archiv Orientalní</i>
ASOR	American Schools of Oriental Research
<i>ASTI</i>	Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute
ATDan	Acta theologica danica
AVTRW	Aufsätze und Vorträge zur Theologie und Religionswissenschaft
<i>BA</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BAC	Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos
<i>BAIAS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society</i>
<i>BAR</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i>
<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BASORSup	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research: Supplement Series
BBB	Bonner Biblische Beiträge
<i>BBR</i>	<i>Bulletin of Biblical Research</i>



<i>BeO</i>	<i>Bibbia e oriente</i>
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BHTh	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BibOr	Biblica et Orientalia
<i>BJRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</i>
<i>BJRULM</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</i>
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
<i>BK</i>	<i>Bibel und Kirche</i>
<i>BL</i>	<i>Bibel und Liturgie</i>
<i>BLE</i>	<i>Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique</i>
<i>BO</i>	<i>Bibliotheca orientalis</i>
<i>BRev</i>	<i>Bible Review</i>
<i>BSOAS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies</i>
<i>BTS</i>	<i>Bible et Terre Sainte</i>
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CahRB	Cahiers de la Revue biblique
<i>CAL Newsletter</i>	<i>The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Newsletter</i>
<i>Cathedra</i>	<i>Cathedra: History of the Land of Israel and Its Settlement</i>
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CEJL	Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature
<i>CJT</i>	<i>Canadian Journal of Theology</i>
<i>ColT</i>	<i>Collectanea theologica</i>
<i>Comm</i>	<i>Communio</i>
<i>Comp</i>	<i>Compostellanum</i>
ConBNT	Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series
<i>CQS</i>	<i>The Context of Scripture</i>
<i>CRAI</i>	<i>Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres</i>
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
<i>CurBS</i>	<i>Currents in Research: Biblical Studies</i>

CV	<i>Communio viatorum</i>
DBSup	<i>Dictionnaire de la Bible: Supplément</i>
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaeen Desert
DSD	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
DSSR	Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, eds., <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader</i> (6 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2004-2005)
EBib	<i>Études bibliques</i>
EJL	Early Judaism and its Literature
EncJud	<i>Encyclopaedia Judaica</i>
EncRel	<i>Encyclopedia of Religion</i> (2d ed., 2005)
ERE	<i>Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics</i>
ErIsr	<i>Eretz-Israel</i>
ESBNT	Joseph A. Fitzmyer, <i>Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament</i> (London: G. Chapman, 1971)
EstBib	<i>Estudios bíblicos</i>
EstEcl	<i>Estudios eclesiásticos</i>
ETR	<i>Études théologiques et religieuses</i>
EvT	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
ExpTim	<i>Expository Times</i>
FBE	Forum for Bibelsk Eksegese
FF	<i>Forschungen und Fortschritte</i>
FO	<i>Folia orientalia</i>
Gesher	<i>Gesher: Bridging the Spectrum of Orthodox Jewish Scholarship. Publication of the Students' Organization of Yeshiva Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary</i>
HBS	<i>Herders biblische Studien</i>
Hen	<i>Henoch</i>
HeyJ	<i>Heythrop Journal</i>
HO	Handbuch der Orientalistik
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HTb	<i>Ho Theológos</i>
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies

<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
<i>IDBSup</i>	<i>Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Supplementary Volume</i>
<i>IEJ</i>	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
<i>Imm</i>	<i>Immanuel</i>
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
<i>IOS</i>	<i>Israel Oriental Studies</i>
<i>JA</i>	<i>Journal asiatique</i>
<i>JAJSup</i>	Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JGRChJ</i>	<i>Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism</i>
<i>JJP</i>	<i>Journal of Juristic Papyrology</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JNSL</i>	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JQRMS</i>	Jewish Quarterly Review Monograph Series
<i>JR</i>	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
<i>JSAI</i>	<i>Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam</i>
<i>JSHRZ</i>	<i>Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit</i>
<i>JSIJ</i>	<i>Jewish Studies Internet Journal</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods</i>
<i>JSJSup</i>	Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods: Supplement Series
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JSOTSup</i>	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
<i>JSPSup</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series</i>
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>Jud</i>	<i>Judaica</i>
<i>KEK</i>	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament

LD	Lectio divina
LHBOTS	Library of Hebrew/Old Testament Studies
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LSTS	Library of Second Temple Studies
<i>Lum</i>	<i>Lumen</i>
<i>MdB</i>	<i>Le Monde de La Bible</i>
<i>MEAH</i>	<i>Miscelánea de estudios árabes y hebraicos</i>
<i>MGWJ</i>	<i>Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums</i>
MHUC	Monographs of the Hebrew Union College
<i>NEA</i>	<i>Near Eastern Archaeology</i>
<i>NIDB</i>	<i>New International Dictionary of the Bible</i> . Edited by James D. Douglas and Merrill C. Tenney. Grand Rapids, 1987
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
<i>NRT</i>	<i>Nouvelle Revue Théologique</i>
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
<i>Numen</i>	<i>Numen: International Review for the History of Religions</i>
OBL	Orientalia et Biblica Lovaniensia
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OLA	Orientalia lovaniensia analecta
<i>Or</i>	<i>Orientalia</i>
<i>OTP</i>	<i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i>
<i>OTS</i>	<i>Old Testament Studies</i>
<i>OtSt</i>	<i>Oudtestamentische Studiën</i>
<i>PAAJR</i>	<i>Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research</i>
<i>PEQ</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
PTSDDP	Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project
PVTG	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece
<i>QC</i>	<i>Qumran Chronicle</i>
<i>RasIsr</i>	<i>Rassegna Mensile di Israel</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>

<i>RBL</i>	<i>Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny</i>
RecBib	Recherches bibliques
<i>REJ</i>	<i>Revue des études juives</i>
<i>RelSoc</i>	<i>Religion and Society</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>RHRP</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>
<i>RHR</i>	<i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i>
<i>RSR</i>	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>
<i>RStB</i>	<i>Ricerche storico bibliche</i>
SAIS	Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture
<i>Salm</i>	<i>Salmanticensis</i>
SAOC	Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilizations
<i>SBFLA</i>	<i>Studii biblici Franciscani liber annus</i>
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLBSNA	Society of Biblical Literature Biblical Scholarship in North America
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
<i>SBLSP</i>	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers</i>
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
<i>ScEs</i>	<i>Science et esprit</i>
ScrHier	Scripta hierosolymitana
<i>ScrTh</i>	<i>Scripta theologica</i>
SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
<i>SE</i>	<i>Studia evangelica</i>
<i>Sem</i>	<i>Semitica</i>
<i>Shnaton</i>	<i>Shnaton: An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies</i> (Hebrew)
SJ	Studia Judaica
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
<i>SJOT</i>	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series

SNTU	Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt. Series A
<i>SPap</i>	<i>Studia papyrologica</i>
<i>SR</i>	<i>Studies in Religion</i>
SSLL	Stanford Studies in Language and Literature
SSN	Studia semitica neerlandica
SSS	Semitic Study Series
<i>ST</i>	<i>Studia theologica</i>
STAC	Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
StPB	Studia post-biblica
StudOr	Studia orientalia
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigraphica
SymbBU	Symbolae biblicae upsalienses
<i>Tarbiz</i>	<i>Tarbiz: A Quarterly for Jewish Studies / A Quarterly Review of the Humanities</i>
<i>TBei</i>	<i>Theologische Beiträge</i>
<i>ThT</i>	<i>Theologisch tijdschrift</i>
<i>TLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
<i>TRE</i>	<i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i> . Edited by Gerhard Krause and Gerhard Müller. Berlin, 1977
<i>TRu</i>	<i>Theologische Rundschau</i>
TS	Texts and Studies
<i>TS</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen
<i>TUAT</i>	<i>Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments</i>
<i>TWNT</i>	<i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i> . Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Stuttgart, 1932- 1979
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>VD</i>	<i>Verbum domini</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements

WACAE	Joseph A. Fitzmyer, <i>A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays</i> (SBLMS 25; Missoula: SBL and Scholars Press, 1979)
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAH	<i>Zeitschrift für Althebräistik</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZDMG	<i>Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>
ZPE	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>
ZTK	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

## INTRODUCTION

DEVORAH DIMANT

It has often been said that study of the Dead Sea Scrolls is and always has been an international enterprise. Certainly, from the very start, albeit with some significant exclusions, practitioners in this field of research were from various countries and worked in collaboration, a situation that continues still today. This communality is evinced in the general surveys published over the years, presenting a seemingly consistent and uniform development. However, in reality, the perception of the Scrolls found in the Qumran caves has reached its present state through a long and intricate process, heavily influenced at important junctures by the particular positions of specific scholars. In addition, it went through a long process of publications, interspersed with lengthy interruptions, which affected the understanding of the entire Dead Sea Scrolls corpus. Moreover, the close correlation of the Scrolls with the final shaping of Judaism and burgeoning Christianity elicited different stresses on various aspects of the Qumran corpus. The differing appreciations of this dual aspect are expressed clearly by two very different evaluations of the initial discovery of the Scrolls. In Jerusalem, Eliezer Sukenik, thrilled as he read for the first time an unknown ancient Hebrew work (which he later named *Hodayot*), learned at that same moment of the United Nations' decision to establish the State of Israel: "While I was examining these precious documents in my study ... my son rushed in with the shout that the vote on the Jewish State had been carried. This great event in Jewish history was thus combined in my home in Jerusalem with another event, no less historic, the one political, the other cultural."<sup>1</sup> In Paris, the French scholar André Dupont-Sommer wrote in one of the earliest assessments of the Scrolls that were known at the time: "Everything in the Jewish New Covenant heralds and prepares the way for the Christian New Covenant. The Galilean Master, as He is presented to us in the writings of the New Testament, appears in many respects as an astonis-

---

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Yigael Yadin from the diary of his father, Eliezer Sukenik, in Yadin, *The Message of the Scrolls*, 24.



hing reincarnation of the Teacher of Righteousness.”<sup>2</sup> The two reactions are emblematic of the road traversed during the study of the Scrolls since its inception 60 years ago. Much is therefore to be gained by considering the distinct scholarly traditions that came together in the investigation of the Qumran documents; this enterprise is undertaken in the volume before us.

Some of the vicissitudes of Qumran scholarship on this long road are appreciated only when taking stock of its entire 60-year history. Fate willed that the first two scrolls to be published, in 1950-1951, only two years after they were retrieved from cave 1, were both related to a specific group and both were preserved whole: the *Community Rule* (1QS) and the *Peshet of Habakkuk* (1QpHab).<sup>3</sup> Of particular significance was the speedy publication of the *Community Rule*, since it lays out the organizational framework of a distinct group and its major ideological views, which are strikingly similar to the descriptions of the Essene community by Philo and Josephus. Also of decisive influence was the presence of the *Damascus Document*, known 50 years before the discovery of the Scrolls in a Genizah version. This work was a mystery that remained unsolved by the early debates on its provenance and character. The central controversy concerned its legal portions and turned on whether they were Pharisaic or Sadducean. But 50 years later, when the publication of the first two scrolls showed that the *Damascus Document* belonged to the Qumran community, this early discussion became marginal. The resemblance in terminology and style, and above all in organizational patterns of the group described in them, left the first students of the Scrolls in no doubt that the *Damascus Document* was a product of the group described in the *Community Rule*. This was subsequently confirmed by the unearthing of additional copies of this text in other Qumran caves.

That the *Community Rule* and the *Damascus Document*, the only Qumran works setting out the organizational pattern of the group in question, were the very first to be studied is crucial for an understanding of the initial developments in Qumran research. For quite a few years they remained the main sources of information on the group's organization and theology. It is no wonder that the two provided the basis for describing the Scrolls community and its theological tenets, so well articulated by Józef Milik and

---

<sup>2</sup> André Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey* (trans. E. Margaret Rowley; Oxford: Blackwell, 1952), 99-100, translated from his *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la mer Morte* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1950), quoted by John Collins in his chapter in this volume.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Millar Burrows with the assistance of John C. Trever and William H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery* (2 vols.; New Haven: ASOR, 1950-1951).

Frank Cross in their two highly influential summaries of the first decade of Scrolls research.<sup>4</sup>

Being there at the beginning, the *Community Rule* and the *Damascus Document* also had a far-reaching influence on the identification of the Scroll community with the Essenes. The organization and some of the ideas laid down in the two works are remarkably similar to the classical descriptions of the Essenes.

The combination of the peculiar organization of this community together with its astonishing similarity to the Essenes likewise contributed to the association of the Scrolls with early Christianity. The author who did much to propagate this connection was André Dupont-Sommer in France,<sup>5</sup> himself under the influence of the *rapprochement* between the Essenes and early Christianity made by his predecessor Ernest Renan.<sup>6</sup> Hence the first years of research into the Dead Sea Scrolls were marked by the search for Christian origins within them.

In this way, the new documents discovered in a cave in the Judean Desert were deemed connected to the Essenes and to Christianity from the very beginning of the research, even before the precise location of this cave—subsequently named cave 1—was known. So when more caves containing scrolls were discovered near the Dead Sea shore, and the nearby site of Qumran was excavated, Pliny the Elder's remark about an Essene settlement near En Gedi was inevitably noted. The evidence in the Scrolls, the accounts on the Essenes, and the archaeology of Qumran became linked together, and were considered mutually corroborating. Following Pliny's lead, the scholars came to regard Qumran as the main, if not the only, settlement of the Essenes; later on, the archaeological chronology of the site was identified with the history of the group that produced the Scrolls. This profile is presented in Milik's 1959 survey, and remained the standard depiction of the Qumran community for the first three decades of research. This description was so persuasive that the evidence of Philo and Josephus, who stated that the Essene communities were scattered around Judaea, was largely ignored. In retrospect, one is struck by the extent to which the spe-

---

<sup>4</sup> Milik, *Ten Years*; Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. Note especially the chapter "Essene Organization and Teachings," in Milik, *Ten Years*, 99-128, where the *Community Rule* and the *Damascus Document* are combined to describe a single community with one organization.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. André Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (L'orient ancien illustré 4; Maisonneuve, 1950); *Les écrits Esséniens découverts près de la mer Morte* (Paris: Payot, 1959).

<sup>6</sup> Dupont-Sommer himself attests to Renan's influence on him by citing him quite extensively. See Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits Esséniens*, 381-4 (382).

cific first scrolls and certain details of the classical accounts on the Essenes influenced subsequent scholarship. What would have been the character of Qumran research had other Qumran works, for example the wisdom text 4QInstruction, been the first to be discovered?

It is worth noting not only what was prominent in early Qumran research but also what was absent from it. The legal-halakhic section of the *Damascus Document*, so central to scholarly discussion when the Genizah copies were first published by Solomon Schechter, had no place in the early reconstructions of the Qumran community's life and beliefs. The summaries produced by Milik and Cross contain no chapters on this subject, and the fact that Milik's few citations from the *Damascus Document* concern only the history of the group and its messianic notions is telling.<sup>7</sup> Not surprisingly perhaps, that in this scholarly context Chaim Rabin produced a new edition of the *Damascus Document* that separated the halakhic section from that reporting the group's origins and controversies.<sup>8</sup>

Philo and Josephus present the Essenes as a movement active in the latter part of the Second Temple period. As these authors are silent regarding their origins, history and politics, the identification of the Scrolls community with the Essenes barely placed it in a historical context. With the *Damascus Document* and the *Pesher of Habakkuk*, the Scrolls acquired these elements. Significantly, the information given in the *Damascus Document* on this aspect of the group remained marginal in the early scholarly discussions of the Genizah documents because few conclusions could be drawn from it. Only with the publication of the *Pesher of Habakkuk* did these details in the *Damascus Document* begin to make sense. In this case, too, we meet a feature typical of the first years of Qumran research: the history of the community is reconstructed chiefly on the basis of only two texts: the *Pesher of Habakkuk* and parts of the *Damascus Document*. In both, the Teacher of Righteousness appears as the founder and leader of the community (CD I, 11; 1QpHab I, 13; II, 1; V, 10); both mention an exile of the group (CD IV, 2-3; VI, 5; 1QpHab XI, 6); and both criticize the Temple priesthood (CD V, 6-11; 1QpHab IX, 4-7; XII, 7-10). Both were understood to allude to a 364-day calendar (CD II, 14-15; 1QpHab XI, 4-8).

On these grounds, together with a few additional texts, it was surmised that the group that authored these works criticized the contemporary Temple priesthood, espousing and nurturing a different method for in-

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Milik, *Ten Years*, 58-60.

<sup>8</sup> See Chaim Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents: I. The Admonition. II. The Laws* (2nd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958).

terpreting the Torah and the Prophets. It was further concluded that the Teacher of Righteousness was persecuted by the Wicked Priest because of their religious differences. Milik identified this wicked figure with the Hasmonean ruler Jonathan. Others explained the rift between the two under the assumption that the Teacher served as High priest but was ousted from office by Jonathan. The references to exile in the *Peshet of Habakkuk* and the *Damascus Document* have been taken to mean that at one point the Teacher and his followers left Jerusalem and went into exile, to Qumran. This synthesis was presented by Milik already in 1959.<sup>9</sup>

Milik reflects another crucial step taken by Qumran scholarship at the time. He identified the archaeological chronology of the Qumran site, as established by Roland de Vaux, with the history of the community as he described it.<sup>10</sup> It is not by chance that Milik opens his survey of the site with a quotation from Pliny on the Essene settlement near En Gedi (*Historia Naturalis* V.17, 73). He thus brings to full term a course started with the first publications of Scrolls. The picture drawn in them is of an Essene community that retired to the desert settlement at Qumran, there to live in seclusion following a rift with the contemporary Temple priesthood and the Hasmonean rulers. They engaged in work and study of the Hebrew Bible, their special writings, and various apocalyptic books in preparation for the imminent final Day of Judgment, when all evil would be annihilated and the members of the group would survive as the righteous remnant. To prepare for this final hour, they undertook a communal life under strict ascetic rules, separating themselves from the rest of the people of Israel. The credible profile of a schismatic group, maintaining a solitary and ascetic existence in study and work, and aspiring to complete purification from sin in expectation of the eschatological era, was indeed a portrait resembling the first Christian communities.

This description was accepted as convincing, based on the textual and archaeological facts; this accounts for its general acceptance until the early 1980s.

However, scholarship at large was unaware that this portrait was based on a very partial view of the Qumran library; an important number of the original Qumran documents remained unpublished and unknown to most of the scholarly readership. Subsequent history of Qumran scholarship would see the gradual publication of the entire library, a process that has reached completion only recently. It would lead to a complete change of perspective

---

<sup>9</sup> Milik, *Ten Years*, 80-87.

<sup>10</sup> Milik, *Ten Years*, 44-58.

and to the gradual disintegration of the earlier seemingly coherent narrative of the Scrolls.

Cracks in this homogeneous picture began to appear with the first publication in 1977 of a different kind of Qumran text, the *Temple Scroll*. Dealing as it does with legal sections from the Torah, and lacking the specific ideas and nomenclature typical of the works related to the Scroll community, the *Temple Scroll* was uncharacteristic of the Qumran documents known until then. The first editor, Yigael Yadin, attempted to incorporate the new scroll into the already known picture of the community's writings, but this soon drew criticism, for ostensibly the *Temple Scroll* required a different approach. Indeed, this long new document introduced to Qumran scholarship a whole series of new issues: a special kind of Bible interpretation, new legal-halakhic material presented in a hitherto unknown way, and a Qumran text without the familiar markers of the Scroll community's output. The *Temple Scroll* thus demanded a rethinking of major Qumran facets. This development was accelerated by the publication of the remaining unpublished texts. With the entire Qumran library available for study, a wholly new profile of the Scrolls is gradually emerging.

It was realized that the library is not a homogeneous sectarian-apocalyptic collection when additional publications demonstrated that it consists of diverse writings apparently from of numerous sources.<sup>11</sup> Within this assortment, the works produced by the Scrolls community are recognizable by their particular style, terminology, and theological notions. Consisting mainly of rules, interpretation of prophecies (*pesharim*), and wisdom texts, this sectarian literature is a corpus of its own with its character and specific problems. Recent investigation of this corpus concentrates on major sectarian texts, such as the *Community Rule*, the *Damascus Document*, the *War Rule* and *Hodayot*. These studies dissect the sectarian writings in order to uncover their underlying sources and their distinct versions, and to define their various recensions. The result is a reconstruction of diachronic development. However it often underestimates the synchronic dimension of these writings and the large number of similar themes and allusions linking the sectarian writings. Additionally, this kind of diachronic analysis often suffers from the absence of new updated commentaries on these substantial sectarian works. Also, major theological tenets of the community, such as dualism and predestination, known from the first Scrolls, have not been re-examined in the light of the new Qumran evidence and fresh scholarly insights.

---

<sup>11</sup> See the chapter by Devorah Dimant in this volume.

The typical sectarian works are unique specimens, and hence have been studied mostly in the context of other sectarian texts. However, new texts have revealed two other types of sectarian works that display an array of links with non-Qumranic literature. This is true of two kinds of Qumran documents: those containing halakhic material and those containing prayers. With its concentration on legal-halakhic themes, the *Temple Scroll* inaugurated the re-entry of these issues into the scholarly discussion. Publication of the *Temple Scroll* also coincided with renewed interest in the legal sections of the *Damascus Document*.<sup>12</sup> But it was the subsequent publication of *Miqṣat Ma'āse Ha-Torah* (4QMMT) that turned the Qumran halakhah into a major research preoccupation.<sup>13</sup> It reveals the ongoing dialogue between the Qumran community and other halakhic schools in contemporary Judaism, both those of the Pharisees and the Sadducees.

Another body of sectarian texts, namely liturgical compositions, attests to a different contact with the Judaism of the time. Some of the Qumranic prayers, especially those for daily recital and for the festivals, betray close similarity to prayers later adopted by rabbinic Judaism.

The interesting feature of the halakhic and liturgical texts from Qumran is that they display a particular sectarian terminology and viewpoint, but at the same time evince close connections with a wide range of Jewish sources beyond the Qumran collection.

A wealth of traditions and procedures similar to other Jewish contemporary literature is also seen in a third group of Qumran texts, the rewritten Bible compositions. This group is one of the great surprises to emerge from the final publication of all the Scrolls, as their prominent presence in the Qumran library was unknown in the first phase of the research. Again, this is a separate corpus, with its own specific features and problems. However, the observation that these rewritten Bible texts do not apply the sectarian terminology and style, and only rarely refer to the peculiar sectarian ideas is significant. This may be due partly to the conscious imitation of the Hebrew Bible, but the matter needs further research.

---

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (SJLA 16; Leiden: Brill, 1975); Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Studies in Qumran Law* (SJLA 24; Leiden: Brill, 1977).

<sup>13</sup> The official text of 4QMMT was published only in 1994 but unofficial and partial publications were known several years earlier. Cf. Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqṣat Ma'āse ha-Torah* (DJD X; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994). See also Yaacov Sussmann, "The History of Halakhah and the Dead Sea Scrolls - Preliminary Observations on *Miqṣat Ma'āse ha-Torah* (4QMMT)," *Tarbiz* 59 (1989-1990), 11-66 (Hebrew); "The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Qimron and Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqṣat Ma'āse ha-Torah*, 179-200.

While the halakhic, liturgical, and rewritten Bible texts point to the variegated character of the Qumran library and its manifold connections with Judaism, a large fourth group of texts, those penned in Aramaic, opens even wider horizons. Three compositions discovered at Qumran were published in part in the early years of the research, but all were original versions of already known compositions: *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees* and the *Aramaic Levi Document*, which was taken to be the *Testament of Levi*. The three were presumed to reflect the apocalyptic-eschatological orientation of the Scrolls community. However, while *Jubilees* is in a category of its own, *1 Enoch* and the *Aramaic Levi Document* belong to a much larger corpus of Aramaic compositions, most of them hitherto unknown. Consisting of various testaments of biblical patriarchs and other biblical themes, they do not seem to have been authored by the Scrolls community. But with their strong emphasis on the biblical events related by the book of Genesis, they seem to have keenly interested the members of the community. A most intriguing feature in several Aramaic texts is the occurrence of various Babylonian and Iranian traditions. Thus, the Aramaic texts widen the perspective of the Qumran library in unexpected ways.

The plethora of novel texts and perspectives places the Qumran community in a new setting. It has gradually moved from the fringes of contemporary Judaism to its very center as a proponent of an important school of thought and practice, which drew on the traditional Jewish heritage and developed it in its own way. With this process, the similarities to Christianity found in the Scrolls may now be viewed as relevant mainly to the sectarian literature but not to the entire multifaceted Qumran library. Even so, rather than pointing to direct contact between the Qumranites and the early Christians, the Scrolls should be viewed as part of the variegated Jewish context of the nascent new religion.<sup>14</sup>

While the study of the full Scroll collection has revealed a previously unexpected variety and wealth of perspectives, a reconstruction of the history of the Scrolls community has become more complex and difficult. The first perplexing fact emerged from the study of *Miqṣat Ma'āśe Ha-Torah*: some of the halakhic issues it espouses are clearly Sadducean. Some scholars promptly concluded that the Qumran community consisted of Sadducean priests rather than Essenes, but this theory remains marginal. Most still hold to the view that the similarity displayed in the Qumranic and Es-

---

<sup>14</sup> See Jörg Frey's formulation of the problems in his chapter in this volume, as well as in "Critical Issues in the Investigation of the Scrolls and the New Testament," in Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: University Press, 2010), 517-45.



sene communities outweighs other arguments. It is also remarkable that Roland de Vaux's essential interpretation of the Qumran site as an Essene settlement has withstood the test of time, being confirmed by a recent re-assessment. All the alternative interpretations are unconvincing.<sup>15</sup> Nevertheless, significant among the few corrections made to de Vaux's archaeological interpretation is the dating of the beginning of the Second Temple settlement at Qumran to around 100 BCE rather than 150 BCE, as de Vaux assumed.<sup>16</sup> This amendment invalidates the theory that the Teacher of Righteousness left Jerusalem and settled at Qumran in the middle of the second century BCE. The difference in date between the corrected archaeological data and the surmised beginning of the community illuminates the initial methodological flaw in the combining of the site's archaeological chronology with the history of the community as conjectured from the various statements in the Scrolls.

Several other facets of the early reconstruction of the community's history have sustained sharp criticism. The notion that the Teacher of Righteousness served for some time as high priest is not supported by the Scrolls. Equally unsubstantiated is the notion that he went into "exile" at Qumran, as is the claim that the Damascus exile mentioned in the *Damascus Document* is a code name for Qumran exile. The view that Qumran was the settlement "in the desert" to which the members of the community retired in order to fulfill the Isa 40:3 directive "to go to the desert in order to prepare the Lord's way" (as prescribed by the *Community Rule* VIII, 13-16) is also without evidence. The Qumran settlement is not in a "desert," and neither should the Isaianic directive be understood literally. The *Community Rule* probably read it metaphorically.

From its inception, Qumran scholarship understood the criticism leveled against the priesthood in various sectarian works as disengagement from the contemporary Temple—and, indeed, from the majority of Israel. Such an understanding has been considered confirmed by certain formulations in the 4QMMT.<sup>17</sup> This is connected to the earlier notion that the very adherence of the community to a 364-day solar-lunar calendar, instead of the lunar one adopted by the Jerusalem priesthood, was a major cause for schism. Recent critique has cast doubt on these current views, arguing that calendar or halakhic disputes were not necessarily a cause of schism or of

---

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002); Eric M. Meyer, "Khirbet Qumran and Its Environs," in Lim and Collins, *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 21-44.

<sup>16</sup> See e.g. Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 65.

<sup>17</sup> See the chapter by Devorah Dimant in this volume.



physical separation from a central religious institution such as the Temple.<sup>18</sup> If so, the priestly aspects of the Qumranites, as well as their polemics, should be re-assessed and interpreted in a more sophisticated manner, also taking into account the community's clearly egalitarian facets.

For many years the important group of some 200 biblical manuscripts found among the Scrolls was treated as an independent corpus within the Qumran library. Talmon's early statement that the range of variants displayed in these biblical texts was not connected to the sectarian worldview is well known.<sup>19</sup> However, additional features emerging in recent publications and further research have altered this assessment. Considering the textual variants in the Qumran biblical copies, the evidence of distinct recensions of some biblical books, for instance, Jeremiah, and the great liberty taken in the Qumran rewriting of Bible texts, some scholars conclude that the collection of writings that the Qumranites held authoritative also included—besides the Torah, the Prophets and David's Psalms—*1 Enoch*, *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll*.<sup>20</sup> Others criticize this idea, pointing out that these works are not cited by the Qumran texts. Evidently, the last word on this subject has yet to be heard.

The sweeping changes that Qumranic scholarship is undergoing may be comprehended even from this rapid sketch, and are relayed in more detail in the respective chapters of the present volume. It offers a moment of retrospection and reflection on the road already traversed, and highlights the pitfalls to be avoided and the direction to be taken in the future.

---

<sup>18</sup> For a critique of the assumption that a different calendar would cause schism, see Sacha Stern, "Qumran Calendars and Sectarianism," in Lim and Collins, *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 232-53. For a critique of the idea that halakhic differences would lead to schism or boycott of the Temple, cf. Albert I. Baumgarten, "But Touch the Law and the Sect will Split': Legal Dispute as the Cause of Sectarian Schism," *Review of Rabbinic Judaism* 5 (2002): 301-15, and Martin Goodman, "The Qumran Sectaries and the Temple in Jerusalem," in Charlotte Hempel, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context* (STDJ 90; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 263-73.

<sup>19</sup> See Shemaryahu Talmon, "The *Old Testament* Text," in Peter R. Ackroyd and Christopher F. Evans, eds., *The Cambridge History of the Bible From the Beginnings to Jerome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 159-99. Cf. the chapter by Emanuel Tov in this volume.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. James C. VanderKam, "Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 5 (1998): 382-402. See the critical comments by Timothy Lim, "Authoritative Scriptures and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Lim and Collins, *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 303-22. For a critique of the notion that the *Damascus Document* XVI, 3-4 cites, the title of *Jubilees* see Devorah Dimant, "Two 'Scientific' Fictions: The So-called *Book of Noah* and the Alleged Quotation of *Jubilees* in CD 16: 3-4," in Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov and James C. VanderKam, eds., *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (VTSup 101; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 230-49.

DEAD SEA SCROLLS SCHOLARSHIP IN  
AMERICA



# THE IDENTIFICATION AND HISTORY OF THE QUMRAN COMMUNITY IN AMERICAN SCHOLARSHIP

SIDNIE WHITE CRAWFORD

## *The Early Generation: 1940s-1950s*

American scholars were active in Qumran scholarship from the first discoveries of the Scrolls. John Trever, William Brownlee, and Millar Burrows, fellows and Director respectively of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem (ASOR), were the first scholars to study the cave 1 manuscripts in the possession of the Metropolitan Samuel.<sup>1</sup> These manuscripts included the *Peshet of Habakkuk* and the *Community Rule*,<sup>2</sup> both central documents in early attempts to identify and reconstruct the history of the Qumran community. Burrows and Brownlee in particular took up the challenge of identifying the community of the Scrolls. In the first American news release of the discovery of the Scrolls, dated April 11, 1948, the Qumran community was already tentatively identified with the Essenes.<sup>3</sup> Burrows and Brownlee issued a series of publications based on the Scrolls photographed by Trever, attempting to identify the historical allusions in the *Peshet of Habakkuk* and to correlate those with the sect reflected in the *Community Rule*.<sup>4</sup> Trever's initial identification of the paleographical date of the *Great Isaiah Scroll* (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>) as the second century BCE, subsequently confirmed

---

<sup>1</sup> For a stirring first person account, see John C. Trever, *The Untold Story of Qumran* (Westwood: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1965).

<sup>2</sup> It was Burrows who first named the manuscript now known as the *Community Rule*, calling it the *Manual of Discipline*. He states, "The title 'Manual of Discipline' is not given in the text itself, but came to my mind when I first read the text in Jerusalem in March 1948. Noting the combination of liturgical directions with rules concerning procedure in the meetings of the group and the personal conduct of the members, I was reminded of the manual of discipline of the Methodist Church." Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (repr. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979), 24. Its present title is a translation of the Hebrew *Serekh ha-Yahad*, suggested by Eliezer Lipa Sukenik.

<sup>3</sup> Trever, *The Untold Story*, 89, 117.

<sup>4</sup> See, e.g., William H. Brownlee, "The Jerusalem Habakkuk Scroll," *BASOR* 111 (1948): 8-18; "Further Light on Habakkuk," *BASOR* (1949): 9-10; Millar Burrows, "The Contents and Significance of the Manuscripts," *BA* (1948): 57-61; "A Note on the Re-

by William Albright, caused them to concentrate their investigations in the latter half of the Second Temple period.<sup>5</sup>

Burrows and Brownlee both supported the identification of the Qumran community with the Essenes (as first proposed by Sukenik), and placed the founding of the community and its subsequent history in the late second and first centuries BCE. Burrows, in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, investigated the evidence of the Scrolls themselves (including the *Damascus Document*), then moved to a consideration of other contemporary evidence (i.e. Josephus, Philo, Pliny, the New Testament, and the rabbis). He correlated the evidence of the Scrolls with the Greco-Roman statements about the Essenes, and concludes,

The sect of the teacher of righteousness and his followers was clearly one of the groups formed within Judaism during the pre-Maccabean and Hasmonean periods. It may probably be accurately included under the term Hasidim, but that does not indicate a specific sect. In many ways it was akin to the Essenes, as we know them from the sources of the Roman period. If this term is used in a broad comprehensive sense, we may legitimately call the Qumran sectarians Essenes....At any rate, it is clear that the sect of Qumran was more closely related to the Essenes than to any other group known to us.<sup>6</sup>

Brownlee, in a 1950 article titled "A Comparison of the Covenanters of the Dead Sea Scrolls with the Pre-Christian Jewish Sects," states,

The points of agreement or similarity between the Covenanters [his term for the Qumran community] and the Essenes are so numerous and cover such a wide range of categories of comparison, it is clear that they belong to the same sect type. It is this fact which makes it appear probable that the Covenanters are to be included under the designation 'Essenes' as employed by Josephus.<sup>7</sup>

Both Burrows and Brownlee argued that the figures mentioned in the *Peshet of Habakkuk* and the *Damascus Document*, which they accepted as closely related to the cave 1 scrolls even before the discovery of copies in

---

cently Discovered Manuscripts," *JQR* (1949): 51-56; "The Discipline Manual of the Judaean Covenanters," *OriSt* (1950): 156-92.

<sup>5</sup> See Trever, *The Untold Story*, 60-61, 85, and William Albright, "Editorial Note on the Jerusalem Scrolls," *BASOR* 111 (1948): 2-3. Albright gives a vigorous defense (against Zeitlin, see below) of the date of the Scrolls on archaeological and paleographical grounds in the following articles: "Are the 'Ain Feshkha Scrolls a Hoax?," *JQR* 40 (1949): 41-49; "On the Date of the Scrolls from 'Ain Feshkha and the Nash Papyrus," *BASOR* 115 (1949): 10-19; "Comments on Dr. Lacheman's Reply and the Scrolls," *BASOR* 116 (1949): 16-17.

<sup>6</sup> Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 298.

<sup>7</sup> William H. Brownlee, "A Comparison of the Covenanters of the Dead Sea Scrolls with Pre-Christian Jewish Sects," *BA* 13 (1950): 65-66.

cave 4,<sup>8</sup> can and should be identified with known historical figures, thus permitting a reconstruction of the history of the sect. For example, Brownlee, who favored an identification of the Wicked Priest with John Hyrcanus I, states, “both the Wicked Priest and the False Prophet were public figures concerning whom we have written history, so that one should not forsake the task of their identification.”<sup>9</sup>

Another surprisingly important voice that helped solidify the growing consensus in American scholarship in the 1950s that the Qumran community was to be identified with the Essenes, and that the community’s history began in the second century BCE with the foundation of the Qumran settlement by the Teacher of Righteousness, was not an academic at all, but a journalist, Edmund Wilson. Wilson wrote a series of articles on the Dead Sea Scrolls in the *New Yorker* magazine after traveling to Qumran and Jerusalem, where he met some of the major figures in Scrolls research, including de Vaux. His articles were collected together and published in 1955 as *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea*. Wilson embraced the Qumran-Essene identification: “The building [at Qumran] has the look of a monastery, and a convergence of evidence seems not merely to suggest but almost beyond question to establish that it was one of the habitations, if not actually the headquarters, of what has previously been known as the Essene sect.”<sup>10</sup> Wilson popularized the views of de Vaux and Dupont-Sommer for the American public, and his book was enormously influential.

The Qumran-Essene identification did not hold universal sway among American academics in the 1940s and 50s, however. The most skeptical view was that of Solomon Zeitlin, who argued in the pages of the *Jewish Quarterly Review* that the Scrolls were either medieval manuscripts or simply forgeries.<sup>11</sup> As evidence grew for the authenticity of the Scrolls, his position was relegated to a footnote in Scrolls scholarship.

By the end of the 1950s, American scholarship had coalesced around the Qumran-Essene hypothesis. This situation would last until well into the 1980s, owing to the influence of two seminal figures in Dead Sea Scrolls studies, Frank Moore Cross and John Strugnell.

<sup>8</sup> E.g. Brownlee, “A Comparison of the Covenanters,” 51-54.

<sup>9</sup> William H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979), 98.

<sup>10</sup> Edmund Wilson, *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea* (rev. ed.; London and Glasgow: Fontana Books, 1957), 32.

<sup>11</sup> Zeitlin, “The Hoax of the ‘Slavonic Joseph,’” *JQR* 39 (1948): 171-80; “A Commentary on the Book of Habakkuk’ Important Discovery or Hoax?,” *JQR* 39 (1949): 235-47; “Scholarship and the Hoax of the Recent Discoveries,” *JQR* 39 (1949): 337-63; “The Alleged Antiquity of the Scrolls,” *JQR* 40 (1949): 57-78.

*Frank Moore Cross and John Strugnell: 1950s-1990s*

Frank Moore Cross, a student of William Foxwell Albright, was appointed in 1953 to the international team of scholars organized by de Vaux to accomplish the sorting and editing of the cave 4 fragments. Although his responsibility lay with the biblical fragments, he wrote and lectured on the identification and history of the Qumran community, and his views shaped a generation of American (and international) Qumran scholarship. In 1957 he was appointed the Hancock Professor of Hebrew and Other Oriental Languages at Harvard University. He was joined there in 1967 by John Strugnell, and together they made Harvard the center of Dead Sea Scrolls studies in the United States.

Cross's first article on the Scrolls appeared in 1949, and his latest publication was the long-anticipated edition of the cave 4 Samuel fragments in 2005.<sup>12</sup> Since Cross's views on the identification and history of the Qumran community were so formative of American scholarship on the question, they should be investigated at length.

In 1956-1957, Cross gave the Haskell Lectures at Oberlin College. These lectures were published in 1958 under the title *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*. In it, Cross flatly identifies the community with the Essenes: "There is now sufficient evidence, to be supplemented as the publication of the Scrolls and reports of excavations in the vicinity of Qumrân continue, to identify the people of the Scrolls definitively with the Essenes."<sup>13</sup> To support this identification, Cross utilizes his well-known synthetic approach to bring together the evidence of the manuscripts, the archaeology and the classical sources, constructing the chain of evidence that makes the Qumran-Essene hypothesis so plausible. He describes the archaeological settlement in this way:

Khirbet Qumrân proved to be the hub of a Hellenistic-Roman occupation spreading nearly two miles north along the cliffs, and some two miles south to the agricultural complex at 'Ën Feskha. The people of this broad settlement lived in caves, tents, and solid constructions, but shared pottery made in a common kiln, read common biblical and sectarian scrolls, operated a

---

<sup>12</sup> Frank M. Cross, "The Newly Discovered Scrolls in the Hebrew University Museum in Jerusalem," *BA* 12 (1949): 36-46; Frank M. Cross, Donald W. Parry, Richard J. Saley and Eugene Ulrich, *Qumran Cave 4. XII: 1-2 Samuel* (DJD XVII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005).

<sup>13</sup> Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 37. All references are to this edition unless otherwise stated. The third edition was published thirty-seven years later. See *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3d ed.

common irrigation system, and, as we shall see, depended on common stores of food and water furnished by the installations of the community center.

The caves yielding manuscripts and identical pottery also radiate out from the center northward and southward.<sup>14</sup>

Cross then discusses the evidence of Philo, Josephus, Dio Chrysostom and Hippolytus for the Essenes, and correlates that evidence with what the Qumran Scrolls reveal about the community that collected them. He particularly relies on evidence from four major works then published: *The Community Rule* (1QS), the *Damascus Document*, the *War Scroll* (1QM) and the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa). While he is convinced that Qumran is an Essene settlement, he does not believe it was the only Essene settlement in Judea, but rather their “principle...center.”<sup>15</sup> He states, concerning the relationship of the evidence of the Scrolls to the classical sources:

It is quite impossible within our limits to pursue all of the details in which our classical sources complement and correspond to sources from the Qumrân caves. This correspondence can be illustrated by citation of details of community organization, offices and trial procedures, or of common practice in such matters as sanitary regulations, the use of oaths, the rites of lustration and baptism. On the one hand we can point to verbal reminiscences in Josephus of theological clichés in the Qumrân texts, and on the other hand to the prohibition of spitting in assembly recorded by both Josephus and the Rule of Qumrân.<sup>16</sup>

However, Cross also acknowledges discrepancies between the Essenes as described in the classical sources and the community of the Scrolls. For example, he notices that while Philo unequivocally states that the Essenes were a celibate order, Josephus discusses two orders of Essenes, one that married and one that did not. He likewise notes that the evidence from Qumran is ambiguous. He concludes,

This area of Essene life can best be understood, not by positing a sect of marrying Essenes alongside a celibate sect, but by recognizing an ambiguous attitude toward marriage integral to the structure of Essene faith. While a genuine asceticism has no place in Judaism, there are two streams in Judaism which have dualistic tendencies. One of these is an extremely ancient one, rooted in the priestly distinctions between ritual purity and pollution...Certain sexual acts render one unclean so that he may not approach holy things. This is especially vivid in the laws of “Holy War,” where all sexual life is suspended, women excluded from the camp, since God’s Spirit...is present in the camp. The second stream is the late developing apocalyptic

<sup>14</sup> Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 41.

<sup>15</sup> Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 57.

<sup>16</sup> Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 69-71.



movement which assimilates certain elements of Persian ethical dualism to the prophetic understanding of history as a drama of divine warfare culminating in the victory of God. In this tradition the “normal life” of the old age is qualified...At Qumrân these streams come together in a priestly apocalypticism...Ritual purity is maintained by the community as a whole. The community takes the posture of a priesthood standing in the presence of God...The Essene in his daily life thus girds himself to withstand the final trial, purifies himself to join the holy armies...This is the situation which prompts counsels against marriage.<sup>17</sup>

It is worth noting that Cross's view about marriage and celibacy in the Qumran community is much more nuanced than that of other scholars in this period, who held that the Qumran community was completely celibate.

Cross continued to hold to the Essene identification of the Qumran community throughout his career. In 1973 he published this famous statement:

We know of no other sect arising in the second century B.C. which can be associated with the wilderness community. Further, the community at Qumrân was organized precisely as a new Israel, a true sect which repudiated the priesthood and cultus of Jerusalem. Neither the Pharisees nor the Saducees [*sic*] can qualify. The Essenes qualify perfectly...The scholar who would “exercise caution” in identifying the sect of Qumrân with the Essenes places himself in an astonishing position: he must suggest seriously that two major parties formed communistic religious communities in the same district of the desert of the Dead Sea and lived together in effect for two centuries, holding similar bizarre views, performing similar or rather identical lustrations, ritual meals, and ceremonies. He must suppose that one, carefully described by classical authors, disappeared without leaving building remains or even potsherds behind; the other, systematically ignored by the classical sources, left extensive ruins, and indeed a great library. I prefer to be reckless and flatly identify the men of Qumrân with their perennial houseguests, the Essenes.<sup>18</sup>

In the third, revised edition of *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*, which includes a new chapter entitled “Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies,” Cross continues to regard the Essene identification of Qumran as certain.<sup>19</sup>

Cross also turned his attention to the reconstruction of the history of the community, once again synthesizing the evidence of the texts, the archaeology, and, to a much lesser extent, the classical sources. He relies mainly on

<sup>17</sup> Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 72-73.

<sup>18</sup> Frank M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University, 1973), 331-2.

<sup>19</sup> Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3d ed., 183-91.

the contemporary allusions in the *pesharim* and the *Damascus Document*, as well as the coin evidence from Qumran and the paleographical sequence of the manuscripts. Concerning the paleographical evidence, he states,

In short, the paleographical analysis of the texts now sets limits within which we must look for the events which gave rise to the sectarian movement: the upper limit, while not certain, is suitably drawn about 150 B.C.; the lower limit, which I should regard as definitively fixed, falls not far from 100 B.C.; in other terms from the priesthood of Jonathan (160-142 B.C.) to the reign of Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 B.C.).<sup>20</sup>

Cross further argues that the archaeological evidence fixes the founding of the community “no earlier than the reign of Simon [the Hasmonean] (142-134 B.C.), no later...than the reign of John Hyrcanus I (134-104 B.C.).”<sup>21</sup> In other words, the paleographical and the archaeological evidence for the founding of Qumran coincide.

Cross then turns to the textual evidence. For Cross, the historical allusions in the Scrolls point to events in the reigns of the Hasmonean kings. He traces the beginnings of the community to the reigns of Jonathan or Simon under the leadership of the Teacher of Righteousness, a disaffected Zadokite priest. Cross’s unique contribution to the early history of the community is his identification of the Wicked Priest with Simon, rather than the more common Jonathan.

Cross based his identification of Simon as the Wicked Priest on the quotation from the *Psalms of Joshua* in 4QTestimonia:

Cursed before the Lord be the man that rises up and rebuilds this city [ ]. At the cost of his first born shall he lay its foundation, and at the cost of his youngest son shall he set up its gates...and behold an accursed man, a son of Belial shall come to power to be a trapper’s snare to his people and a ruin to all his neighbors...the two of them shall become violent instruments, and they shall rebuild the [city?]...and set up a wall and towers for it to make a stronghold of wickedness[ ]...horrors in Ephraim and Judah[ ]...[and they shall] commit sacrilege in the land...[bl]ood like water [shall flow?] on the battlements of the daughter of Zion and in the district of Jerusalem.<sup>22</sup>

Cross applies this passage to the murder of Simon and his eldest and youngest sons at the hands of his son-in-law Ptolemy in Jericho, and the subsequent attack by Antiochus VII Sidetes upon Judea.<sup>23</sup> This identification, however, did not gain wide acceptance, one reason being that the title

<sup>20</sup> Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 90.

<sup>21</sup> Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 91.

<sup>22</sup> As translated by Cross in *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 112-13.

<sup>23</sup> Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 113.

“Wicked Priest” does not appear in the 4QTestimonia passage.<sup>24</sup> Otherwise Cross’s historical reconstruction follows along the lines proposed by Józef Milik, Geza Vermes, and others of the first generation.<sup>25</sup>

The other central figure in American Dead Sea Scrolls studies, John Strugnell, arrived at Harvard via the scrollerly in Jerusalem. Educated at Oxford, he was appointed at the young age of 24 as a British representative to the international editorial team. He became, along with Józef Milik, an expert in the previously unknown Hebrew texts, which make up the majority of the Qumran collection. After spending several years in Jerusalem working on editing scrolls he was invited to teach in the United States. First he taught at the Oriental Institute of Chicago and Duke University and then came to Harvard Divinity School in 1967 as Professor of New Testament and Christian Origins and, together with Cross, trained the next generation of American Dead Sea Scrolls scholars.

Since Strugnell was not as widely published as Cross, his support of the Essene identification of the Qumran community and his understanding of its history is not as well documented. However, his publications give some evidence of his general support of the Essene identification and the accepted outlines of the community’s history. In 1958, in an article in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, he wrote, “We must now take the identification of the Qumranites and the Essenes as proved.”<sup>26</sup> Over forty years later, in a short article, remarking on what he calls “the main outlines of Qumranological ‘orthodoxy’” as defined by Vermes, Milik, Cross, and de Vaux, he says, “I have not yet seen adequate reasons for abandoning them to follow after more recent heresiarchs” (one recognizes Strugnell’s characteristic cadences in that quote!).<sup>27</sup> However, one is also struck, on reading through his publications, especially those of a later date, on the caution of his language. For example, he prefers the terms “Qumranite,” “Qumranian,” “Qumran sect,” or “sectarian,” to “Essene.”<sup>28</sup> By the end of his career, he clearly preferred to avoid the term “Essene” and to make no assumptions concerning

<sup>24</sup> Milik, *Ten Years*, 61-64; Sidnie White Crawford, “Simon (Hasmonean),” in Schiffman and VanderKam, *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:876-877.

<sup>25</sup> Milik, *Ten Years*; Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (rev. ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977).

<sup>26</sup> John Strugnell, “Flavius Josephus and the Essenes: *Antiquities* XVIII, 18-22,” *JBL* 77 (1958): 107.

<sup>27</sup> John Strugnell, “Qumranology Then and Now,” *NEA* 63 (2000): 175.

<sup>28</sup> See, for example, his article “Moses-Pseudepigrapha at Qumran: 4Q375, 4Q376, and Similar Works,” in Lawrence H. Schiffman, ed., *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 221-56.

the identity of such figures as the Teacher of Righteousness or the Wicked Priest. He states in 2000,

The principle remaining question here is whether these code names, these mysterious epithets, such as ‘The Teacher of Righteousness’ and ‘The Wicked Priest,’ remained constant in their meaning (thus always referring to the events of the period of the sect’s beginnings, 150-120 BCE), or whether they were reused and reapplied to other persons and events of later times (e.g. the time of Alexander Janneus). I am of the second opinion, but in that case such floating reutilizations of these epithets will make identifying all these historical persons and events with certainty unattainable.<sup>29</sup>

Strugnell was always willing to question the established orthodoxies of Dead Sea Scrolls studies, and welcomed change and nuance as part of the progress of scholarship. Here he is, for example, questioning his own earlier statements about *Miqṣat Ma’āse ha-Torah* (4QMMT) and the absolute differentiation usually made between Essene and Sadducee:

Whether we can advance to a conclusion that the writers of MMT, and perhaps also their Qumrânite descendants, should be called Sadducees at *juxta modum*, is too long a question to be handled here. In antiquity historians used the titles Sadducee, Hasid, and also Essene in a changing and fluid way. When we limit ourselves to the legal evidence, it is hard to separate this new corpus of law in MMT from that of some of the later Sadducees. It is also hard to separate it from the law of other texts related to the early Qumrân sect or its predecessors. One should not forget that, in the early days of the study of the Qumrân sect, several scholars ascribed their texts to the Sadducees, rather than to the Essenes, and vainly tried to draw attention to the fact that the sect’s self-appellation בני צדוק really was the same as “Zadokite” or “Sadducee.” Perhaps that part of their argument deserves to be revived.<sup>30</sup>

In conclusion, however, it should be clear that Strugnell, like Cross, supported the Qumran-Essene hypothesis throughout his career, and passed that support on to his students, who make up the majority of the next generation of American Qumran scholars.

<sup>29</sup> Strugnell, “Qumranology Then and Now,” 175.

<sup>30</sup> John Strugnell, “MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition,” in James C. VanderKam and Eugene C. Ulrich, eds., *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1994), 65.

*The Next Generation: 1970s-1990s*

As the field of Dead Sea Scrolls studies widened in the 1970s and 80s, several American scholars took up the legacy of Cross and Strugnell, and turned their attention to the identification and history of the community. Some of the major names from this period are those of James VanderKam, John Collins, George Nickelsburg, all students of Cross and/or Strugnell, and Lawrence Schiffman. There were also two radically alternative theories proposed by the American scholars Robert Eisenman and Norman Golb.

James VanderKam has been the most vocal proponent of the Qumran-Essene hypothesis and its accompanying historical reconstruction on the American scene. In his widely read introduction to the Scrolls, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, VanderKam develops a case for the Essene hypothesis, assessing the evidence of the Scrolls, the archaeology of Qumran, and the classical sources. He concludes, "enough evidence has been assembled to show that the Scrolls reflect a series of beliefs and practices which the ancient sources (especially Josephus) characterize as Essene."<sup>31</sup> In a later volume of synthesis (co-authored with Peter Flint) he writes, "When all is said and done, the Essene hypothesis is consistent with the evidence and provides the most economical explanation."<sup>32</sup> Finally, in an assessment of the state of scholarship on the question in 1999, he states, "In sum...the Essene identification remains the dominant one today...It is fair to say, on the basis of the data presented above combined with the two traditional pillars of the theory, that this view has the largest amount of evidence in its favor."<sup>33</sup> VanderKam does acknowledge that the evidence of the Scrolls and the archaeology of Qumran do not always match perfectly with what the classical sources have to say about the Essenes. In *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, for example, he outlines several areas of disagreement between the Qumran evidence and the classical sources, including entry procedures and marriage.<sup>34</sup> However, he continues to hold that "Incomplete coverage in one or the other is not...a counterargument to identifying the people of Qumran as a branch of the Essenes."<sup>35</sup> It is important to note the nuance of that identification, Qumran as a *branch* of the Essenes. One important devel-

<sup>31</sup> VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 87.

<sup>32</sup> James C. VanderKam and Peter W. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: HarperCollins, 2002), 254.

<sup>33</sup> James C. VanderKam, "Identity and History of the Community," in Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:500.

<sup>34</sup> VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 87-91.

<sup>35</sup> VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 250.

opment in the Qumran-Essene hypothesis, reflected here in VanderKam's quotation, is the abandonment of the absolute identification of the Essenes with the Qumran community and only the Qumran community; rather an acknowledgement of the differences between the Scrolls and the classical sources gave rise to the idea that Qumran was a "branch," "subset," or "offshoot" of a wider Essene movement.<sup>36</sup>

VanderKam also champions the most widely accepted general outline of the history of the community. According to him, the community arose in the middle of the second century BCE, led by the Teacher of Righteousness. VanderKam identifies Jonathan as the Wicked Priest, the major opponent of the Teacher of Righteousness. The community arrived at Qumran c. 100 BCE and remained there (with a short period of abandonment) until its destruction (by the Romans) in the late first century CE.<sup>37</sup>

VanderKam's position is also held by John Collins and George Nickelsburg. Concerning the Qumran-Essene identification, Collins states, "The discrepancies between the Greek sources and the Scrolls, significant though they are, are outweighed by the similarities. The correspondence of geographic location and the extensive similarity of community structure make overwhelmingly probable the identification of Qumran...as 'Essene'."<sup>38</sup> And in a later publication he says, "I think the Essene identification is highly probable."<sup>39</sup>

George Nickelsburg is another well-known proponent of the Qumran-Essene hypothesis. In his influential 1981 book *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah*, Nickelsburg writes,

The Scrolls were the property of members of the Essene sect, one of four "philosophies" or religious groups mentioned by Josephus...

Khirbet Qumran was the community center for at least one group of these Essenes, who retreated to the desert, fleeing what they considered to be the pollution of Jerusalem and awaiting the coming of God and the dawn of a new age. Their archenemies were the Hasmoneans, personified in "the Wicked Priest," who is probably to be identified with either Jonathan or Si-

---

<sup>36</sup> E.g., from VanderKam: "The community that eventually settled at Qumran...was only a small part of the larger Essene persuasion whose origins can perhaps be traced to a reform movement in the early second century B.C.E.," "Identity and History of the Community," 527.

<sup>37</sup> VanderKam, "Identity and History of the Community," 527-31.

<sup>38</sup> John J. Collins, "Essenes," in David Noel Freedman, ed., *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York: Doubleday, 1990), 2:619-26.

<sup>39</sup> John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 7.

mon. The founder and early leader of the sect was a high priest known in the Scrolls as the Teacher of Righteousness.<sup>40</sup>

It is interesting to trace the growing complexity of scholarship concerning Qumran origins and history by comparing that statement with one from the same section of the 2005 revision of Nickelsburg's *Jewish Literature*:

Early in scrolls research, a consensus began to emerge about the *identity* of the Qumranites. They were Essenes, a Jewish group whose beliefs and practices were described by the first-century Jewish authors Philo and Josephus, and whose location near the Dead Sea was attested by the Roman author Pliny the Elder. Although this theory still commands the assent of a majority of scholars, it has been challenged in recent years...

Even if the Essene identity of the Qumranites is accepted, questions remain as to the origins and history of the group... The Qumranites were part of a substantial reform movement in second-century Judaism. Equally uncertain and disputed are the details of the sect's history. The Qumranites were only one group of Essenes.<sup>41</sup>

One reason for Nickelsburg's more nuanced position in 2005 is the influential arguments of Lawrence Schiffman, who proposed a revision of the Qumran-Essene hypothesis that has gained widespread acceptance. Schiffman, an expert in the Qumran legal texts,<sup>42</sup> based his revision of the accepted reconstruction of Qumran origins on the document known as *Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (4QMMT).<sup>43</sup> Even before its publication in 1994, Schiffman noted that the legal disputes outlined in 4QMMT indicate that the opponents of the sect were Pharisees, while the positions espoused by the sect are attributed in rabbinic literature to the Sadducees.<sup>44</sup> This observation leads Schiffman to several conclusions. First, any theory of origins among the Hasidim or the Pharisees must be abandoned.<sup>45</sup> Second, "the dominant Essene hypothesis, if it is to be maintained, would require radical reorientation. It would be necessary to assume that the term Essene came

<sup>40</sup> George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981); 2d ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 122-3.

<sup>41</sup> Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 2d ed., 121.

<sup>42</sup> Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 1975); *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code* (BJS 33; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983).

<sup>43</sup> Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (DJD X; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).

<sup>44</sup> Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect," in Zdzislaw J. Kapera, ed., *Qumranica Mogilanensia* (Mogilany: Enigma Press, 1989), 2:67.

<sup>45</sup> Schiffman, "The New Halakhic Letter," 69.

to designate the originally Sadducean sectarians who had gone through the process of radicalization and were now a distinct sect in the sense we know it from the sectarian documents.”<sup>46</sup> Finally, “henceforth, any theory of sectarian origins must place the earliest, pre-teacher stage in the offshoots of intra-priestly contention, and must reckon with the Sadducean views of those who formed the sect.”<sup>47</sup> In a later publication, Schiffman spells out his view in more detail:

The earliest members of the sect must have been Sadducees unwilling to accept the status quo established in the aftermath of the Maccabean revolt... Even after leaving Jerusalem, the Dead Sea sect continued to refer to itself or its leaders as the “sons of Zadok.” Our text [4QMMT] makes clear that the designation “Sons of Zadok” is to be taken at face value. These were indeed Sadducees who protested the imposition of Pharisaic views in the Temple under the Hasmonaean priests.<sup>48</sup>

Concerning the Essene identification, he writes:

The dominant Essene hypothesis, if it is to be maintained at all, requires radical reorientation. Those holding this theory must now argue that the term “Essene” came to designate the originally Sadducean sectarians who had gone through a process of radicalization until they became a distinct sect. Alternatively, they must broaden their understanding of the term to include a wide variety of similar groups, of which the Dead Sea sect might be one.<sup>49</sup>

Schiffman’s arguments have proved extremely compelling, and have prompted most American scholars to accept some version of the view that the Qumran sect had some relationship to the Zadokites/Sadducees and that one extremely important component of their ideology was their legal tradition. For example, VanderKam and Flint, strong supporters of the Essene identification, acknowledge:

It is true that one can find legal points in the scrolls that agree with those attributed elsewhere to the Sadducees... Moreover, the scrolls refer a number of times to Zadokite priests as leaders in the community and the name *Zadok* may underlie the name *Sadducee*... The fact that the Qumranites and the Sadducees agreed on some important *legal* views means... that they be-

---

<sup>46</sup> Schiffman, “The New Halakhic Letter,” 69.

<sup>47</sup> Schiffman, “The New Halakhic Letter,” 70.

<sup>48</sup> Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia and Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 87-88.

<sup>49</sup> Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 89.



longed to a similar legal tradition, apparently one noted for its literal and strict reading of the Torah.<sup>50</sup>

Two radical alternatives to the Qumran-Essene hypothesis were proposed in this period by the American scholars Norman Golb and Robert Eisenman. Golb has argued forcefully in a series of publications, most notably *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?*, that Sukenik's initial identification of the Dead Sea sect as Essene, and de Vaux's subsequent identification of Qumran as the Essene settlement described by Pliny, were incorrect and, further, that their errors became mutually reinforcing. Rather, Golb advocates a complete separation of the archaeology of Qumran and the evidence of the manuscripts. He concludes, first, that Qumran was a Jewish fortress destroyed by the Romans in the First Revolt.<sup>51</sup> Second, he believes that the Qumran manuscripts originated in Jerusalem, and were hidden in the caves of Qumran during the first century CE.<sup>52</sup> While Golb raises good critical questions concerning the Qumran-Essene hypothesis, his own theory is flawed and has been convincingly refuted.<sup>53</sup>

Robert Eisenman completely rejected the Essene identification in favor of a Zadokite/Zealot identity that links Qumran with Judah the Maccabee and his followers, through the opponents of Herod and the Zealot resistance against Rome, culminating in the early Christian community in Jerusalem under James the brother of Jesus.<sup>54</sup> Eisenman's theories are highly speculative and have not gained any adherents.

### *The Present*

In recent years, John Collins, whose early views were presented above, has thoroughly critiqued the Qumran-Essene hypothesis.<sup>55</sup> Collins proposes a new reconstruction of the origins and history of the sect, based on a close reading of the sectarian scrolls, especially the *Damascus Document*, the

<sup>50</sup> VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 251.

<sup>51</sup> Norman H. Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* (New York: Scribner, 1995), 3-41.

<sup>52</sup> Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?*, 143.

<sup>53</sup> See, for example, VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 95-97, and Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 73-104.

<sup>54</sup> Robert Eisenman, *Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 1983); *James the Brother of Jesus: The Key to Unlocking the Secrets of Early Christianity and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London and New York: Penguin Books, 1997).

<sup>55</sup> John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids-Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010).

*Community Rule*, 4QMMT, and the *Pesharim*. He makes a firm distinction between the *Damascus Document* and the *Community Rule*, arguing that, although the two works are related, they reflect different community structures. The community of the *Damascus Document*, which he refers to as the “New Covenant,” is

A movement dedicated to the strict observance of the Torah of Moses, which lends urgency to its observance by the expectation of an eschatological judgment. It is a family-based movement, but it is also an organized community that makes extensive demands on its members, and to a great degree undercuts the authority of the paterfamilias. It restricts relations with the outside world, but has not withdrawn to anything resembling a monastic way of life. Marriage is the norm, although it is regulated and restricted.<sup>56</sup>

The *Community Rule*, on the other hand, legislates for a community (referred to by Collins by the Hebrew term *Yahad* [יחד]) with a greater cohesiveness and tighter community structures than the *Damascus Document* community.<sup>57</sup> Where he departs from the traditional interpretation of the *Community Rule* is in his argument that the *Rule* did not simply legislate for the group that resided at Qumran (although he believes that Qumran was a settlement of the *Yahad*<sup>58</sup>). Instead, the *Rule* assumes that the *Yahad* had multiple places of residence, and legislates for several communities of variable size.<sup>59</sup> In fact, according to Collins,

The view that that (*sic*) the *yahad* was an association dispersed in multiple settlements may also explain why different editions of the *Serek* continued to be copied, and why the more primitive form found in 4QS<sup>d</sup> was not simply superseded by the more developed edition found in 1QS...Some [editions of S] may have been brought [to Qumran] from different settlements of the *yahad*, which may have been operating with different editions of the *Community Rule*.<sup>60</sup>

The purpose of the *Yahad* is to seek the perfection of holiness by its scrupulous observance of the law, but the thought of the *Yahad* is also laced with mystical and apocalyptic elements.

Collins also takes up the arguments concerning the origin and history of the sectarian movement. He rejects the consensus of earlier scholars that the movement originated in the second century BCE in a dispute over the high

<sup>56</sup> Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 51.

<sup>57</sup> Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 54.

<sup>58</sup> Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 208.

<sup>59</sup> Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 67, 69.

<sup>60</sup> Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 68.

priesthood.<sup>61</sup> Rather, he agrees with Schiffman that the intellectual origins of the sect are found in disputes over correct legal interpretations, and that the sect opposed Pharisaic teachings.<sup>62</sup> He places the origins of the sect in the late second century BCE, and the founding of Qumran, based on the archaeological evidence, to c. 100 BCE. However, he radically revises the historical reconstruction that placed the Teacher of Righteousness's dispute with the Wicked Priest at the beginning of both the sect's history and the Teacher's career. Instead, he argues that the identity of the Wicked Priest, and thus the date of the conflict with the Teacher, must be sought in the legal differences that are at the heart of the sect's self-definition. According to this criterion, the High Priest who best fits the description of the Wicked Priest found in the *Pesharim* is Hyrcanus II, who, beginning in the reign of his mother Salome Alexandra (76-67 BCE), probably adhered to Pharisaic halakhah.<sup>63</sup> If the identification of Hyrcanus II as the Wicked Priest is accepted, that places the dispute with the Teacher in the mid-first century BCE, towards the end of the Teacher's career. Thus Collins, while adhering to the main outlines of the Qumran-Essene hypothesis, proposes major revisions to its details.

Younger American scholars have also proposed revisions to the Qumran-Essene hypothesis that have similarities to those of Collins. Michael Wise would also place the career of the Teacher of Righteousness in the first century BCE.<sup>64</sup> However, he goes much further than Collins by divorcing the evidence of the Scrolls from the archaeological evidence from Qumran and denying the connection of the sect to Qumran. He then locates the origins of the sect to the assumption of the High Priesthood by Hyrcanus II in 76 BCE. Further, he argues that the sect was short-lived, disappearing in the late first century BCE: "the Teacher's movement was a phenomenon essentially confined to the first century BCE."<sup>65</sup>

Up until very recently, the only method used to investigate the question of the identity and history of the Qumran community, no matter what conclusion individual scholars have reached, has been that of historical criticism. The evidence of the Scrolls themselves, the archaeology of Qumran, other Jewish literature of the period, and the classical sources

<sup>61</sup> Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 96.

<sup>62</sup> Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 121.

<sup>63</sup> Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 112-16, 120.

<sup>64</sup> Michael O. Wise, "Dating the Teacher of Righteousness and the *Floruit* of His Movement," *JBL* 122 (2003): 53-87; "The Origins and History of the Teacher's Movement," in Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 92-122.

<sup>65</sup> Wise, "The Origins and History of the Teacher's Movement," 118.

have been marshaled to support either the Qumran-Essene hypothesis or an alternative. This method remains most common in American Qumran scholarship, as the students of Cross and Strugnell, and now their students, remain active in the field. However, often scholars now concentrate on one aspect of the historical picture, as the amount of data that must be controlled has grown exponentially. For example, Jodi Magness is a stalwart champion of the Qumran-Essene hypothesis, working primarily with the archaeological data and secondarily with the texts.<sup>66</sup> Scholars have also begun to put more and more emphasis on Qumran and its manuscripts as integral components of the wider Second Temple Jewish world. Qumran is no longer treated as an isolated and peculiar phenomenon, but as one alternative among several in the Judaism of this period.<sup>67</sup> This is as it should be, as it moves Qumran scholarship out of its perceived “ghetto” and into the mainstream of Second Temple studies.

Other methods have also begun to appear, for example that of Carol Newsom, a student of Strugnell’s. She uses socio-rhetorical and discourse analysis to study the major texts at Qumran, not so much asking the questions of *when* these texts were written or *who* wrote them, as *how* they functioned in the community.<sup>68</sup> Maxine Grossman uses the discipline of literary criticism to propose an alternative to the purely historical approach.<sup>69</sup> Alison Schofield utilizes a “radial-dialogic” model from social-scientific criticism to investigate the *Community Rule*, and suggests that the Yahad was not one community, but many smaller settlements, for which Qumran may have played a special role.<sup>70</sup> Although these alternative methods will never replace the historical method, they demonstrate new and enlightening angles from which to view the Qumran community and its documents.

---

<sup>66</sup> Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran*.

<sup>67</sup> See, for example, Benjamin G. Wright and Lawrence M. Wills, eds., *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (SBL Symposium Series; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), in which the Qumran texts are treated simply as evidence for Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic in ancient Judaism (including early Christianity).

<sup>68</sup> Carol Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ; Leiden: Brill, 2004).

<sup>69</sup> Maxine Grossman, *Reading for History in the Damascus Document: A Methodological Study* (STDJ; Leiden: Brill, 2002).

<sup>70</sup> Alison Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad* (STDJ 77; Leiden: Brill, 2009).



## RESEARCH ON THE SECTARIAN SCROLLS IN NORTH AMERICA

EILEEN M. SCHULLER

In this essay I will examine the contribution of North American scholars to research on a select number of compositions from the Dead Sea Scrolls that are commonly designated as “sectarian texts.” Without pausing overly long on establishing an exact definition of what should be included in that category, suffice it to say that from the early years of Scrolls study, scholars have agreed that there is a corpus of texts that share certain distinctive theological emphases and vocabulary and reflect the social organization of a specific group within Second Temple Judaism.<sup>1</sup> Central texts are the *Community Rule*, the *Rule of the Congregation*, the *Rule of Blessings*, the *Thanksgiving Psalms*, the *Pesharim*, and the *War Texts*.<sup>2</sup> The provenance and authorship of many of the prayer and hymnic works in the Scrolls is difficult to determine and only a short discussion of a few texts of this genre is included. No attempt has been made to cover every short and poorly preserved composition that might possibly be sectarian, nor compositions whose origin and categorization are still a matter of much dispute.<sup>3</sup>

Before turning to individual sectarian works, let me say a few words about the translations of these documents that are in common use in North

---

<sup>1</sup> There is an extensive bibliography on the terminology and identification of “sectarian/non-sectarian” works. The criteria and the list formulated by Devorah Dimant over ten years ago have been especially influential; “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” in Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman, eds., *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness* (STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23-58. For a very careful and nuanced consideration of what it means to call a text “sectarian,” see Carol Newsom, “‘Sectually-Explicit’ Literature from Qumran,” in William H. Propp, Baruch Halpern and David N. Freedman, *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167-88.

<sup>2</sup> Some works that are generally considered as sectarian or closely related, the *Damascus Document*, collections of legal rulings, the *Temple Scroll* and *Miqsat Ma’ase ha-Torah*, are discussed in the chapter “American Scholarship on Jewish Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls” in this volume.

<sup>3</sup> For instance, not included is the *Copper Scroll* from cave 3. For the wisdom texts, especially *Instruction*, I have followed the judgment of the editors: “on the grounds of its thought and language it cannot be considered a product of the Qumran community itself.” See John Strugnell, Daniel J. Harrington in John Strugnell, Daniel J. Harrington and Torleif Elgvin, in consultation with Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: 4QInstruction (Musar leMevin): 4Q415 ff.* (DJD XXXIV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 36.

America.<sup>4</sup> Over the years probably the most widely used translation has been that of Geza Vermes from England (in various editions, 1962 to 1997).<sup>5</sup> But well before that, already in 1956, Theodor Gaster published a translation of the texts then available, *The Dead Scriptures*;<sup>6</sup> precisely because the purpose was “to reproduce the original in idiomatic English,” his translation was exceptionally readable and has continued to hold a place alongside more literal versions. More comprehensive, obviously, was the new translation that was made after the entire corpus became accessible, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* by Michael Wise, Martin Abegg and Edward Cook.<sup>7</sup> The multi-volume Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project, launched in 1985 and still ongoing under the editorship of James Charlesworth, aims to present an improved critical text with a translation “as literal as good English will allow;”<sup>8</sup> most of the volumes with the major sectarian texts are now available (the *Hodayot* volume is in preparation). A number of Canadian scholars in Quebec, under the leadership of Jean Duhaime, are currently participating in the French translation project of *la Bibliothèque de Qumrân*; their contribution will be to the volumes on *Nevi'im*, specifically treating the *Pesharim*.<sup>9</sup> Somewhat surprisingly, no pointed Hebrew text, comparable to Lohse in German or Habermann in Hebrew, has been produced in North America.

North American scholars have been active participants in the publication and research on the sectarian Scrolls from the earliest years up until the present.<sup>10</sup> By happy chance three Americans, Millar Burrows, William Hugh Brownlee and John Trever, were in residence at the American School in

<sup>4</sup> American scholars have also been involved in a number of shared projects; note especially the collaboration of Donald Parry with Emanuel Tov as editors of *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader* (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

<sup>5</sup> Most recent edition, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Penguin Books, 1998).

<sup>6</sup> Theodor H. Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scriptures* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1956), revisions in 1964 and 1976.

<sup>7</sup> Michael Wise, Martin Abegg, Edward Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls, A New Translation* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996, 2005).

<sup>8</sup> James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (PTS-DDP 1; Tübingen-Louisville: Mohr Siebeck-John Knox, 1994), xiii.

<sup>9</sup> Katell Berthelot, Thierry Legrand, and André Paul, *Écrits prophétiques* (La Bibliothèque de Qumrân 4-5; Paris: Cerf, forthcoming).

<sup>10</sup> As “North American,” are included scholars who have taught and/or published their key works while living in the United States or Canada, whatever their citizenship or birth. I have been able to find very limited information on Scrolls scholarship in Mexico; Florentino García Martínez called my attention to a translation of the main documents (Pedro Gringoire, *Los rollos del Qumrân*, Edamex, Mexico D.F., 1979 and repeatedly re-published); there have been some translations of European books into Spanish and published in Mexico (the translation of Kurt Schubert, *La Comunidad del Mar Muerto* [Mexico: Uthea, 1961]).

Jerusalem in February, 1948, when the monks from St. Mark's monastery showed up at their door with scrolls that the Bedouin had recovered from a cave near the Dead Sea. By early March 1948, William F. Albright at John Hopkins University received copies of the first photographs taken by Trever and shared them with his graduate students, including Frank Moore Cross, David Noel Freedman, and Samuel Iwry. Thus, from very early on, a core group of North American scholars were intimately involved with what was happening in Jerusalem and the first readings of some of the major sectarian scrolls from cave 1.

### *The Community Rule*

The composition that is officially designated as the *Community Rule* (a title already applied to it by Eliezer Sukenik in 1950<sup>11</sup>) was better known throughout the first decades in North America as the *Manual of Discipline*.<sup>12</sup> In 1951, the plates and a transcription were published by Millar Burrows with John Trever and William Brownlee under the auspices of ASOR.<sup>13</sup> Although Burrows wrote the first articles on the scroll, it fell to Brownlee to publish the first translation along with brief notes and thirteen short appendices.<sup>14</sup> The color photographs that John Trever had taken were published in 1972 jointly by ASOR and the Shrine of the Book, and a student edition (without color) in 1974.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Eliezer L. Sukenik, *Megillot Genuzot: Scrolls Stored in an Ancient Geniza Found in the Judean Desert, Second Survey* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1950), 27 (Hebrew). He acknowledges that the suggestion for this title came from Hanoch Yalon.

<sup>12</sup> Millar Burrows takes credit for the nomenclature, explaining that "the title ... came to my mind when I first read the text in Jerusalem in March 1948. Noting the combination of liturgical directions with rules concerning procedure in the meetings of the group and the personal conduct of the members, I was reminded of the manual of discipline of the Methodist Church", *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking Press, 1955). Brownlee, in his 1951 translation and commentary (see note 14), explains, "The ... title (to be presented by the letters DSD) has been adopted by the American Schools of Oriental Research because of its appropriateness to characterize much of the scrolls' contents, when 'discipline' is construed broadly as in the Methodist 'Book of Discipline'" (note 1 to col. 1, line 1).

<sup>13</sup> Millar Burrows with John C. Trever and William H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, Vol. II, Fasc. 2, Plates and Transcription of the Manual of Discipline* (New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951).

<sup>14</sup> William H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline, Translation and Notes* (New Haven: BASORSup 10-12, 1951).

<sup>15</sup> *Scrolls from Qumrān Cave I: The Great Isaiah Scroll, the Order of the Community, the Peshet to Habakkuk from photographs by John C. Trever* (Jerusalem: The Albright Institute of Archaeological Research and the Shrine of the Book, 1972, 1974).



This text immediately attracted great interest. William Foxwell Albright judged it “unquestionably the most valuable of all the scrolls yet known from the standpoint of history;”<sup>16</sup> Frank Moore Cross stated, “The Order of the Community and its adjuncts is perhaps the most important sectarian work found at Qumrân.”<sup>17</sup> Surprisingly, there has been no book-length commentary or detailed study written by a North American scholar (Albright alludes to an “official commentary” that was to be written by Leonard Rost but it never appeared<sup>18</sup>). The scroll was discussed, however, at considerable length by both Burrows and Cross in their more popular works that became standard introductions to the Dead Sea Scrolls in North American colleges, seminaries and churches.<sup>19</sup> From this scroll could be gathered the fullest and clearest information about the structural organization and regulations of the sect, the disciplinary code by which members lived and were punished, the theological foundation as laid out in the “Two Spirits Discourse” (cols. III-IV), the entrance ceremony by which members joined (cols. I-II), and a psalmic expression of their piety (cols. X-XI). It was this scroll that really established the link with the Essenes both among scholars and for the general public.<sup>20</sup> Above all, the absence of any mention of women, marriage and family (except for metaphorical phrases such as the “son of your handmaid”) supported the identification of its authors with the non-marrying Essenes of Josephus (while the *Damascus Document* could be linked with the marrying Essenes because it mentions families). This aspect of the *Community Rule* was explored in great detail in the thesis of Todd Beall (a student of Joseph Fitzmyer at Catholic University of America) who laid out twenty-six parallels between Josephus and Qumran (most of them specifically from the *Community Rule*), plus twenty-one probable parallels.<sup>21</sup> A few Jewish scholars such as Saul Lieberman saw links between

<sup>16</sup> William F. Albright, “Current and Forthcoming Publications of the Scrolls,” *BASOR* 119 (1950): 4.

<sup>17</sup> Frank M. Cross, “Introduction,” *Scrolls from Qumrân Cave 1*, 4.

<sup>18</sup> William F. Albright, “Editorial Announcement” at the beginning of the *BASOR* issue with Brownlee’s translation and notes; see Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline*.

<sup>19</sup> Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1955); *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1958). Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*; this latter was based on the Haskell Lectures given in 1957 at Oberlin College; there was a second edition in 1961 and a third and revised edition in 1995. Although the introduction to the Scrolls by Milik, *Dix ans* was translated by John Strugnell into English as *Ten Years* it never achieved comparable popularity in North America.

<sup>20</sup> For example, the official announcement of ASOR about the discovery (*The Times*, April 12, 1948) in its list of the scrolls stated, “another seemed to be a manual of discipline of some comparatively little-known sect or monastic order, possibly the Essenes.”

<sup>21</sup> Todd S. Beall, *Josephus’ Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SNTS 58; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

the structures of communal organization in the *Community Rule* and the *haverim* of the rabbis.<sup>22</sup> In contrast to the direction taken by much European scholarship, in the early years surprisingly little work was done on the American scene in attempting to reconstruct literary and compositional layers; rather attention was paid to the more “theological” sections of the *Community Rule*, especially the “Two Spirits Discourse,” 1QS III, 13-IV, 14, which was analyzed in detail, often in comparison with the theology and vocabulary of the Gospel of John.<sup>23</sup>

Work on the *Community Rule* took on a new life when the cave 4 copies (4Q255-4Q264) were fully published.<sup>24</sup> Sarianna Metso, in studies begun in Germany and England and pursued since her move to North America, proposed a comprehensive hypothesis to explain the redactional history of this document;<sup>25</sup> she argues that although some copies (4QS<sup>b-d</sup> and 4QS<sup>e</sup>) are to be dated paleographically as later than 1QS, these manuscripts preserve versions that are actually earlier than that found in 1QS. This would mean that biblical quotations (lacking in 4Q copies and present in 1QS) were added secondarily, and that there was a transition from the lay leadership of “the *rabbim*” (4QS<sup>b,d</sup>) to a priestly dominance in which the community was governed “according to the sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant and to the multitude of the men of the community ...” (1QS V, 2-3). Other North American scholars, such as Paul Garnet and Charlesworth/Strawn, have favored the alternate proposal for recensional development that was laid out in DJD XXVI by the editors, Philip Alexander and Geza Vermes, which gives priority to the paleographical dating of the copies and sees 1QS as a longer and earlier version, and 4QS<sup>b</sup> and 4QS<sup>d</sup> as shortened texts. According to this reconstruction, the strength of the Zadokite priesthood weakened in favor of lay leadership over the course

<sup>22</sup> Saul Liebermann, “The Discipline in the So-Called Dead Sea Manual of Discipline,” *JBL* 71 (1952): 199-206. For discussions of this issue see the articles by Alex Jassen and by Aharon Shemesh in this volume.

<sup>23</sup> For example, Dale C. Allison, “The Authorship of 1QS III,13-IV, 14,” *RevQ* 10 (1979-1981): 257-68; James H. Charlesworth, “A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in 1QS II:13-IV:26 and the Dualism Contained in the Gospel of John,” in James H. Charlesworth, ed., *John and Qumran* (London: Chapman, 1972), 76-106; Jean Duhaime, “L’instruction sur les deux esprits et les interpolations dualistes à Qumrân,” *RB* 84 (1977): 566-94.

<sup>24</sup> Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.XIX: 4Q<sup>Serekh</sup> Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (DJD XXVI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

<sup>25</sup> Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997); *The Serekh Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 9; London: T&T Clark, 2007).

of time.<sup>26</sup> Recently Alison Schofield has attempted still another explanation for the complicated textual development of S that does not focus solely on chronological development but emphasizes a number of traditions diverging from early common roots outside of a single “Qumran scribal school.”<sup>27</sup> Sarianna Metso continues to write extensively on the *Community Rule* and she has recently turned her attention to the formation of the legal traditions and to fundamental questions about the relationship between historical reality and literary representations of that reality.<sup>28</sup> Certainly discussion of this important and complex document continues to be lively on the North American scene.

*The Rule of the Congregation (1QSa) and the Rule of Blessings (1QSB)*

These two compositions were written on sheets that had originally been stitched to the 1QS scroll, but because they became separated from the main part of the scroll, were recovered from cave 1 by archaeologists, and then passed on to Józef Milik in the Scrollery of the Jerusalem Rockefeller Museum for editing in DJD, they did not attract the same level of attention from American scholars. 1QSa, the *Rule of the Congregation*, was discussed at some length by Cross and Burrows; in addition, a number of early articles focused on establishing links to the New Testament so that particular attention was devoted to the section on the communal meal and the two Messiahs (1QSa II, 11-22). It was an American scholar, Lawrence Schiffman, who wrote the first monograph-length commentary on this short document in 1989; as indicated by the title, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, he emphasized the eschatological thrust of this rule for a community that would be the “messianic mirror” of the present Qumran

<sup>26</sup> Paul Garnet, “Cave 4 MS Parallels to 1QS 5.1-7: Towards a Serekh Text History,” *JSP* 15 (1997): 67-78; James A. Charlesworth and Brent A. Strawn, “Reflections on the Text of Serekh ha-Yahad Found in Cave 4,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 403-35.

<sup>27</sup> Alison Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for The Community Rule* (STDJ 77; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

<sup>28</sup> This has played out in the recent debate between Metso and John Collins about how to understand even the basic term *yahad*. Collins takes 1QS VI 1-8 as a key text describing the ongoing historical reality so that *yahad* is the umbrella term that encompasses multiple small communities of ten; see John J. Collins, “Forms of Community in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in Paul et al., *Emanuel*, 97-111. Metso, in contrast, understands 1QS VI, 1-8 as an interpolation that preserves “an earlier, time-honored set of directions that may not mirror the same circumstances as the surrounding material in 1QS 5-7;” see “Whom does the Term Yahad Identify,” in Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović, eds., *Defining Identities: We, You and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 70; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 84.

community.<sup>29</sup> One passage in 1QSa that attracted particular attention from American scholars is 1QSa I, 11 which is part of an extended description of the various stages in the life of a member: he is to be married at age twenty and then “she will be received/will be accepted to give witness against him (about) the regulations of the law.” In 1957, Joseph Baumgarten, in an influential article, argued that there was “need for a slight emendation,” changing the prefix of the verb from a *taw* to a *yod*, thus making the male sectarian the subject, not his wife;<sup>30</sup> this proposal was adopted and popularized in the translations of Vermes, Gaster and Charlesworth/Stuckenbruck, and reinforced by Schiffman.<sup>31</sup> But already in 1957, Richardson had spoken against emendation,<sup>32</sup> and more recently Schuller and Wassen have attempted to situate this particular passage within a broader discussion of the presence and role of women throughout the Scrolls and the assumptions that influence our readings;<sup>33</sup> at present, there is a shift towards accepting the unemended text speaking about a woman.<sup>34</sup>

The *Rule of Blessings* (1QSa), which is not a rule but a liturgical compilation of blessings to be pronounced over various groups and individuals, has attracted much less attention. Because it is so very fragmentarily preserved, even the basic outline of which groups and persons are to be blessed can be reconstructed in a number of different ways. In contrast to the fourfold

---

<sup>29</sup> Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989). Schiffman’s eschatological emphasis was in contrast to the approach taken by many European scholars who read the text as the oldest of the Essene rules (Milik, Stegemann) or as applying to a different community than the one at Qumran (Davies, Hempel). For a detailed description of Schiffman’s view see the chapter of Alex Jassen in this volume.

<sup>30</sup> Joseph M. Baumgarten, “On the Testimony of Women in 1QSa,” *JBL* 76 (1957): 266-9.

<sup>31</sup> Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, 16-20; see also the discussion in Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 133-5.

<sup>32</sup> H. Neil Richardson, “Some Notes on 1QSa,” *JBL* 76 (1957): 103-22; his rationale was methodological rather than explicitly feminist: “to emend the text of the Qumran documents to make them conform either to Josephus or rabbinic sources seems to this writer to be an erroneous methodology” (119).

<sup>33</sup> Eileen M. Schuller, “Women in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 117-44; Cecilia Wassen, *Women in the Damascus Document* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 181-2.

<sup>34</sup> Joseph Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266-273)* (DJD XVIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 165, reexamined the text and concluded “it now appears possible that no emendation is needed;” Moshe Bernstein continues to emphasize some still-unresolved difficulties with the passage as a whole but assumes that these are to be resolved within the framework of an unemended text, “Women and Children in Legal and Liturgical Texts,” *DSD* 11 (2004): 207-9.

division proposed by Milik in the *editio princeps*,<sup>35</sup> Schiffman's brief discussion in his commentary and also the edition in the Princeton volume have popularized among American readers the eightfold division that was first proposed by Jacob Licht;<sup>36</sup> more recently Abegg proposed a slightly different eightfold division and Baxter a simpler, three-fold structure.<sup>37</sup> The discussion has implications for whether this document can be used as evidence for a dual (priestly and royal) messiahship, that is, whether there is a separate blessing for the future priestly messiah, parallel to the messiah of David.

### *The Pesharim*

American scholars have contributed to aspects of the discussion about sectarian biblical interpretation, particularly to issues of genre and the use of the *pesharim* as a source for reconstructing the history of the community.<sup>38</sup>

The *Pesher of Habakkuk*, a small scroll alternating *lemma* and commentary on the first two chapters of Habakkuk, was among the scrolls photographed by John Trever in February 1948; the plates and a transcription were published by ASOR in 1950.<sup>39</sup> William Brownlee took up the study of this scroll as his special project. Already in 1951, he published a list of thirteen hermeneutical principles or presuppositions of *1QpHab*, somewhat artificially enumerated to correspond to *middot* of Rabbi Ishmael.<sup>40</sup> A few years later, he made an important contribution with a detailed compilation and analysis of all the distinctive readings in the quotations of Habakkuk, even though many of his conclusions have had to be modified as our under-

<sup>35</sup> Józef T. Milik, "Recueil des Bénédiction," in Dominique Barthélemy and Józef T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD I; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 118-29.

<sup>36</sup> Jacob Licht, *The Rule Scroll* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965), 277-89 (Hebrew); Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, 72-76; James H. Charlesworth and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "Blessings (1QSb)," (PTSDDP 1; Tübingen- Louisville: Mohr Siebeck- John Knox, 1994), 119-21.

<sup>37</sup> Martin G. Abegg, "1QSb and the Elusive High Priest," in Paul et al., *Emanuel*, 3-16; Wayne Baxter, "1QSb: Old Division Made New," *RevQ* 21 (2004): 615-30.

<sup>38</sup> See the chapter by Sidnie White-Crawford in this volume.

<sup>39</sup> Millar Burrows, with John C. Trever and William H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, Vol. I, The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary* (New Haven: ASOR, 1950). The *Pesher of Habakkuk* was also included in the printings of photographs by ASOR in 1972 and 1974; see note 13.

<sup>40</sup> William H. Brownlee, "Bible Interpretation among the Scribes of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *BA* 19 (1951): 54-76.

standing of textual development and fluidity has developed; <sup>41</sup> his full commentary, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk*, appeared in 1979.<sup>42</sup> Although Brownlee argued at length for the designation “midrash pesher” especially on the basis of 1QpHab I, 14 where the two terms occur in close proximity, this hybrid combination was never widely adopted. Brownlee’s legacy continued through his student George Brooke who came to the United States from Britain to do his doctoral thesis on 4QFlorilegium, and has continued to explore all aspects of biblical interpretation.<sup>43</sup>

The official publication of the *pesharim* texts from cave 4 was done by John Allegro in DJD V (1968), but indispensable to the ongoing study of these texts is the almost book-length review that John Strugnell prepared a few years later.<sup>44</sup> Although Strugnell is more associated with the *Hodayot* (as will be discussed below), in this review he made significant contributions to the study of the *pesharim*, such as the identification of fragment 5 in 4QpPs<sup>b</sup> as coming from a separate manuscript (219), important comments on the eschatological thrust of *Florilegium* (4Q174) and *Catena* (4Q171), as well as simply correcting many errors and omissions in the *editio princeps*. Much of Strugnell’s work was adopted and made more generally available in the virtual re-edition of all the published *pesharim* by Maurya Horgan for her doctoral thesis under Joseph Fitzmyer at Catholic University (1976).<sup>45</sup>

Throughout much of the 1960s and 1970s, considerable effort was devoted to trying to define “*pesher*” as a genre and to establish where it might fit in the categorization of different types of biblical interpretation. What is interesting is the number of American rabbis who, though not Scrolls specialists, became involved and brought their expertise and the conceptual framework from rabbinic literature to bear on the question (for example,

<sup>41</sup> William H. Brownlee, *The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran* (SBLMS 11; Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1959).

<sup>42</sup> William H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979).

<sup>43</sup> George Brooke’s thesis was published as *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985). See his survey “The Dead Sea Scrolls Scholarship in the United Kingdom” in this volume.

<sup>44</sup> John M. Allegro with A. A. Anderson, *Qumrân Cave 4.I (4Q158-4Q186)* (DJD V; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968); John Strugnell, “Notes en marge du volume V des ‘Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,’” *RevQ* 7 (1969-1971): 163-276.

<sup>45</sup> Maurya P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (CBQMS 8; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of American, 1979). Another student of Fitzmyer, Paul J. Kobelski, in a volume in the same series, *Melchizedek and Melchiresa* (CBQMS 10; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of American, 1981) included a major re-edition of the 11QMelchizedek Scroll.

Silberman, Finkel, Slomovic<sup>46</sup>); this discussion still continues with Steven Fraade and Moshe Bernstein taking up the question anew and bringing in parallels and contrasts in rabbinic forms of interpretation.<sup>47</sup>

In addition to genre, an ongoing question has been to what extent and how the *peshtarim* can be used to reconstruct the history of the Qumran community. Most American scholars have followed the “consensus” view that *Pesher Habakkuk* and a few other texts (*Testimonia*) can be mined for historical data to identify the Wicked Priest as Jonathan Maccabees, though Cross has always championed the case for Simon Maccabees,<sup>48</sup> and Wise, Abegg and Cook proposed Hyrcanus II.<sup>49</sup> To use Charlesworth’s terminology (from the title of his recent survey of the discussion), there has been more consensus than chaos on this issue.<sup>50</sup>

### *The War Texts*

North American scholarship on the *War Texts* has been more limited and focused on specific issues.<sup>51</sup> The *War Scroll* from cave 1 (1QM) was purchased by Eliezer Sukenik and published in Israel,<sup>52</sup> and no major English commentary was written after the massive work of Yigael Yadin was trans-

<sup>46</sup> Lou H. Silberman, “Unriddling the Riddle: A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Pesher (1QpHab),” *RevQ* 3 (1961-1962): 323-64; Asher Finkel, “The Pesher of Dreams and Scriptures,” *RevQ* 4 (1963-1964): 357-70; Eliezer Slomovic, “Toward an Understanding of the Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *RevQ* (1969-1971): 3-15.

<sup>47</sup> For example, Steven D. Fraade, “Looking for Narrative Midrash at Qumran,” in Steven D. Fraade, Aharon Shemesh and Ruth A. Clements, eds, *Rabbinic Perspectives: Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 62; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 43-66; “Rewritten Bible and Rabbinic Midrash as Commentary,” in Carol Bakhtos, ed., *Current Trends in the Study of Midrash* (JSJSup 106; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 59-78; Moshe J. Bernstein, “‘Rewritten Bible’: A Generic Category which has Outlived its Usefulness?” *Textus* 22 (2005): 169-96.

<sup>48</sup> Cross, *Ancient Library of Qumran*, 110-17.

<sup>49</sup> Wise, Abegg, Cook, “A New Proposal for Scrolls Origins,” *New Translation*, 27-33.

<sup>50</sup> James H. Charlesworth, *The Peshtarim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002). Perhaps the American consensus is not so firm if we take into account the dissenting reading of the *Pesher of Nahum* that has recently been proposed by Gregory Doudna, an American scholar who developed his theories during his doctoral work in Denmark. See Gregory L. Doudna, *4QPesher Nabum: A Critical Edition* (JSPSup 35; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

<sup>51</sup> This terminology is taken from Jean Duhaime, *War Texts: 1QM and Related Manuscripts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 6; London: T&T Clark, 2004). “War Scroll” is reserved for 1QM; much of the material in cave 4 is closely related but not simply copies.

<sup>52</sup> Selected columns (plates and transcription) were published by Eliezer Sukenik in *Megillat Genuzah I and II* (1948, 1950) and the full text in *The Dead Sea Scrolls of Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1954; Hebrew edition, 1955).



lated into English in 1962.<sup>53</sup> Most of the discussion in the 1970s and 80s focused on establishing recensional layers and tracing the development of dualistic ideas and was carried out primarily among European scholars although John Collins and Jean Duhaime became involved in the issues of dualism and the nature of apocalyptic/apocalypticism.<sup>54</sup> One of the few instances of close work with the manuscripts was the dissertation of Martin Abegg that proposed that one of the cave 4 manuscripts, 4Q491, was actually three separate manuscripts.<sup>55</sup> Recently, Jean Duhaime has written the volume on the *War Texts* for the Companion to the Qumran Scrolls series and Brian Schultz published a monograph on 1QM.<sup>56</sup> So perhaps there will be a revival of interest in fundamental questions about the compilation, sources and purposes of this complex corpus of materials, rather than a focus on specific and sensational passages as has sometimes happened in the past.

For instance, when the unpublished scrolls materials first became more generally accessible after the reorganization of the editorial team in the fall of 1990, one fragment of a War-type text, 4Q285, attracted considerable attention in North America when it appeared on the front page of the *New York Times*. There Robert Eisenman claimed that this *pesher*-like interpretation of Isaiah 10:34-11:1 was evidence for a tradition of a suffering and slain Messiah.<sup>57</sup> Other scholars were quick to point out that the text is much more likely to be read as a statement that the Messiah will slay his adversary.

Another fragment that has attracted ongoing interest is a hymnic passage that is preserved in 4Q491 (fragment 11 i and perhaps 12) but is not part of 1QM; in the *editio princeps*, Baillet had designated it as a “cantique de Michel et cantique des justes” that was to be sung as part of the final battle.<sup>58</sup> Morton Smith made the sensational claim that this should be read (and reconstructed – since much depends on how key lacunae are

<sup>53</sup> Yigael Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962).

<sup>54</sup> John J. Collins, “Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM: A Reply to P. R. Davies,” *VT* 29 (1979): 212-16; Jean Duhaime, “La redaction de 1QM XII et l’évolution du dualisme à Qumrân,” *RB* 84 (1977): 210-38; “La Règle de la Guerre de Qumrân et l’apocalyptique,” *ScEs* 36 (1984): 68-88.

<sup>55</sup> Martin Abegg, *The War Scroll from Cave 1 and Cave 4: A Critical Edition* (Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew Union College, 1993).

<sup>56</sup> Duhaime, *War Texts*; Brian Schultz, *Conquering the World: the War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered* (STDJ 76; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

<sup>57</sup> *The New York Times*, November 8, 1991; *The Times*, November 9, 1991.

<sup>58</sup> Maurice Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482-4Q520)* (DJD VII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 26-29.



reconstructed) not as referring to the angel Michael but as a description of the ascension of a human figure (perhaps Herod) to heaven – and thus a passage of great relevance for the New Testament.<sup>59</sup> The discussion of this fascinating piece has been ongoing among American scholars (as well as with their European and Israeli colleagues), especially after Schuller published another version of the hymn that was preserved as part of three cave 4 *Hodayot* manuscripts.<sup>60</sup> There is little agreement about the identity of the speaker – an angel, a historical figure, an eschatological priest, Lady Wisdom, one of the members of the sect – the last word has certainly not yet been written.

### *The Thanksgiving Psalms (Hodayot)*

In addition to the *War Scroll*, Eliezer Sukenik purchased a second large sectarian scroll for the Hebrew University, a collection of poems of thanksgiving modeled on the biblical psalms. These were published by 1954-1955, and immediately attracted considerable interest, in part because they were not battle plans nor legal regulations but more personal and pietistic, in Sukenik's words, able to give us access to "the views and feelings of one of the members of the sect."<sup>61</sup> These psalms immediately attracted attention in North America, and the individual columns that Sukenik released first in a preliminary fashion were translated by both Christian and Jewish scholars and published in religiously based periodicals (e.g., the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, *Theological Studies*, and *Commentary*).<sup>62</sup> Following upon a series of joint studies by Joseph Baumgarten and Menahem Mansoor, in 1961 Mansoor published the first American commentary on a major sectarian

<sup>59</sup> Morton Smith, "Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM<sup>a</sup>," in Lawrence H. Schiffman, ed., *Archaeology and History of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New Testament University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (SJPSup 8; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 181-8. The New Testament significance was emphasized in a second article, Morton Smith, "Two Ascended to Heaven – Jesus and the Author of 4Q491," in James H. Charlesworth, ed., *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Doubleday: 1992), 290-301.

<sup>60</sup> Eileen Schuller, "A Hymn from a Cave Four Hodayot Manuscript: 4Q427 7 i + ii," *JBL* 112 (1993): 605-28; John J. Collins, "A Throne in Heaven," in *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995); Michael Wise, "מי כמוני באלים" – A Study of 4Q491c, 4Q471b, 4Q427 7 and 1QH<sup>a</sup> 25:35-26:10," *DSD* 7 (2000): 173-219.

<sup>61</sup> Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of Hebrew University*, 39.

<sup>62</sup> J. M. Paul Bauchet and Edmund F. Sutcliffe, "Transcription and Translations of a Psalm from Sukenik's Dead Sea Scroll," *CBQ* 12 (1950): 331-5; George S. Glanzman, "Sectarian Psalms from the Dead Sea," *TS* 13 (1952): 487-524; Menahem Mansoor, "Two More Psalms as Translated from the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Commentary* (1955): 368-9.

document in the newly established Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah series;<sup>63</sup> the enduring strength of this commentary lies in its careful and detailed attention to linguistic and philological aspects. In 1955, Józef Milik published two fragments (1Q35) in DJD I that had been recovered from cave 1 that he identified as belonging “presque certainement à 1QH.”<sup>64</sup> John Strugnell (along with others) quickly recognized that these two fragments overlap with poems in the large *Hodayot* manuscript and that they must be all that remains of a separate (probably incomplete) second copy (1QH<sup>b</sup>).<sup>65</sup>

Among the allotment of fragments assigned to Strugnell for publication were six manuscripts that he soon recognized as copies of the *Hodayot* collection in 1QH<sup>a</sup>; by 1956 he was able to say “ils complètent le ms. de 1Q en plusieurs endroits où il est lacuneux et nous permettent de voir que l'ordre des hymnes dans la collection était variable.”<sup>66</sup> Strugnell made almost all the identifications of the fragments and wrote the draft of an extensive commentary (over 180 typewritten pages), but he never completed it for publication. In 1989, he transferred this material to his former student, Eileen Schuller, and asked her to prepare the 4Q manuscripts for the DJD series. Schuller published first a large and important poem that was preserved most fully in 4QH<sup>a</sup> (with small overlaps in 1QH<sup>a</sup>, 4QH<sup>b</sup>, and 4QH<sup>c</sup>) that was of special interest because of its similarity with the poem in 4Q491; she also made available a descriptive outline of the various manuscripts and their contents, and finally all the manuscripts in DJD XXIX in 1999.<sup>67</sup> With the full publication, it became clear that there were at least two collections of *Hodayot*, with different contents and arranged in different orders (compare 1QH<sup>a</sup> / 4QH<sup>b</sup> in contrast to 4QH<sup>a</sup>), and that some collections continued to be copied independently (4QH<sup>c</sup>, perhaps

<sup>63</sup> Menahem Mansoor, *The Thanksgiving Hymns: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction* (STDJ 3; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961).

<sup>64</sup> Barthélemy and Milik, *Qumran Cave I*, 135-8, plate xxi.

<sup>65</sup> John Strugnell, Hartmut Stegemann, and Émile Puech all came to the same conclusion very soon after the publication of DJD I, but there was little discussion of 1QH<sup>b</sup> in print until Puech included a brief section in his article, “Quelques aspects de la restauration du Rouleau des Hymnes (1QH),” *JJS* 39 (1988): 39-40.

<sup>66</sup> John Strugnell, “Le travail d'édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumrân,” *RB* 63 (1956): 64. A few other manuscripts in his allotment, 4Q433, 4Q433a, 4Q440, were designated as “hodayot-like,” similar in style, form and vocabulary but with no overlap with material preserved in 1QH<sup>a-b</sup> or 4QH<sup>a-f</sup>.

<sup>67</sup> Schuller, “A Thanksgiving Hymn,” 137-50; “The Cave 4 *Hodayot* Manuscripts: A Preliminary Description,” *JQR* 85 (1994): 137-51; “*Hodayot*,” in Esther G. Chazon et al., in consultation with James C. VanderKam and Monica Brady, *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XXIX; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 69-254.

also 4QH<sup>f</sup>), but a full and comprehensive theory of origins, authorship, and recensional development still needs to be developed.

In the early 1960s, John Strugnell was consulted by Hartmut Stegemann in Germany who had just completed his doctoral thesis at Heidelberg. Stegemann had made a “material reconstruction” of what he proposed as the original order of the badly damaged cave 1 manuscript, twenty-eight columns, arranged in their original order, with the result that what Sukenik had called cols. I-XII became the center of the manuscript, cols. IX-XX; what Sukenik had numbered as cols. XIII-XVII became part of the first third (especially cols. IV-VIII), and the final columns (cols. XXI-XXVI) were put together from fragments that Sukenik had only been able to present as isolated pieces. On the basis of his knowledge of the 4QH<sup>o</sup>-dayot copies, Strugnell was able to confirm the general correctness of the restoration. Stegemann and Strugnell carried on an extensive written correspondence about *Hodayot* matters and worked together over many summers at the École Biblique in Jerusalem, writing copious and detailed notes though virtually nothing was published, in part because Stegemann judged that Strugnell had first publication rights to the cave 4 materials allotted to him. After the cave 4 texts were published, in 2005 Stegemann and Schuller undertook to work together on a new edition of 1QH<sup>a</sup>, but this joint endeavor was cut short before it even began by Stegemann’s sudden death in 2005. Schuller agreed to prepare his reconstruction and his text for publication in DJD XL and Carol Newsom provided the translation; the volume was published in December 2008.<sup>68</sup>

In addition to textual work on the *Hodayot*, American scholars have experimented with various approaches and methodologies in studying this document. Much of this work has been in doctoral theses; for example there have been a few theses that tackle the problems of prosody and parallelism;<sup>69</sup> the careful literary analysis of selected hymns by Bonnie Kittel;<sup>70</sup> Sarah Tanzer’s thesis giving particular attention to the place and function

<sup>68</sup> Hartmut Stegemann with Eileen M. Schuller, translation of texts by Carol Newsom, *Qumran Cave 1: III: 1QH<sup>o</sup>dayot<sup>a</sup> with Incorporation of 1QH<sup>o</sup>dayot<sup>b</sup> and 4QH<sup>o</sup>dayot<sup>c-f</sup>* (DJD XL; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009). Martin Abegg prepared the Concordance for the volume and Ingo Kottsieper of Göttingen (Germany) the plates.

<sup>69</sup> Arlis J. Ehlen, *The Poetic Structure of a Hodayah from Qumran: An Analysis of Grammatical, Semantic, and Auditory Correspondence in 1QH 3:19-36* (Th.D. diss., Harvard Divinity School, 1970); Gary R. Williams, *Parallelism in the Hodayot from Qumran* (Ph.D. diss., Annenberg Research Institute, 1991).

<sup>70</sup> Bonnie P. Kittel, *The Hymns of Qumran: Translation and Commentary* (Ph.D. thesis, Graduate Theological Union, 1975), published as *The Hymns of Qumran* (SBLDS 50; Scholars Press, 1981).

of wisdom components;<sup>71</sup> Michael Douglas's detailed study of the Hymns of the Teacher that refined the criteria and categorization of the so-called Heidelberg School (especially Gert Jeremias),<sup>72</sup> and Angela Kim Harkins's thesis that begins to explore the process of editorial development.<sup>73</sup> In her innovative and creative book, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, Carol Newsom has drawn upon the work of rhetorical and literary critics such as Bhaktin and Burke to rephrase the fundamental question we put to these poems as "What Do the Hodayot Do?," that is, how does language negotiate the transformation of a nonsectarian into a sectarian identity by constructing an alternate language of piety.<sup>74</sup>

### *Other "Sectarian" Texts*

Although a two-fold division of the materials has been a standard conceptual tool for many decades now in Scrolls scholarship, there is increasing recognition that a straight "sectarian/non-sectarian" categorization is probably too simplistic, and even as a heuristic tool may be creating more problems than it is solving. In North America, the complexity of defining these categories was articulated very perceptively already in 1990 by Carol Newsom in what has become a classic essay, "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran."<sup>75</sup> Newsom proposed that authorship cannot be the sole criterion; patterns of use and rhetorical function within the community should also be considered. Recently Robert Kugler has taken up the question, though from a somewhat different perspective, and suggested that a number of works (for example, some copies of *Aramaic Levi*, *4QNarrative and Poetic Composition*) that were once classified as "non-sectarian" or pseudepigraphic could be considered in fact "hitherto unrecognized 'sec-

<sup>71</sup> Sarah Tanzer, *The Hodayot: A Literary Reassessment of the Hymns of the Teacher and the Hymns of the Community* (Harvard University, 1990).

<sup>72</sup> Michael Douglas, *Power and Praise in the Hodayot: A Literary Critical Study of 1QH 9:1-18:14* (Ph.D. diss, University of Chicago, 1997), published in part as "The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis Revisited: New Data for an Old Crux," *DSD* 6 (1999): 239-66.

<sup>73</sup> Angela Y. Kim, *Signs of Editorial Shaping of the Hodayot Collection: A Redactional Analysis of 1QH<sup>a</sup> and 4QH<sup>a-f</sup>* (Ph.D. diss., Notre Dame University, 2003). She has carried on this work in a series of articles, including "Observations on the Editorial Shaping of the So-Called Community Hymns from 1QH<sup>a</sup> and 4QH<sup>a</sup> (4Q427)," *DSD* 1 (2005): 233-56; "The Community Hymns Classification: A Proposal for Further Differentiation," *DSD* 15 (2008): 121-54.

<sup>74</sup> Carol Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004).

<sup>75</sup> Newsom, "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran."

tarian' compositions" in the sense that they are reworkings of traditions unique to Qumran.<sup>76</sup> That is, in addition to the "core" sectarian texts that we have already considered, there is a whole other group of texts that might be considered sectarian depending on our definition and criteria – this is a discussion that has only begun.

The special difficulty of classifying prayer and hymnic material has frequently been recognized, especially given the extensive reuse of stereotypical biblically based phraseology and the specialized and limited content of the discourse (legal and organizational topics are not expected in a prayer).<sup>77</sup> Daniel Falk, continuing his earlier work that was done in Oxford, has been a strong voice in North American circles in arguing that there is a cluster of collections of prayers, 4Q503 *Daily Prayers*, 4Q502 *Ritual of Marriage*, 4Q414 and 4Q512 *Ritual Purity A and B*, that "likely originated in the Yahad" and thus should be considered with the sectarian compositions.<sup>78</sup> But perhaps the discussion of provenance has been most interesting – and disputed – in the case of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. In her first edition of the cave 4 copies (4Q400-4Q407), Carol Newsom acknowledged that there is "no internal evidence that can establish beyond question the provenance of the Sabbath Shirot" but she adopted as "the working hypothesis ... that the scroll of the Sabbath Shirot is a product of the Qumran community."<sup>79</sup> In her 1990 essay, she is much more nuanced when answering the question of whether this is a sectarian text: in terms of its rhetoric, no; in terms of its authorship, most likely not; in terms of its use, "there are good grounds for thinking that the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice functioned as an adopted or naturalized text within the sectarian perspective of the Qumran community."<sup>80</sup>

<sup>76</sup> Robert A. Kugler, "Whose Scripture? Whose Community? Reflections on the Dead Sea Scrolls Then and Now, by Way of Aramaic Levi," *DSD* 15 (2008): 5-23.

<sup>77</sup> The problematics with regards to prayer and liturgical materials specifically were articulated by Eileen M. Schuller, "Prayer, Hymnic and Liturgical Texts from Qumran," in Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam, eds., *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 169-70.

<sup>78</sup> The quotation is from Daniel K. Falk, "Qumran Prayer Texts and the Temple," in Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, Eileen M. Schuller, eds., *Sapiential, Liturgical & Poetical Texts from Qumran* (STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 106-26; this follows his earlier arguments in Daniel K. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath & Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998).

<sup>79</sup> Carol Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (HSS 26; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 4.

<sup>80</sup> Newsom, "Sectually Explicit", 185.

### *Conclusion*

North American scholars have been active in the study of the major sectarian scrolls. The serendipitous presence of Americans in Jerusalem in 1947-1948 gave them immediate access to the *Community Rule* and the *Pesher of Habakkuk*, and, not surprisingly, these were the focus of much of the earliest study. Understandably, there was less immediate involvement with those scrolls (*Hodayot*, *War Scroll*) that became the property of Hebrew University and Israel. Given the allocation of many cave 4 liturgical and prayer texts to John Strugnell, it is fitting that there has been considerable interest in both the *Hodayot* and the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*.

American scholars have written few major commentaries on the sectarian texts, though they have produced many more short articles on small sections or specific topics than could be listed or discussed in this article. In recent years, perhaps the distinctive contribution of American scholarship has been the interest in exploring new methodologies and drawing upon interdisciplinary resources. It was not by chance that when the fifth meeting of the International Organization of Qumran Studies in Groningen in 2004 set out to explore the “insights gained by literary, historical and social-sciences approaches now operating within the field,” three Americans formed the opening panel: Maxine Grossman, George Nickelsburg and Carol Newsom.<sup>81</sup> Another approach that is attracting considerable interest is that of Ritual Studies, as demonstrated in the recent monograph by Russell Arnold.<sup>82</sup> A recent book edited by Maxine Grossman reflects explicitly on method and theory, including sociological models, rhetorical criticism, ritual studies, feminist criticism, social-scientific approaches, historiography and the study of religious belief.<sup>83</sup>

Although with the publication of the complete Dead Sea Scrolls corpus it has become apparent that the sectarian scrolls are a minority in terms of numbers (approximately one-third of the total), they continue to play a central role in understanding the theology, organizational structure and piety of this particular Second Temple Jewish group. Although the cave 1

---

<sup>81</sup> See their papers, as well as those by other North American scholars – Sarianna Metso, Jean Duhaime, Hannah Harrington, André Gagné – in the conference volume, García Martínez and Popović, *Defining Identities*; the quotation is from the Preface.

<sup>82</sup> Russell C. D. Arnold, *The Social Role of Liturgy in the Religion of the Qumran Community* (STDJ 60; Leiden: Brill, 2006). The earlier essay of Robert Kugler was the first effort to apply the taxonomy of Catherine Bell, “Making All Experience Religious: The Hegemony of Ritual at Qumran,” *JSJ* 33 (2002): 131-52.

<sup>83</sup> Maxine Grossman, ed., *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010).

manuscripts have been studied for sixty-years now, the more recent availability of multiple copies from cave 4 for many of these texts (especially the *Community Rule*, *Hodayot* and the *War Scroll*) has enabled us to ask radically different questions and glean new information about the processes of composition, transmission and development. In the early years, over the decades, and in the present, the contribution of North America scholars to this endeavor has been consistent and significant.

## BIBLICAL SCROLLS SCHOLARSHIP IN NORTH AMERICA

EUGENE ULRICH

Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship is for the most part a broadly international endeavor, as indicated by the three General Editors of the publication project appointed on 4 December 1990: Emanuel Tov of Israel (1941-), Émile Puech of France (1941-), and Eugene Ulrich of the United States (1938-). But the history of the publication of the biblical scrolls is, with a number of important exceptions, predominantly centered in the United States.<sup>1</sup> The majority of the biblical scrolls came from cave 4, and it was the two Americans on the original team of cave 4 editors—Frank Cross of Harvard University and Patrick Skehan of the Catholic University of America—who were assigned to edit the biblical scrolls.<sup>2</sup>

### *Discoveries and Early Publications: 1947-1980*

#### *Cave 1*

The first important exception to an American focus is Eliezer Sukenik (1889-1953), who made the first identification of a biblical scroll as genuinely ancient, 1QIsa<sup>b</sup>, on 22 December 1947.<sup>3</sup> Professor of Archaeology at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and a specialist in Hebrew epigraphy, he recognized the antiquity of the scroll and labored intensively on it, once

---

<sup>1</sup> Many of the details in this chapter are culled from Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3d ed; John C. Trever, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Personal Account* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977); Weston W. Fields, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Short History* (Leiden: Brill, 2006); and Eugene Ulrich and Peter W. Flint, DJD XXXII (see note 11).

<sup>2</sup> The term “biblical” is anachronistic. The biblical dimension of the entire DJD project was set up according to the Masoretic canon. This was fully understandable in the mid-twentieth century, insofar as the texts were predominantly in Hebrew and the categories used then to interpret the new data were the modern categories of the Masoretic Hebrew Bible. Decades later it is easier to see that certain works, such as 4QReworked Pentateuch, 1 Enoch, and Jubilees, may well have been considered Scripture in the late Second Temple period, whereas many books of the Ketuvim display little evidence of being considered Scripture yet. With this broader horizon, names such as Józef Milik, James VanderKam, George Nickelsburg, Emanuel Tov, and Sidnie White Crawford would figure more prominently in the history of the biblical scrolls.

<sup>3</sup> See Fields, *A Short History*, 111.



it had been carefully unrolled. His transcription of it was published posthumously, originally in Hebrew (1954), and then by his assistant, Nahman Avigad, and his son, Yigael Yadin, in English (1955).<sup>4</sup> The scroll was unrolled by James Bieberkraut and was photographed with great clarity by his wife Helena Bieberkraut. Both procedures presented difficult challenges, and both were executed with great success.

The first biblical manuscript to be discovered, however, and the only complete biblical one found at Qumran was the *Great Isaiah Scroll* (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>). It was discovered in January or February of 1947 (or possibly even earlier) by Arab Bedouin, and was eventually purchased by the Metropolitan Mar Athanasius Yeshue Samuel, Archbishop of the Syrian Orthodox Church in Jerusalem, in July 1947.<sup>5</sup> A second Isaiah scroll from the same cave (1QIsa<sup>b</sup>) was not discovered until a few months after 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, during a subsequent visit to the cave in May or June 1947.<sup>6</sup>

The first person to identify the *Great Isaiah Scroll* as a Second Temple text of Isaiah was the American, John Trever, on 19 February 1948.<sup>7</sup> Although the Dutch Dominican Jan van der Ploeg, at the *École Biblique et Archéologique Française*, had identified it in late July 1947 as a text of Isaiah, he did not think the manuscript was ancient. A number of others who viewed it also doubted that it was more than a couple centuries old. But Trever (1916-2006) was well prepared for recognizing both the scroll's text and its age. He had written his 1943 Ph.D. dissertation at Yale University on "The Contributions of Second Isaiah to the Semantic Development of Hebrew Words," and had studied the Nash Papyrus, which William Albright of Johns Hopkins University had published and dated palaeographically to

---

<sup>4</sup> Eliezer Lipa Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (eds. Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin: Jerusalem: Hebrew University and Magnes Press, 1955 [Hebrew, 1954]). Dominique Barthélemy published additional fragments of the scroll that were later salvaged during the official excavation of cave 1 in Dominique Barthélemy and Józef T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD I; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 66-68.

<sup>5</sup> Mar Samuel also purchased three other scrolls: the *Pesher of Habakkuk* (1QpHab), the *Community Rule* (1QS), and a fourth which was later identified as the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QapGen).

<sup>6</sup> Bibliographic details of early accounts of the discoveries can be found in Cross, *Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3d ed., 22, n. 1.

<sup>7</sup> Trever already on 19 February 1948 copied three lines from the bottom of column LI of the scroll. Later that day, as he and William Brownlee, a fellow researcher, were both trying to identify the text, he identified it as Isa 65:1. It was only sometime later that he realized the irony of the verse: "I was ready to be sought out by those who did not ask, to be found by those who did not seek me" (Trever, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Personal Account*, 25-28).

150-50 BCE.<sup>8</sup> Trever immediately recognized that the script of the new scroll was close to that of the Nash Papyrus and quite different from that in his photograph of the mediaeval British Museum Torah Codex.

Trever and William Brownlee (1917-1983), a Ph.D. from Duke University, were Fellows of the American School of Oriental Research (ASOR) in Jerusalem during 1947-1948. Trever had been appointed as temporary director of ASOR while the Director, Millar Burrows of Yale (1889-1980), was visiting Baghdad. Mar Samuel's assistant, Butros Sowmy, on 18 February 1948 had telephoned for Brownlee; but since he happened to be out, the legendary ASOR cook, Omar, asked Trever to take the call. Trever arranged for Samuel and Sowmy to come to ASOR the next day.

Fortunately, Trever was also a superb photographer, and during the visit on 19 February he was able to convince Mar Samuel to allow him to photograph 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> along with the other two scrolls in the Syrian Patriarch's possession, the *Pesher of Habakkuk* (1QpHab) and the *Community Rule* (1QS). These Isaiah photographs, taken in 1948 in the basement of ASOR, remain the best resource for studying the Isaiah text and are used for the critical edition of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and 1QIsa<sup>b</sup> in DJD XXXII. Burrows, with Trever and Brownlee, soon published them with the photographs.<sup>9</sup>

Further Bedouin explorations of cave 1 produced more fragments, and the official scholarly excavation of the cave during 15 February-5 March 1949 produced yet more. Fragments of thirteen (or fourteen?)<sup>10</sup> further biblical manuscripts were found and were published by Dominique Barthélemy in the first volume of *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* (DJD).<sup>11</sup>

<sup>8</sup> William F. Albright, "A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabean Age: The Nash Papyrus," *JBL* 56 (1937): 145-76.

<sup>9</sup> Millar Burrows, with the assistance of John C. Trever and William H. Brownlee, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery: Volume 1: The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary* (New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950). There was a second, slightly revised printing that same year.

<sup>10</sup> Some fragments are so small and contain such generic text that they are only tentatively identified as a biblical manuscript and thus are listed with a question mark.

<sup>11</sup> It will be helpful to list together all the DJD volumes containing the biblical scrolls: DJD I: Dominique Barthélemy and Józef T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955);

DJD II, IIa: Pierre Benoit, Józef T. Milik, and Roland de Vaux, *Les grottes de Murabba'at* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961);

DJD III, IIIa: Maurice Baillet, Józef T. Milik, and Roland de Vaux, *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962);

DJD IV: James A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QP<sup>s</sup>)* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965);

DJD VIII: Emanuel Tov with the collaboration of Robert A. Kraft, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr) (The Seiyal Collection I)* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990; reprinted with corrections, 1995);

Seven more fragments from the 1QIsa<sup>b</sup> scroll were also dug up from that cave and published in DJD 1, proving the provenance of that scroll.

The first biblical scroll, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, traveled to the United States in late December 1948 or early January 1949. Mar Samuel had been appointed Apostolic Delegate of the Syrian Church to the United States and Canada and sailed from Beirut to Jersey City, bringing 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and the other three scrolls along with the rest of his possessions. Unable to find a buyer for the manuscripts at an acceptable price, he put an advertisement in the *Wall Street Journal* on 1 June 1954:

*'The Four Dead Sea Scrolls'*

Biblical Manuscripts dating back to at least 200 BC, are for sale. This would be an ideal gift to an educational or religious institution by an individual or group.

Box F 206, The Wall Street Journal

Harry Orlinsky of Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion was able, posing as “Mr. Green,” to confirm the authenticity of the scrolls, and on 1 July Yigael Yadin was able to purchase for the State of Israel the four scrolls that had eluded his father, and they were able to join the other three cave 1 scrolls purchased by his father for the Hebrew University.<sup>12</sup>

### *Caves 2-3, 5-10*

A second exception to an American focus is the series of discoveries during the ensuing years of further “minor caves” at Qumran as well as caves at other sites in the general region. In 1951 the Bedouin brought fragments

---

DJD IX: Patrick W. Skehan, Eugene Ulrich, and Judith E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4.IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992);

DJD XII: Eugene Ulrich, Frank M. Cross, et al., *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994 [repr. 1999]);

DJD XIV: Eugene Ulrich, Frank M. Cross, et al., *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995 [repr. 1999]);

DJD XV: Eugene Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997);

DJD XVI: Eugene Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000);

DJD XVII: Frank M. Cross, Donald W. Parry, Richard J. Saley, and Eugene Ulrich, *Qumran Cave 4.XII: 1-2 Samuel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005);

DJD XXIII: Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam Simon van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11.II: 11Q2-18, 11Q20-30* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998);

DJD XXXII Part 1, Part 2: Eugene Ulrich and Peter W. Flint, *Qumran Cave 1.II: The Isaiah Scrolls* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2010).

<sup>12</sup> For Orlinsky's role in purchasing the four manuscripts from Samuel see “The Bible Scholar Who Became an Undercover Agent,” *BAR* 18 (1992): 26-28.

from Wadi Murabba'at to Roland de Vaux, Editor-in-Chief of the DJD project; excavations ensued the following year, and in March 1955 the large Hebrew *Minor Prophets* scroll was found in a fifth cave at Murabba'at. It and the other four (five?) of the Murabba'at biblical scrolls were published by Józef Milik in DJD II. In summer of 1952 the Bedouin brought more fragments from another unidentified cave, probably Naḥal Hever, and the next year they brought more from there: fragments of a Greek scroll of the *Minor Prophets*. That manuscript was studied insightfully by Dominique Barthélemy, who identified an important "missing link" in the recensional development of the Greek tradition.<sup>13</sup>

Qumran cave 2 was discovered in February 1952 and cave 3 in March 1952. Cave 2 contained sixteen (seventeen?) biblical manuscripts, and cave 3 had three biblical ones. Whereas Qumran caves 1-3 had been found in the limestone cliffs above ground level, in late summer 1952 the Bedouin came upon cave 4 in the lower marl level close to the ruins of the Qumran compound. Official excavations of the cave were conducted 22-29 September 1952, and during the process caves 5 and 6 were also found nearby. Cave 5 contained seven biblical manuscripts and cave 6 had five (eight?). No further caves were discovered by either Bedouin or scholars until spring 1955 when caves 7-10 were noticed just over the cliff from the compound itself. These four caves, however, yielded precious little: a Greek manuscript of Exodus and another of the Letter of Jeremiah in Cave 7, two Hebrew manuscripts in cave 8, and no biblical manuscripts in cave 9 or cave 10. All the thirty-four (thirty-nine?) manuscripts from caves 2-3 and 5-10 were published in DJD III: those from cave 5 by Milik and the remainder by Maurice Baillet.

#### *Cave 4 and the International Team of Editors*

Catapulting the project into an entirely new dimension, tens of thousands of fragments from more than 600 manuscripts were salvaged from cave 4.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Dominique Barthélemy, "Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante," *RB* 60 (1953): 18-29; see also Dominique Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963). The manuscript was subsequently edited by Emanuel Tov, with the collaboration of Robert A. Kraft, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Hever (8HevXIIgr)* (DJD VIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990; repr. with corrections 1995).

<sup>14</sup> It is true that 4Q582 is the highest number listed for cave 4 manuscripts in the complete inventory in DJD XXXIX, and that there seem to be even fewer manuscripts since those originally listed between 4Q186 and 4Q196 have been placed elsewhere and the numbers no longer appear. Due to the reassignment of fragments, however, as the work of identification continued, whereas some fragments were identified and grouped with those

Gerald Lankester Harding, Director of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan, and Roland de Vaux (1903-1971) from the École Biblique realized that the gigantic task of editing all the 600-plus manuscripts required a much-expanded publication plan. So in spring of 1953 Harding began to assemble an international and interconfessional team of editors.<sup>15</sup> The board of directors for the Palestine Archaeological Museum consisted of the heads of the national archaeology schools in Jerusalem, and they each nominated one or two promising young scholars from their country to join the team of editors.<sup>16</sup>

The first two members invited were Józef Milik (1922-2006) and Frank Cross (1921-). Milik, originally from Poland but eventually with the French Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), had already been working at the museum and was experienced in the process of sifting and publishing the Scrolls. Frank Cross was a student of Albright and had just published a dissertation on early Hebrew orthography.<sup>17</sup> He arrived in Jerusalem in May 1953 to begin work on the cleaning, sorting, identifying, and editing of the innumerable fragments that had been excavated from cave 4. The second American, Patrick Skehan, esteemed as text editor for the Old Testament of *The New American Bible*, arrived in June 1954 and was the Annual Professor at ASOR for 1954-1955. He was soon followed by the British John Strugnell (1930-2007) from Jesus College, Oxford. Barthélemy (1921-2002), who had edited the cave 1 biblical manuscripts, also began work with the accumulating team, including his French compatriot Jean Starcky (1909-1988), but ill health forced him to cease and return to France. Claus-Hunno Hunzinger from Göttingen arrived in October 1954 for one year; he remained for two years but then left. The second

---

under a previous number, yet more were distinguished and separated from their originally assigned number. For example, there are twenty-seven different entries all sharing the number 4Q249 (= 4Q249 + 4Q249a-z). A recent count of all individual manuscripts produced a total of more than one thousand manuscripts.

<sup>15</sup> See Frank M. Cross, *Ancient Library of Qumran*, 39. Cf. also John Strugnell's rather protean account of the membership of "the team" recounted clearly by Emanuel Tov, *The Text from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (DJD XXXIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 2, n. 2. But the team of cave 4 editors was the original group of eight editors, later expanded to include their successors and their associate editors.

<sup>16</sup> Note that this activity took place in the then-Jordanian sector of Jerusalem. No Jewish scholars, Israelis or others, were included in the first editorial team, a fact that had consequences on the subsequent history of Qumran research. See the chapter on research in Israel (ed.).

<sup>17</sup> See Frank M. Cross and David N. Freedman, *Early Hebrew Orthography* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1952). Cross and Freedman co-published two dissertations; the second was *Studies in Ancient Yabwistic Poetry* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975).

British editor, John Allegro (1923-1988) from Manchester, completed the team of eight, soon reduced to seven by Barthélemy's departure. For the most part the team worked admirably well together. Cross noted that "the staff exhibits a remarkably ecumenical spirit . . . a harmony of scientific pre-suppositions, shared excitement in new discoveries, and a common good humor."<sup>18</sup>

Cross, born on July 13, 1921, earned a B.D. degree from McCormick Theological Seminary in 1946 and a Ph.D. from Johns Hopkins University in 1950.<sup>19</sup> He taught at McCormick until he was appointed to the Hancock Professorship of Hebrew and Other Oriental Languages at Harvard in 1957, where he remained until his retirement in 1992. A devoted teacher, he supervised more than one hundred doctoral dissertations. He served as director of the Harvard Semitic Museum and as president of both the Society of Biblical Literature and the American Schools of Oriental Research.<sup>20</sup>

Cross was a pioneer of many insights in various fields which have shaped Qumran studies: epigraphy, palaeography, orthography, textual criticism, and the history of the biblical text. The task facing the editors was uncommonly complex. In addition to inheriting tens of thousands of chaotic fragments that needed order and photographing with infrared film before any progress could be made, they had to undertake foundational work in the subdisciplines of palaeography, orthography, and archaeology. Hebrew palaeography, for example, was a virtually non-existent field obviously limited by the dearth of ancient inscriptions before the Scrolls' discovery. The subdisciplines required to edit the Scrolls intelligently had to be constructed from the ground up before the Scrolls could be fully understood and published.

Cross performed an incalculable task in painstakingly analyzing the palaeographical details of hundreds of formal, semi-formal, and cursive scripts presented by the manuscripts to achieve a typology for dating them. Well taught by Albright, he studied numerous samples of scripts on documents written throughout the Second Temple period that bore specific dates. With those fixed chronological points established as a basis, he was able, although none of the Scrolls bear dates, to place the various cave 4 scripts in their proper chronological niche typologically along the palaeographical

---

<sup>18</sup> See Cross, *Ancient Library of Qumran*, 39.

<sup>19</sup> Much of the content of this profile of Cross and that of Skehan is derived from Ulrich's articles about them in Schiffman and VanderKam, *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:157-8, and 2:880.

<sup>20</sup> A bibliography up to 1999 of Cross's more than 270 publications can be found in Baruch A. Levine et al., eds., *Frank Moore Cross Volume, Erisr 26* (1999), xiii-xxiv.

spectrum.<sup>21</sup> The system he produced was generally confirmed by Carbon 14 and accelerated mass spectrometry technology and is still, a half century later, the accepted system used for dating the manuscripts. He was, moreover, the prime mover in the exploration for charting understanding of the history of the biblical text now illuminated by the Scrolls' evidence:

He wrote a series of essays on the implications of the textual variants in the biblical manuscripts for the development of the texts of the Hebrew Bible. He argued that in the Second Temple period there were three local texts of the Pentateuchal books (the one represented now in the Masoretic Text, [probably] of Babylonian origin, the one in the Septuagint, of Egyptian origin, and the one in the Samaritan Pentateuch, of Palestinian origin) and that when the text was standardized after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE one of these, the Masoretic, was chosen as the normative text. For other books in the Hebrew Bible there were two textual families and again just one was chosen after 70 CE. He was also able to clarify the history of the Greek text through use of the Qumran Hebrew texts and evidence from other Judean Desert sites.<sup>22</sup>

He also composed a broad overview of the library at Qumran and its broader historical and religious context, which brought knowledge of the fascinating world of the Scrolls to the general public.<sup>23</sup>

Skehan was born in New York City on 30 September 1909 and died on 9 September 1980. Having gained his doctorate in Scripture and Semitic Languages from the Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C. in 1938, he immediately began teaching there and continued until his retirement in 1979. Skehan held the post as editor of the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* and was president of the Catholic Biblical Association in 1946-1947. He served as text editor of the Old Testament for *The New American Bible* as well as vice-chair of its editorial board. Since Washington is so close to Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Albright invited him as visiting professor several times to take his place while on sabbatical leave. Skehan jokingly referred to replacing Albright as "pinch-hitting for Babe Ruth."<sup>24</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Frank M. Cross, "The Development of the Jewish Scripts," in G. Ernest Wright, ed., *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1961), 133-202; see more recently "Palaeography and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1:379-402 and Pls. 9-14. See the chapter on research in Israel for the early paleographic charts of Nahman Avigad and the subsequent palaeographic work of Ada Yardeni.

<sup>22</sup> Ulrich, *Encyclopedia*, 1:157.

<sup>23</sup> Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3d ed.

<sup>24</sup> Skehan's publications up to 1971 are listed in *Studies in Israelite Poetry and Wisdom* (CBQMS 1; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1971), 254-60; publications from 1971 to his death are listed in *CBQ* 43 (1981): 96-98.



Skehan brought to the group the breadth of his biblical knowledge gained from his role as the Old Testament text editor for the *New American Bible*.<sup>25</sup> Published in 1970, it was possibly the first Bible translation to make use of variants from the Qumran biblical scrolls for improving biblical translations. Skehan, with Cross for the Book of Samuel, composed the *Textual Notes* for the *New American Bible*.<sup>26</sup>

Cross and Skehan were charged with editing the biblical manuscripts. There were originally 124 numbers assigned for the cave 4 biblical manuscripts (though the corpus eventually swelled to 145), including Palaeo-Hebrew, Jewish-script, and Septuagint manuscripts, plus unidentifiable manuscripts that appeared to be possibly biblical. Skehan agreed to edit the Palaeo-Hebrew manuscripts, the numerous Isaiah and Psalms manuscripts, the two Proverbs manuscripts, the Septuagint manuscripts, and the unidentified manuscripts (a total of ca. 60 manuscripts); Cross was in charge of all the remaining manuscripts in the Jewish script (ca. 85 manuscripts). The number of manuscripts is somewhat misleading, however, since, for example, whereas some manuscripts required only a single page, the edition of 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> required 78 DJD pages and 27 plates for its 44 extant columns plus 447 unidentified fragments, and since 4QSam<sup>a</sup> required nearly an entire volume, with 22 plates, including two plates of yet unidentified fragments.

Both Cross and Skehan quickly published articles announcing the major learnings from the most important scrolls assigned to them. Cross published, for example, photographs and analyses of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and 4QSam<sup>b</sup>, as well as the full photograph of the clear, simple, but important and instructive 4QDeut<sup>n</sup>.<sup>27</sup> Skehan published photographs and analyses of 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup>, 4QDeut<sup>q</sup>, 4QLXXLev<sup>a</sup>, 4QLXXNum, and a full collation of the Psalms.<sup>28</sup> Meanwhile, the colossal amount of less interesting routine work

<sup>25</sup> *The New American Bible: Translated from the Original Languages with Critical Use of All the Ancient Sources by Members of the Catholic Biblical Association of America* (New York: Benziger, 1970).

<sup>26</sup> *Textual Notes on the New American Bible* (Paterson: St. Anthony's Guild, 1970).

<sup>27</sup> Frank M. Cross, "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," *BASOR* 132 (1953): 15-26; "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran," *JBL* 74 (1955): 147-72; "The Ammonite Oppression of the Tribes of Gad and Reuben: Missing Verses from 1 Samuel 11 Found in 4QSamuel<sup>a</sup>," in Hayim Tadmor and Moshe Weinfeld, eds., *History, Historiography, and Interpretation* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1983), 148-58; and *Scrolls from the Wilderness of the Dead Sea* (San Francisco: Lawton & Alfred Kennedy, 1969), 18, 29-30.

<sup>28</sup> Patrick W. Skehan, "Exodus in the Samaritan Recension from Qumran," *JBL* 74 (1955): 435-40 (he revised his "Samaritan" view in "Qumran and the Present State of Old Testament Text Studies: The Masoretic Text," *JBL* 78 [1959]: 21-25 [22]); "A Fragment of



went on in private, with admirable tenacity, by Skehan, who had almost finished, but with more distractions for Cross due to wider responsibilities and a wider range of subjects for Cross, though his exhaustive edition of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> in DJD XVII would constitute a life's work for many scholars. All the manuscripts assigned to Cross were published in DJD XII and XIV-XVII, many of them by his students whose dissertations he had supervised. The manuscripts allotted to Skehan were published in DJD IX and XIV-XVI.

Finally, Joseph Fitzmyer (1920-) and Raymond Brown (1928-1998), who had also studied with Albright, provided a vital service for the editorial team at the Palestine Archaeological Museum. Fitzmyer in 1957-1958 began the *Preliminary Concordance* for the cave 4 texts, and Brown continued it in 1958-1959; Willard Oxtoby completed the remainder of the cave 4 texts in 1959-1960.<sup>29</sup> Fitzmyer also produced a large study of the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QapGen)<sup>30</sup> as well as the highly useful *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study*, periodically updating both.<sup>31</sup>

---

the 'Song of Moses' (Deut. 32) from Qumran," *BASOR* 136 (1954): 12-15; "The Structure of the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy (Dt 32:1-43)," *CBQ* 13 (1951): 153-63 (repr. Patrick W. Skehan, *Studies in Israelite Poetry and Wisdom* [CBQMS 1; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1971], 67-77); "The Qumran Manuscripts and Textual Criticism," *Volume du Congrès, Strasbourg, 1956* (VTSup 4; Leiden: Brill, 1957), 148-60; "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran and the Text of the Old Testament," *BA* 28 (1965): 87-100; "Qumran and Old Testament Criticism," in Delcor, *Qumrân, sa piété*, 163-82.

<sup>29</sup> The concordance was eventually published by Hans-Peter Richter, *A Preliminary Concordance to the Hebrew and Aramaic Fragments from Qumran Caves II-X, Including Especially the Unpublished Material from Cave IV* (5 vols.; Göttingen: Private Publication, 1988). Fitzmyer (*A Guide to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008], 175-6) reports that the hundreds of index cards with all the entries eventually "were photographed in the 1980s, and the printed photographs were bound in five vols. As such, the concordance was limited in distribution to the team of cave 4 researchers and a few others, but no copy of it was made available to those who originally compiled the concordance...!" Ulrich had a copy, and in response to a request from Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in Cincinnati, Ohio, sent it there in a spirit of collegiality and collaboration. "This concordance was used by Ben-Zion Wacholder and Martin Abegg to reconstruct texts in *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four* (4 fascicles; Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991, 1992, 1995, 1996)" (Fitzmyer, *A Guide*, 175-6).

<sup>30</sup> *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1: A Commentary* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966; 2d ed. 1971; 3d ed. 2004).

<sup>31</sup> *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975; 2d ed. 1990; rev. and expanded ed.: *A Guide to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature*, 2008).

### Cave 11

Yet another exception to an American focus was the discovery of cave 11 in 1956 and the publication of many of its contents. Yadin published the large *Temple Scroll* (11QT<sup>a</sup>),<sup>32</sup> and Florentino García Martínez, Eibert Tigchelaar, Adam van der Woude, and Edward Herbert published most of the remaining cave 11 scrolls, including six (seven?) biblical manuscripts.<sup>33</sup>

Two further major biblical manuscripts from that cave were published by the Americans, James Sanders and David Noel Freedman with Kenneth Mathews. Sanders published the edition of 11QPs<sup>a</sup> in DJD IV, and Freedman and Mathews published 11QpaleoLev<sup>a</sup>.<sup>34</sup> There was strenuous debate concerning the status of 11QPs<sup>a</sup>. Sanders viewed it as a biblical Psalter (and thus the siglum). But a number of respected scholars viewed it as a post-biblical, liturgical composition based on, but distinct from, the “canonical” Masoretic Psalter.<sup>35</sup> Understanding has grown, however, regarding the developmental nature of the composition of the scriptural texts and their variant editions. Thus more scholars have come to see 11QPs<sup>a</sup> as a representative of the Book of Psalms, simply a later, more expanded edition than that of the Masoretic Text. Both are based on a form of the text slightly earlier than the Masoretic Text; the Masoretic Text shows some secondary development not yet present in the Qumran texts, while 11QPs<sup>a</sup> has major developments beyond the earlier edition shared with the Masoretic Text.

In sum, at the end of the first decade of Scrolls publication, though quantitatively the major portions of the biblical scrolls were not published, qualitatively the major learnings regarding the biblical text and its development were published. The text of the Masoretic Text was shown to have been transmitted with great accuracy from antiquity, but evidence of the pluriformity and variant editions of the Hebrew texts abounded as well. The Samaritan Pentateuch was vindicated as based on a Jewish expanded edition

<sup>32</sup> Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983).

<sup>33</sup> Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, Adam van der Woude, and Edward Herbert, *Qumran Cave 11.II: 11Q2-18; 11Q20-31* (DJD XXIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

<sup>34</sup> James A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPs<sup>a</sup>)* (DJD IV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965); David N. Freedman and Kenneth A. Mathews, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev)* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns for ASOR, 1985).

<sup>35</sup> Shemaryahu Talmon, “Pisqah Be’emš’a Pasuq and 11QPs<sup>a</sup>,” *Textus* 5 (1966): 11-21; Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, “The Psalms Scroll (11QPs<sup>a</sup>): A Problem of Canon and Text,” *Textus* 5 (1966): 22-33; and Patrick W. Skehan, “A Liturgical Complex in 11QPs<sup>a</sup>,” *CBQ* 34 (1973): 195-205, plus “Qumran and Old Testament Criticism,” in Delcor, *Qumran. Sa piété*, 163-82 (168-9). See also, tentatively, Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3d ed., 37.

of the Torah in use by Jews and changed only with regard to the chosenness of Mount Gerizim in place of Jerusalem. The Septuagint was vindicated as presenting a generally faithful translation from an ancient Hebrew text of each book, often simply from a Hebrew edition at variance with the now-relativized Masoretic Text edition. The Greek codices of the fourth and fifth centuries were also validated as having accurately transmitted the Old Greek texts seen in the Qumran Septuagint manuscripts.

*Editing and Final Publication: 1980-2005*

*The Younger Generation: Skehan and Ulrich*

Patrick Skehan had worked steadily on the editions entrusted to him and had completed the transcriptions of most of them. He retired in 1979 and told his friends, quite realistically, that he would finish his volume within the next year or so. But a heart attack put an end to his labors on 9 September 1980. He had directed that Eugene Ulrich complete his editions for publication in DJD in the event of his death. Ulrich had been trained in the Greek and Latin classics, had studied Hebrew, Aramaic, and New Testament with Joseph Fitzmyer, including a year-long seminar at Johns Hopkins University on Aramaic Inscriptions. He had then earned his Ph.D. with Frank Cross and John Strugnell at Harvard University, where he also gained much from Shemaryahu Talmon as a Visiting Professor. Ulrich had published a text-critical study of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> in 1978 and an edition of 4QSam<sup>c</sup> in 1979.<sup>36</sup> Skehan, in light of those publications and his own failing health, asked that, if necessary, Ulrich complete his editions.

With Skehan's decades of intimate knowledge and familiarity with the manuscripts in his lot and his transcriptions of most of them finished, it is quite likely that he would have completed his volume in a year or so, as he envisioned. But though he knew the editions intimately, he had not marked which ones were fully completed and ready for publication and which still needed major work. So Ulrich had to begin from the beginning, examining and checking all.<sup>37</sup> Moreover, Skehan's editions were in the style of

<sup>36</sup> *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978); "4QSam<sup>c</sup>: A Fragmentary Manuscript of 2 Samuel 14-15 from the Scribe of the *Serek Hayahad* (1QS)," *BASOR* 235 (1979): 1-25.

<sup>37</sup> One of the advantages of this reworking was the discovery that a set of fragments originally labelled "unidentified non-biblical Greek (on leather)" was in fact the remnants of a Septuagint manuscript of Deuteronomy; see Eugene Ulrich, "The Greek Manuscripts of the Pentateuch from Qumran, Including Newly-Identified Fragments of Deuteronomy

the laconic early volumes in the DJD series, in contrast to the fuller introductions, transcriptions, notes on problematic readings, and systematic presentation of variants characterizing Cross's growing edition of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Ulrich's edition of 4QSam<sup>c</sup>. A broader and more detailed range of questions had become common, and thus the fuller style of edition seemed advisable.

Ulrich began with a sampling of the manuscripts: one in Palaeo-Hebrew, one Isaiah manuscript, and one Septuagint manuscript. He was greatly helped by an able graduate assistant, Judith Sanderson, with the edition of the huge 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup>,<sup>38</sup> and then with 4QpaleoGen-Exod<sup>l</sup> and 4QpaleoDeut<sup>f</sup>.<sup>39</sup> In 1984-1985, Pièrre Benoit (1906-1987), ailing and planning to step down as Editor-in-Chief of the DJD series, asked for a report from each of the team of editors. Cross, Strugnell, and Ulrich met at Harvard to discuss their reports, the current status, and the future. They cast their votes, supported by a majority of the international team, for Strugnell, who had done so much in ongoing identification of long-unclassified fragments, to replace Benoit as Editor-in-Chief.

### *The Younger Generation: Cross and Ulrich*

Moreover, Frank Cross, nearing retirement then and seeing that Ulrich had completed much of Skehan's lot in five years, asked him to complete the remainder of his own manuscripts as well. Ulrich agreed, with the understanding that he could gather a group of associate editors to produce the editions of a modest amount of manuscripts each. Since Emanuel Tov had published on Jeremiah,<sup>40</sup> Ulrich asked him to edit the Jeremiah manuscripts (and later some Leviticus manuscripts and the Canticles manuscripts); Tov had also in 1982 been asked by Benoit to finish the Greek *Minor Prophets* scroll and was nearing completion of it for DJD VIII. In light of Sanderson's text-critical dissertation and help on the edition of the Palaeo-Hebrew

---

(4QLXXDeut)," in Albert Pietersma and Claude Cox, eds., *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Mississauga: Benben Press, 1984), 71-82; and Patrick W. Skehan, Eugene Ulrich and Judith E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4, IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD IX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).

<sup>38</sup> See the dissertation of Judith E. Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran: 4Qpaleo-Exod<sup>m</sup> and the Samaritan Tradition* (HSS 30; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).

<sup>39</sup> Skehan, Ulrich, and Sanderson, *Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts*, 53-130.

<sup>40</sup> Emanuel Tov, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of Jeremiah 29-52 and Baruch 1:1-3:8* (HSM 8; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976).

manuscripts, Ulrich asked her to edit the Jewish-script Exodus manuscripts (and later the Ezekiel manuscripts). Julio Treballe Barrera of Madrid, who had published his dissertation on Kings,<sup>41</sup> was asked to edit the manuscripts of Judges, Kings, and Chronicles.

Cross and Ulrich also agreed that exceptional doctoral students ready to write their dissertation (and therefore motivated to produce expeditiously) would be invited to edit small groups of manuscripts under the direction of Cross and Strugnell, which would then be checked and volume-edited camera-ready by Ulrich. Accordingly James Davila edited the Genesis manuscripts, Nathan Jastram edited the large 4QNum<sup>b</sup>, Sidnie White Crawford and Julie Duncan each edited half of the many Deuteronomy manuscripts, and Russell Fuller edited the manuscripts of the Twelve Prophets.

### *The Changing World of Computers, Assistants, and Grants*

Other major shifts in academic life-style were also happening. As opposed to the traditional scholars working in solitude with hand-written pages or typewriters when they could find time after their teaching duties, younger scholars were being supplied not only with graduate assistants (as above), but also with computers and with grants for sabbatical research, which were becoming more plentiful. A major technological advance came in 1984 with the Macintosh computer, though Ulrich had to design his own Hebrew and Greek fonts, pixel by pixel, since no such fonts were available.<sup>42</sup> He was also helped greatly by a series of editorial grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities.<sup>43</sup>

The first seven DJD volumes had been typeset by Oxford University Press, their complexity requiring usually three years between date of submission and publication. Tov was the first editor to submit his volume as a computer file, but the complexity of that innovative procedure meant that the volume was not finely formatted, proofread, and published until 1990. Meanwhile, Ulrich had submitted his DJD IX volume to Strugnell in 1988, but Strugnell and the press were engaged with Tov's volume, and they did not begin to process DJD IX until 1990. DJD IX was finally published in

<sup>41</sup> Julio Treballe Barrera, *Salomón y Jeroboán: Historia de la recensión y redacción de 1 Reyes 2-12; 14* (Bibliotheca Salmanticensis Dissertationes 3; Salamanca: Universidad Pontificia, 1980).

<sup>42</sup> For the fonts see Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll*.

<sup>43</sup> See *Rediscovering America: Thirty-Five Years of the National Endowment for the Humanities* (Washington: National Endowment for the Humanities, 2000), 64-65.

1992, and the remaining cave 4 biblical volumes were published in 1994, 1995, 1997, and 2000. Only 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and 4QSam<sup>b</sup> awaited publication, and Cross, assisted by Donald Parry and Richard Saley, published DJD XVII in 2005.

### *From Data to Theory*

To this point most of the discussion has been on manuscripts and their publication. Knowledge should, of course, start with the data and then, once the data are clearly established, move to their interpretation, significance, and implications. One such significant implication calls for brief discussion: the history of the development of the biblical text.

The mentalities of scholars in the middle of the twentieth century had all been trained in the “pre-Copernican” biblical universe in which there were one earth at the center and two planets: the Masoretic Text was the textual center, the “standardized text” around which all other texts revolved; the Samaritan Pentateuch was basically dismissed as a secondary derivative based on the “original” Masoretic Text, and the Septuagint was a translation, sometimes helpful but often paraphrastic and suspect. Observing the gradual evolution in proper conceptualization of the textual universe is fascinating.

The new world began when Cross presented convincing data that 4QSam<sup>a</sup> was a Hebrew text that primarily agreed with the Septuagint of Samuel against the Masoretic Text, and Skehan demonstrated the alignment of the Jewish scroll 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> with the Samaritan Pentateuch against the Masoretic Text.<sup>44</sup> These findings sparked Albright’s insight regarding the Pentateuch that the Masoretic Text, Samaritan Pentateuch, and the Septuagint represented three “recensions” stemming from three locales: Babylon, Palestine, and Alexandria.<sup>45</sup> Cross and Skehan continued probing the issue of the history of the biblical text as manuscript after manuscript was examined. Having amassed an array of readings, Cross greatly elaborated Albright’s “three local texts” theory with sufficient persuasion to reign

---

<sup>44</sup> Cross, “A New Qumran Biblical Fragment”; Skehan, “Exodus in the Samaritan Recension.”

<sup>45</sup> William F. Albright, “New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible,” *BASOR* 140 (1955): 27-33; repr. in Frank M. Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon, eds., *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975), 140-46.

as the sole theory for a decade and more.<sup>46</sup> Both Albright and Cross presupposed a single text that had developed into those three, though Cross discarded the idea of recensions. Then, Shemaryahu Talmon observed that abundant textual variation was the rule as far back as the textual evidence could lead. In place of Cross's one-to-three schema, Talmon argued rather for a many-to-three process. He saw that the multi-faceted variation in texts was reduced to only three forms after the destruction in 70 CE, because only three groups survived: the rabbis, the Samaritans, and the Christians, each with their set of texts. Cross and Talmon gathered a collection of various ground-breaking articles in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*.<sup>47</sup>

As the years progressed and Tov and Ulrich worked through the biblical editions, they continued developing these lines of thought. Tov's masterful *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* brought the subject of textual criticism into the post-Qumran world, incorporating the insights gained from the Scrolls.<sup>48</sup> He widened the "three texts" model into five categories: to texts aligned with the proto-Masoretic Text, with the pre-Samaritan (for the Pentateuch), and with the Septuagint, he added the categories of "texts written in the Qumran practice" and "non-aligned" texts.<sup>49</sup> This had the advantage of further diminishing the notion of "three recensions." It also provided a schema for clearly classifying texts in terms that could be quickly grasped.

Noting the repeated and apparently intentional nature of the major variants between different forms of certain books, Ulrich proposed the idea of variant literary editions—that a creative scribe had purposely made a different edition of a particular book. Noting further the pattern that one edition often developed and expanded an earlier form of that text according to discernible principles, Ulrich described the phenomenon of successive "new and expanded editions" for a number of the books. Thus, while appreciating the pedagogical value of Tov's five classifications, he suggested an alternate schema. Many scholars were coming to agree that the individual books of the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint were not standardized

---

<sup>46</sup> Frank M. Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert," *HTR* 57 (1964): 281-99; repr. in Cross and Talmon, *Qumran and the History*, 177-95.

<sup>47</sup> Cross and Talmon, *Qumran and the History*.

<sup>48</sup> Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1992; 2d ed. 2001).

<sup>49</sup> Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 114. Tov has since removed the category of "texts written in the Qumran practice" from his statistical analysis of the Qumran biblical scrolls; see his *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays* (TSAJ 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 144.



“text types” but simply chance copies made from one edition or another for each book, and that the character of the texts in each collection varied from book to book. Ulrich accordingly adopted a “successive literary edition” schema. Since the Masoretic Text, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the Septuagint were not “standardized texts types,” they should not be the standard-bearers according to which the Qumran texts were “aligned” or “non-aligned.” The extant texts were not the “originals” but were already “rewritten Bible,” preceded by an unknown number ( $n$ ) of previous editions. Thus they could be envisioned as simply the first extant edition ( $n + 1$ ) of that book, with “new and expanded editions” listed as ( $n + 2$ ,  $n + 3$ , etc.).<sup>50</sup>

To be sure, the discussion is only a part of the way down the road that hopefully it will travel. Ulrich’s schema, for example, is somewhat cumbersome, more difficult to navigate than Tov’s, and in need of refinement and elaboration. With all the manuscripts now published, the data invite future scholars to explore the full range of texts and to advance the theoretical discussion. That discussion will presumably keep broadening to include the interrelated issue of a broader understanding of “biblical texts” than the Masoretic collection for the Second Temple period and the rise of Christianity and rabbinic Judaism, as well as the issue of the mostly uncharted process toward the eventual canon.

Biblical students of today inherit a textual worldview quite different from, and hopefully more advanced and more historically accurate than the “pre-Copernican” textual world in which their professors were trained. They will learn in a course or two what it took their teachers a generation to learn.

### *Wider Contributions and the Future*

A short history such as this can provide only an impressionistic sample of the many other scholarly contributions during the ensuing years. Many

---

<sup>50</sup> The Book of Exodus may furnish an example. For Exodus 35-40 the Old Greek presents presumably the earliest edition extant for those chapters (edition  $n + 1$ ). The Masoretic Text presents a revised edition (edition  $n + 2$ ) developed from the tradition seen in the Old Greek. 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> has an expanded edition ( $n + 3$ ) based on expanding the Masoretic edition. The Samaritan Pentateuch displays the same general edition as 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> but adds such transforming theological changes (Mount Gerizim) that one could classify it as a fourth edition ( $n + 4$ ). 4QReworked Pentateuch (4Q158, 4Q364-4Q367) would constitute yet a fifth edition ( $n + 5$ ) for Exodus insofar as it is a biblical text rather than a post-biblical composition.



other scholars in North America—far too many to be mentioned here—have contributed various major biblical services.

Two scholars were especially influential in initial efforts probing the interrelationships of the Scrolls and the New Testament: Joseph Fitzmyer and Krister Stendahl (1921-2008). Fitzmyer, Professor at Fordham University and then at Catholic University, published a series of New Testament essays that culminated in *The Semitic Background of the New Testament*.<sup>51</sup> Stendahl, Dean and Professor at Harvard Divinity School then later Bishop of Stockholm, built a basis for scholarly discussion of the Scrolls and the New Testament.<sup>52</sup> George Brooke and Craig Evans have also continued to be major voices in this area.<sup>53</sup> Menahem Mansoor of the University of Wisconsin–Madison was one of the early professors who digested the Scrolls' riches for college students.<sup>54</sup> The translation team of the *New Revised Standard Version* of the Bible made full use of the Scrolls in revising their translation.<sup>55</sup>

Lawrence Schiffman and James VanderKam engineered the compilation of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, with a full range of entries on the biblical manuscripts.<sup>56</sup> James Charlesworth established a valuable series of volumes of text with translation and commentary, which incorporates improved readings plus scholarly advances.<sup>57</sup> VanderKam and Ulrich hosted an international conference at Notre Dame in 1993,<sup>58</sup> and Charlesworth convened a conference on the Scrolls at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1997, publishing a volume on the biblical Scrolls.<sup>59</sup> VanderKam also

<sup>51</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *To Advance the Gospel: New Testament Studies* (New York: Crossroad, 1981); *The Semitic Background of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997).

<sup>52</sup> Krister Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew, and Its Use of the Old Testament* (Uppsala: C. W. K. Gleerup, Lund, 1954; 2d ed. 1968); Krister Stendahl, ed., *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (New York: Harper, 1957).

<sup>53</sup> George J. Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005); Craig A. Evans, *Noncanonical Writings and New Testament Interpretation* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992).

<sup>54</sup> Menahem Mansoor, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A College Textbook and a Study Guide* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964). Mansoor was also one of the first to produce a commentary on the *Hodayot*; see his *The Thanksgiving Hymns* (STDJ 3; Leiden: Brill, 1961).

<sup>55</sup> *The Holy Bible: Containing the Old and New Testaments: New Revised Standard Version* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).

<sup>56</sup> Schiffman and VanderKam, *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*.

<sup>57</sup> James H. Charlesworth et al., eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* (Tübingen-Louisville: Mohr Siebeck-Westminster John Knox, 1994-).

<sup>58</sup> Eugene Ulrich and James C. VanderKam, eds., *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994).

<sup>59</sup> James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Dead Sea Scrolls Jubilee Symposium Held at Princeton Theological Seminary, November 1997*,

published the popular survey of the research and, with Peter Flint, a more comprehensive and updated volume.<sup>60</sup>

Martin Abegg, Peter Flint, and Eugene Ulrich published an English translation of all the biblical scrolls,<sup>61</sup> and Ulrich has produced a one-volume collection of transcriptions of all the Qumran Hebrew biblical fragments with their textual variants.<sup>62</sup> Finally, Abegg with James Bowley and Edward Cook provided the concordance to the biblical scrolls,<sup>63</sup> a companion to the concordance of the nonbiblical scrolls.<sup>64</sup>

As one looks to the future, several areas beg for exploration. The textual variants displayed by the Scrolls in contrast to the witness of previous sources are now ripe for mature text-critical analysis and more nuanced understanding of the precise causes, whether intentional or inadvertent, that produced the various readings.<sup>65</sup> Ever further refinement is needed in the area of the text history of the Hebrew Bible and the factors in its process toward the eventual canon. But the “Hebrew Bible” needs to be envisioned in a broader sense than the traditional Masoretic canon, including a larger corpus of works such as *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch*, as, for example, VanderKam<sup>66</sup> and Brooke<sup>67</sup> have urged.

Though the items mentioned above are but a few of the roads that invite future research, the list cannot be complete without explicitly pointing

---

*Vol. 1: The Hebrew Bible and Qumran* (North Richland: Bibal Press, 2000); updated ed., *The Bible and The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins. Vol. 1: Scripture and the Scrolls* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006).

<sup>60</sup> James C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994; 2d ed. 2010); James C. VanderKam and Peter W. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2002).

<sup>61</sup> Martin G. Abegg, Peter W. Flint, and Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999).

<sup>62</sup> Eugene Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants* (VT-Sup 134; Leiden: Brill, 2010).

<sup>63</sup> Martin G. Abegg, Jr., James E. Bowley, and Edward M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance. Vol. III. 1, 2: The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

<sup>64</sup> Martin G. Abegg, James E. Bowley, and Edward M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance. Vol. I. 1, 2: The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 2003); volume II is in process.

<sup>65</sup> See, e.g., D. Andrew Teeter, “Exegesis in the Transmission of Biblical Law in the Second Temple Period: Preliminary Studies” (Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame, 2008).

<sup>66</sup> James C. VanderKam, “Questions of Canon Viewed through the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in Lee M. McDonald and James A. Sanders, eds., *The Canon Debate* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 91-109 (95).

<sup>67</sup> George J. Brooke, “The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible,” in Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov, eds., *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (London: The British Library and Oak Knoll Press, 2002), 31-40.

to the tantalizing issue of “Rewritten” Bible. A pivotal set of manuscripts is, of course, 4QReworked Pentateuch (4Q158 and 4Q364-4Q367). Ulrich raised the question in 1993 whether these manuscripts should not be considered scriptural, as opposed to post-scriptural.<sup>68</sup> Michael Segal in 1997 addressed the issue in more detail.<sup>69</sup> Emanuel Tov, who with Sidnie White Crawford had originally published 4Q364-4Q367 as nonbiblical, has subsequently agreed that they could have been considered as scripture by some.<sup>70</sup> Moshe Bernstein,<sup>71</sup> Sidnie White Crawford,<sup>72</sup> Daniel Falk,<sup>73</sup> and Molly Zahn<sup>74</sup> have also addressed the question recently, but to my knowledge, none have concluded definitively that they merit scriptural status.

As we look to the future, one hopes that scholars will remember with gratitude the original team of editors — the giants on whose shoulders we stand.

---

<sup>68</sup> Eugene Ulrich, “The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures at Qumran,” in Ulrich and VanderKam, *The Community of the Renewed Covenant*, 77-93 (92 n. 51); repr. in Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids-Leiden: Eerdmans-Brill, 1999), 32.

<sup>69</sup> Segal’s lecture was presented in 1997 and published later. Michael Segal, “Biblical Exegesis in 4Q158: Techniques and Genre,” *Textus* 19 (1998): 45-62; “4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch?” in Schiffman, Tov, and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years*, 391-9.

<sup>70</sup> Tov (“The Many Forms of Scripture: Reflections in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch,” in Armin Lange, Matthias Weigold, and Jozsef Zsengeller, eds., *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of his 65th Birthday* [FRLANT 230; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009]) now agrees that 4QRP is “to be reclassified as a biblical text, ‘4QPentateuch,’” and needs “to be studied as Hebrew Scripture.”

<sup>71</sup> Moshe J. Bernstein, “‘Rewritten Bible’: A Generic Category Which Has Outlived Its Usefulness?” *Textus* 22 (2005): 169-96; “What Has Happened to the Laws? The Treatment of Legal Material in 4QReworkedPentateuch,” *DSD* 15 (2008): 24-49.

<sup>72</sup> Sidnie W. Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008).

<sup>73</sup> Daniel K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures Among the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: T&T Clark, 2007).

<sup>74</sup> Molly M. Zahn, “The Problem of Characterizing the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts: Bible, Rewritten Bible, or None of the Above?” *DSD* 25 (2008): 315-39.

*Index of Qumran Biblical Manuscripts and Editors*

1Q1	1QGen	Barthélemy
1Q2	1QExod	Barthélemy
1Q3	1QpaleoLev-Num <sup>a</sup>	Barthélemy, Ulrich
1Q3a	1QpaleoLev <sup>b?</sup>	Barthélemy, Ulrich
1Q4	1QDeut <sup>a</sup>	Barthélemy
1Q5	1QDeut <sup>b</sup>	Barthélemy
1Q6	1QJudg	Barthélemy
1Q7	1QSam	Barthélemy
1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	Burrows, Ulrich-Flint
1Q8	1QIsa <sup>b</sup>	Sukenik, Barthélemy, Ulrich-Flint
1Q9	1QEzek	Barthélemy
1Q10	1QPs <sup>a</sup>	Barthélemy
1Q11	1QPs <sup>b</sup>	Barthélemy
1Q12	1QPs <sup>c</sup>	Barthélemy
1Q71	1QDan <sup>a</sup>	Barthélemy, Trever
1Q72	1QDan <sup>b</sup>	Barthélemy, Trever
2Q1	2QGen	Baillet
2Q2	2QExod <sup>a</sup>	Baillet
2Q3	2QExod <sup>b</sup>	Baillet
2Q4	2QExod <sup>c</sup>	Baillet
2Q5	2QpaleoLev	Baillet
2Q6	2QNum <sup>a</sup>	Baillet
2Q7	2QNum <sup>b</sup>	Baillet
2Q8	2QNum <sup>c</sup>	Baillet
2Q9	2QNum <sup>d?</sup>	Baillet
2Q10	2QDeut <sup>a</sup>	Baillet
2Q11	2QDeut <sup>b</sup>	Baillet
2Q12	2QDeut <sup>c</sup>	Baillet
2Q13	2QJer	Baillet
2Q14	2QPs	Baillet
2Q15	2QJob	Baillet
2Q16	2QRuth <sup>a</sup>	Baillet
2Q17	2QRuth <sup>b</sup>	Baillet
3Q1	3QEzek	Baillet
3Q2	3QPs 2	Baillet
3Q3	3QLam	Baillet

4Q2	4QGen <sup>b</sup>	Davila
4Q3	4QGen <sup>c</sup>	Davila
4Q4	4QGen <sup>d</sup>	Davila
4Q5	4QGen <sup>e</sup>	Davila
4Q6	4QGen <sup>f</sup>	Davila
4Q7	4QGen <sup>g</sup>	Davila
4Q8	4QGen <sup>h1</sup>	Davila
4Q8a	4QGen <sup>h2</sup>	Davila
4Q8b	4QGen <sup>h-para</sup>	Davila
4Q9	4QGen <sup>i</sup>	Davila
4Q10	4QGen <sup>k</sup>	Davila
4Q12	4QpaleoGen <sup>m</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich
4Q483	4QpapGen <sup>o</sup>	Baillet, Puech
4Q576	4QGen <sup>n</sup>	Puech
4Q1	4QGen-Exod <sup>a</sup>	Davila
4Q11	4QpaleoGen-Exod <sup>l</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Sanderson
4Q13	4QExod <sup>b</sup>	Cross
4Q14	4QExod <sup>c</sup>	Sanderson
4Q15	4QExod <sup>d</sup>	Sanderson
4Q16	4QExod <sup>e</sup>	Sanderson
4Q18	4QExod <sup>g</sup>	Sanderson
4Q19	4QExod <sup>h</sup>	Sanderson
4Q20	4QExod <sup>j</sup>	Sanderson
4Q21	4QExod <sup>k</sup>	Sanderson
4Q22	4QpaleoExod <sup>m</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Sanderson
4Q17	4QExod-Lev <sup>f</sup>	Cross
4Q24	4QLev <sup>b</sup>	Ulrich
4Q25	4QLev <sup>c</sup>	Tov
4Q26	4QLev <sup>d</sup>	Tov
4Q26a	4QLev <sup>e</sup>	Tov
4Q26b	4QLev <sup>g</sup>	Tov
4Q23	4QLev-Num <sup>a</sup>	Ulrich
4Q27	4QNum <sup>b</sup>	Jastram
4Q28	4QDeut <sup>a</sup>	White Crawford
4Q29	4QDeut <sup>b</sup>	Duncan
4Q30	4QDeut <sup>c</sup>	White Crawford
4Q31	4QDeut <sup>d</sup>	White Crawford
4Q32	4QDeut <sup>e</sup>	Duncan
4Q33	4QDeut <sup>f</sup>	White Crawford

4Q34	4QDeut <sup>g</sup>	White Crawford
4Q35	4QDeut <sup>h</sup>	Duncan
4Q36	4QDeut <sup>i</sup>	White Crawford
4Q37	4QDeut <sup>j</sup>	Duncan
4Q38	4QDeut <sup>k1</sup>	Duncan
4Q38a	4QDeut <sup>k2</sup>	Duncan
4Q38b	4QDeut <sup>k3</sup>	Duncan
4Q39	4QDeut <sup>l</sup>	Duncan
4Q40	4QDeut <sup>m</sup>	Duncan
4Q41	4QDeut <sup>n</sup>	White Crawford
4Q42	4QDeut <sup>o</sup>	White Crawford
4Q43	4QDeut <sup>p</sup>	White Crawford
4Q44	4QDeut <sup>q</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich
4Q45	4QpaleoDeut <sup>r</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Sanderson
4Q46	4QpaleoDeut <sup>s</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich
4Q47	4QJosh <sup>a</sup>	Ulrich
4Q48	4QJosh <sup>b</sup>	Tov
	XJosh	Charlesworth
4Q49	4QJudg <sup>a</sup>	Trebolle Barrera
4Q50	4QJudg <sup>b</sup>	Trebolle Barrera
	XJudg	Charlesworth
4Q51	4QSam <sup>a</sup>	Cross-Parry-Saley
4Q52	4QSam <sup>b</sup>	Cross-Parry-Saley
4Q53	4QSam <sup>c</sup>	Ulrich
4Q54	4QKgs	Trebolle Barrera
4Q55	4QIsa <sup>a</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich
4Q56	4QIsa <sup>b</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich
4Q57	4QIsa <sup>c</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich
4Q58	4QIsa <sup>d</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich
4Q59	4QIsa <sup>e</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich
4Q60	4QIsa <sup>f</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich
4Q61	4QIsa <sup>g</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich
4Q62	4QIsa <sup>h</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich
4Q62a	4QIsa <sup>i</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich
4Q63	4QIsa <sup>j</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich
4Q64	4QIsa <sup>k</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich
4Q65	4QIsa <sup>l</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich
4Q66	4QIsa <sup>m</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich
4Q67	4QIsa <sup>n</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich

4Q68	4QIsa <sup>o</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich
4Q69	4QpapIsa <sup>p</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich
4Q69a	4QIsa <sup>q</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich
4Q69b	4QIsa <sup>r</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich
4Q70	4QJer <sup>a</sup>	Tov
4Q71	4QJer <sup>b</sup>	Tov
4Q72	4QJer <sup>c</sup>	Tov
4Q72a	4QJer <sup>d</sup>	Tov
4Q72b	4QJer <sup>e</sup>	Tov
4Q73	4QEzek <sup>a</sup>	Sanderson
4Q74	4QEzek <sup>b</sup>	Sanderson
4Q75	4QEzek <sup>c</sup>	Sanderson
4Q76	4QXII <sup>a</sup>	Fuller
4Q77	4QXII <sup>b</sup>	Fuller
4Q78	4QXII <sup>c</sup>	Fuller
4Q79	4QXII <sup>d</sup>	Fuller
4Q80	4QXII <sup>e</sup>	Fuller
4Q81	4QXII <sup>f</sup>	Fuller
4Q82	4QXII <sup>g</sup>	Fuller
4Q83	4QPs <sup>a</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Flint
4Q84	4QPs <sup>b</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Flint
4Q85	4QPs <sup>c</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Flint
4Q86	4QPs <sup>d</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Flint
4Q87	4QPs <sup>e</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Flint
4Q88	4QPs <sup>f</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Flint
4Q89	4QPs <sup>g</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Flint
4Q90	4QPs <sup>h</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Flint
4Q91	4QPs <sup>j</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Flint
4Q92	4QPs <sup>k</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Flint
4Q93	4QPs <sup>l</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Flint
4Q94	4QPs <sup>m</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Flint
4Q95	4QPs <sup>n</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Flint
4Q96	4QPs <sup>o</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Flint
4Q97	4QPs <sup>p</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Flint
4Q98	4QPs <sup>q</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Flint
4Q98a	4QPs <sup>r</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Flint
4Q98b	4QPs <sup>s</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Flint
4Q98c	4QPs <sup>t</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Flint
4Q98d	4QPs <sup>u</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Flint

4Q98e	4QPs <sup>v</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Flint
4Q98f	4QPs <sup>w</sup>	Fitzmyer
4Q98g	4QPs <sup>x</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich-Flint
[4Q522	Ps 122 in 4Q522	Puech]
4Q99	4QJob <sup>a</sup>	Ulrich-Metso
4Q100	4QJob <sup>b</sup>	Ulrich-Metso
4Q101	4QpaleoJob <sup>c</sup>	Ulrich
4Q102	4QProv <sup>a</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich
4Q103	4QProv <sup>b</sup>	Skehan-Ulrich
4Q103a	4QProv <sup>c</sup>	Puech
4Q104	4QRuth <sup>a</sup>	Ulrich-Murphy
4Q105	4QRuth <sup>b</sup>	Ulrich-Murphy
4Q106	4QCant <sup>a</sup>	Tov
4Q107	4QCant <sup>b</sup>	Tov
4Q108	4QCant <sup>c</sup>	Tov
4Q109	4QQoh <sup>a</sup>	Ulrich
4Q110	4QQoh <sup>b</sup>	Ulrich
4Q111	4QLam	Cross
4Q112	4QDan <sup>a</sup>	Ulrich
4Q113	4QDan <sup>b</sup>	Ulrich
4Q114	4QDan <sup>c</sup>	Ulrich
4Q115	4QDan <sup>d</sup>	Ulrich-Niccum
4Q116	4QDan <sup>e</sup>	Ulrich
4Q117	4QEzra	Ulrich
4Q118	4QChr	Trebolle Barrera
5Q1	5QDeut	Milik
5Q2	5QKgs	Milik
5Q3	5QIsa	Milik
5Q4	5QXII (5QAmos)	Milik
5Q5	5QPs 119	Milik
5Q6	5QLam <sup>a</sup>	Milik
5Q7	5QLam <sup>b</sup>	Milik
6Q1	6QpaleoGen	Baillet
6Q2	6QpaleoLev	Baillet
6Q3	6QpapDeut?	Baillet
6Q20	6QDeut?	Baillet
6Q4	6QpapKgs	Baillet
6Q5	6QpapPs78?	Baillet
6Q6	6QCant	Baillet



6Q7	6QpapDan	Baillet
8Q1	8QGen	Baillet
8Q2	8QPs	Baillet
11Q1	11QpaleoLev <sup>a</sup>	Freedman-Mathews
11Q2	11QLev <sup>b</sup>	García-vdWoude-Tigchelaar
11Q3	11QDeut	García-vdWoude-Tigchelaar
11Q4	11QEzek	Herbert
11Q5	11QPs <sup>a</sup>	Sanders, Gar-Woude-Tigch
11Q6	11QPs <sup>b</sup>	García-vdWoude-Tigchelaar
11Q7	11QPs <sup>c</sup>	García-vdWoude-Tigchelaar
11Q8	11QPs <sup>d</sup>	García-vdWoude-Tigchelaar
11Q9	11QPs <sup>e?</sup>	García-vdWoude-Tigchelaar

## “REWRITTEN BIBLE” IN NORTH AMERICAN SCHOLARSHIP

SIDNIE WHITE CRAWFORD

The subject of “Rewritten Bible” or, better, “Rewritten Scripture,” has been part of North American Qumran scholarship since the late 1970s.<sup>1</sup> Publications on the subject have approached the question from different angles, either keeping the relatively narrow focus of Geza Vermes’s original definition,<sup>2</sup> or embracing a much broader definition that included many more Second Temple Jewish works. For the latter position, the work of George Nickelsburg and Daniel Harrington stand out. Nickelsburg, in “The Bible Rewritten and Expanded,” discusses “literature that is very closely related to the biblical texts, expanding and paraphrasing them and implicitly commenting on them.”<sup>3</sup> He thus includes under his rubric works such as *I Enoch* and the *Book of Giants* and the *Apocalypse of Moses*, as well as *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*. Daniel Harrington likewise expands Vermes’s definition to include such works as the *Paralipomena of Jeremiah* and the *Life of Adam and Eve / Apocalypse of Moses*.<sup>4</sup>

In recent years American scholars have favored a more narrow definition of the term Rewritten Bible/Scriptures. Moshe Bernstein began this trend with articles beginning in 1979.<sup>5</sup> His interest in the subject grew out of his training in rabbinic midrash, and led him to wrestle with questions of both genre and purpose. Bernstein wishes to retain Vermes’s genre definition, but with modifications, broadening it to include legal as well as narrative

---

<sup>1</sup> For a discussion of the more appropriate nomenclature “Rewritten Scripture,” see Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 6-9.

<sup>2</sup> See Geza Vermes, *Scripture and tradition in Judaism: Haggadic studies* (StPB 4; Leiden: Brill, 1983; 2d rev. ed.).

<sup>3</sup> George W. E. Nickelsburg, “The Bible Rewritten and Expanded,” in Michael E. Stone, ed., *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 2; Assen-Philadelphia: Van Gorcum-Fortress, 1984), 89.

<sup>4</sup> Daniel J. Harrington, “The Bible Rewritten (Narratives),” in Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg, eds., *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 239-47. Harrington is uncomfortable with using “Rewritten Bible” as a genre designation, stating “it seems better to view rewriting the Bible as a kind of activity or process than to see it as a distinctive literary genre of Palestinian Judaism...” (243).

<sup>5</sup> Moshe J. Bernstein, “Midrash Halakah at Qumran? 11QTemple 64:6-13 and Deuteronomy 21:22-23,” *Gesher* 7 (1979): 21-31.

texts. He states, "My own preference, it should be clear, is for a Vermes-like narrowness in the employment of the term, demanding comprehensive or broad scope rewriting of narrative and/or legal material woven into the fabric implicitly."<sup>6</sup> Thus, Bernstein would, unlike Vermes, include the *Temple Scroll* in the category, but exclude works like *1 Enoch* or the *Life of Adam and Eve*.

Sidnie White Crawford, a younger contemporary of Bernstein's, began publishing in the area of Rewritten Scripture with the critical edition of the 4QReworked Pentateuch manuscripts (4Q364-4Q367) in 1995.<sup>7</sup> The *Reworked Pentateuch* manuscripts, as their name implies, are manuscripts containing all or parts of the Pentateuch, expanded and reworked in various ways. Their early history had an impact on the entire discussion of what constitutes a Rewritten Scripture manuscript. When these cave 4 manuscripts were first identified, they were assigned to Frank Cross as "biblical" manuscripts. After examining them, Cross turned them over to John Strugnell as "nonbiblical."<sup>8</sup> When Crawford and Tov first published the manuscripts, they spoke in terms of a single "author" of a "composition," who extensively altered a "biblical base text."<sup>9</sup> However, further study of the manuscripts led some scholars, notably Eugene Ulrich, to argue that 4QReworked Pentateuch was actually simply a collection of expanded Pentateuch texts, which should have retained their "biblical" label.<sup>10</sup> Crawford has moved much closer to this position in recent years, stating, "we can say with almost complete certainty that 4Q364 and 4Q365 were meant by the scribes who prepared them to be read as regular pentateuchal texts." However, she cautions that their acceptance as scriptural texts is still uncertain.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Moshe J. Bernstein, "'Rewritten Bible': A Generic Category which has Outlived its Usefulness?" *Textus* 22 (2005): 169-96 (195).

<sup>7</sup> Emanuel Tov and Sidnie White, "Reworked Pentateuch," in Harold Attridge et al., *Qumran Cave 4. VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (DJD XIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 187-352.

<sup>8</sup> John Strugnell, oral communication.

<sup>9</sup> See, e.g., Emanuel Tov, "The Textual Status of 4Q364-367 (4QPP)," in Trebelle Barrera and Vegas Montaner, *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 43-82, and Sidnie A. White, "4Q364 & 365: A Preliminary Report," 217-28 in the same volume.

<sup>10</sup> Eugene C. Ulrich, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Biblical Text," in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years*, 51-59.

<sup>11</sup> Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*, 56-57. Tov has also changed his mind, accepting the 4QRP manuscripts as regular biblical manuscripts. Emanuel Tov, "Reflections on the Many Forms of Hebrew Scripture in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch," in Armin Lange, Matthias Weigold and József Zsengellér, eds., *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of His 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday* (FRLANT 230; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 11-28.

Crawford has written more broadly on the phenomenon of Rewritten Scripture in the Second Temple period, concentrating on the Pentateuchal texts. In agreement with Bernstein, she favors a narrower definition of what constitutes a Rewritten Scripture text: “These Rewritten Scriptures constitute a category or group of texts which are characterized by a close adherence to a recognizable and already authoritative base text (narrative or legal) and a recognizable degree of scribal intervention into that base text for the purpose of exegesis.”<sup>12</sup> She sets those works that fall under that definition along a spectrum, beginning with the existing base text, and moving further away until recognizably new compositions are created (e.g. *Jubilees*, the *Temple Scroll*, and the *Genesis Apocryphon*). She also makes a sharp distinction between Rewritten Scripture texts and “parabiblical” texts, which “use a passage, event, or character from a scriptural work as a ‘jumping off’ point to create a new narrative or work,” such as *I Enoch* or *Joseph and Asenath*.<sup>13</sup>

In the past decade several younger American scholars have furthered the work begun by the earlier generations. Daniel Falk has explored the methods that scribes/editors/authors used to extend (Falk’s term) scriptural traditions in the Second Temple period.<sup>14</sup> Falk recognizes that the sharp boundaries scholars such as Cross and Strugnell originally drew between what was “biblical” and what was “nonbiblical” are no longer tenable, and it is difficult finally to be absolutely certain as to a particular work’s scriptural status in this period.<sup>15</sup> However, he recognizes that there was at this time a “Scripture consciousness” which affected the way texts were approached by their scribes/editors/authors.<sup>16</sup> He also rejects the term “Rewritten Bible” as a literary genre, preferring to focus on the strategies that were used, and to think of the phenomenon as an activity.<sup>17</sup>

Most recently, Molly Zahn has concentrated on questions of exegesis, composition, and textual authority in the major works most frequently cited as belonging to the category “Rewritten Bible”: 4QReworked Pentateuch, *Jubilees*, the *Temple Scroll*, and the *Genesis Apocryphon*.<sup>18</sup> She notes

<sup>12</sup> Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*, 12.

<sup>13</sup> Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*, 14.

<sup>14</sup> Daniel Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: T&T Clark, 2008), 2-3.

<sup>15</sup> For example, he agrees with Crawford as to the uncertainty of the scriptural status of 4QRP. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts*, 119.

<sup>16</sup> Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts*, 2.

<sup>17</sup> Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts*, 17. This is similar to Harrington’s “process.”

<sup>18</sup> Molly M. Zahn, *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts* (STDJ 95; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2011); “Rewritten Scripture,” in Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2010), 325-6.

that all these texts are characterized by “their steady interaction with the text of scripture,” and common compositional techniques, such as minor additions and alterations, rearrangement, harmonization, addition of new material, and paraphrase.<sup>19</sup> She acknowledges the difficulty of determining the authoritative status of these rewritten texts, and argues for a type of “reader-response” method to uncover the place of these texts in Second Temple Judaism: “In order to advance the discussion, it seems most profitable to abandon the notion of a continuum of reworking and think instead about how exactly readers or hearers construe texts.”<sup>20</sup>

Several other young North American scholars have become active in this field in the last decade, and their work promises new and different insights in the years to come.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Zahn, “Rewritten Bible,” 329; *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture*, 234-5.

<sup>20</sup> Zahn, *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture*, 241.

<sup>21</sup> Among these are Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (SJSJ 77: Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2003), whose work is influenced by contemporary genre theory and discourse analysis, and David Andrew Teeter, *Exegesis in the Transmission of Biblical Law in the Second Temple Period: Preliminary Studies* (Unpublished Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame, 2008).

## QUMRAN RESEARCH IN THE UNITED STATES: THE NON-SECTARIAN TEXTS

JAMES C. VANDERKAM

North American scholars have been an important force in the study devoted to the non-sectarian Hebrew Scrolls in the sixty years since the first texts from Qumran were made available. Three Americans—Millar Burrows, William Brownlee, and John Trever—were involved in the now famous episode of identifying and photographing the Scrolls shown to them by representatives of St. Mark's Monastery in early 1948, and all three were to write extensively about the Scrolls. They did, of course, mention the non-sectarian texts, but their interests lay elsewhere. One scholar from Canada,—Robert Scott of McGill University—was instrumental in raising funds to assist the Jordanian authorities in purchasing Scrolls, with the provision that eventually McGill would own a significant set of them, although that effort failed in the sense that no scrolls ever came to McGill.<sup>1</sup> Scott also did not work with the non-sectarian texts.<sup>2</sup>

### *The First Phase 1948-1970*

Work on the non-sectarian Scrolls in North America started slowly. One indirect reason may have been that the decades before the finds in the Qumran area were not especially productive ones in study of the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic literature. Another, more direct cause was the fact that information about the non-sectarian Qumran Scrolls trickled out at first and the actual publication of texts was piecemeal for years. If one recalls that the first scrolls removed from cave 1 and made available were either biblical scrolls (1QIsa<sup>a,b</sup>), sectarian texts (1QS, 1QpHab, 1QH<sup>a</sup>, 1QM) or possibly sectarian (and in Aramaic—1QapGen), no texts in our category

---

<sup>1</sup> The Jordanian authorities later decided that no Scrolls would leave the country and returned the money to McGill (about \$20,000 [Canadian]). See Jacqueline S. Du Toit and Jason Kalman, "Great Scott! The Dead Sea Scrolls, McGill University, and the Canadian Media," *DSD* 12 (2005): 6-23 (15). See the survey of Eileen Schuller in this volume.

<sup>2</sup> Scott was the author of *Treasure from Judean Caves: The Story of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Toronto: United Church Publishing House, 1955). The book is 43 pages long.

were among them. Some small fragments of non-sectarian works were soon either announced or made available. For example, Roland de Vaux reproduced a fragment of *Jubilees* with a photograph, Józef Milik identified another small piece as coming from the *Book of Enoch* (or Noah), and William Brownlee mentioned there were also parts of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.<sup>3</sup> With the publication of DJD I in 1955, several of these and other texts became available, and the members of the editorial team continued to report further identifications.<sup>4</sup>

Even on this limited basis, prescient scholars saw from the earliest days that the Judean Desert texts had enormous potential for energizing the study of the history and literature of the Second Temple period. As William Albright wrote in first reporting on the Scrolls find: "It is easy to surmise that the new discovery will revolutionize intertestamental studies, and that it will soon antiquate all present handbooks on the background of the New Testament and on the textual criticism and interpretation of the Old Testament."<sup>5</sup>

Introductory books about the Scrolls made basic information available to readers. For example, Frank Cross wrote: "Another large portion of Cave IV documents belongs to the category of Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical works in both Hebrew and Aramaic: Tobit, Jubilees, The Psalms of Joshua, pseudo-Jeremianic works, Testaments of Levi and Naphtali, sources of the later Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Enoch, and an apocryphal Daniel literature are examples."<sup>6</sup> In his presidential address to the Society of Biblical Literature, delivered on December 27, 1956, James Philip Hyatt of Vanderbilt University (where a number of Scrolls dissertations were written in the 1950s), observed:

The Dead Sea Discoveries have helped to reveal the fluidity, variety, and great vitality of Judaism in the period of the first [!] two centuries B.C. and the first century of the Christian era. Previously it had been difficult for scholars to study Judaism before the year A.D. 70, partly because of the nature of the

<sup>3</sup> Roland de Vaux, "La grotte des manuscrits hébreux," *RB* 56 (1949): 602-05 (pl. XVIa = 1Q17; cf. Józef T. Milik, "Elenchus textuum ex Caverna Maris Mortui," *VD* 30 [1952]: 34-45, 101-09); "The Dead Sea Scrolls Fragment of the Book of Enoch," *Bib* 32 (1951): 393-400 (= 1Q19 *Book of Noah*); William H. Brownlee, "A Comparison of the Covenanters of the Dead Sea Scrolls with Pre-Christian Jewish Sects," *BA* 13 (1950): 51 n. 1. See also Józef T. Milik, "Le Testament de Lévi en Araméen: Fragment de la grotte 4 de Qumrân," *RB* 62 (1955): 398-406.

<sup>4</sup> Józef T. Milik, "Le travail d'édition des manuscrits du désert de Juda," in G. W. Anderson, *Volume du Congrès Strasbourg 1956* (VTSup 4; Leiden: Brill, 1957), 17-26; "Le travail d'édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumrân," *RB* 63 (1956): 49-67.

<sup>5</sup> William F. Albright, "Notes from the President's Desk," *BASOR* 110 (1948): 3.

<sup>6</sup> Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 34.

rabbinic sources. Now we have available materials which are clearly pre-70; they must be carefully compared with the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic materials, Josephus, Philo, tannaitic literature, etc. The Dead Sea discoveries have shown the importance in this period of the apocalyptic-messianic element in Judaism, which was to a large extent suppressed or obscured after A.D. 70, subsequent to the rise of Christianity.<sup>7</sup>

A survey of publications from the years 1948-1970 reveals that three texts and related issues received a large amount of attention: 1) the new finds of material from the Hebrew text of the *Wisdom of Ben Sira* and the possible relations between it and the writings found in the caves; 2) the *Apocryphal Psalms* in the 11QPsalms<sup>a</sup> scroll; and 3) the question whether the calendrical information from the Scrolls and *Jubilees* (with *1 Enoch*) contributed to a solution to the conflicting chronologies of Passion week in the synoptics and John.

### *Ben Sira*

Two small fragments identified as coming from a scroll of *Ben Sira* in Hebrew were published in DJD III.<sup>8</sup> They are listed as 2Q18 (among the "Textes Bibliques"). The fragments were identified by the editor, Maurice Baillet, as containing: fragment 1: Sir 6:14-15? or possibly 1:19-20; the uncertainty was caused by the fact that only five letters on two lines survive; three of them are marked as uncertain; fragment 2: Sir 6:30-31; the last letter or letters of eight lines (with room for other lines between some of them but with no preserved letters) permitted a more secure identification. While the presence of these scraps at Qumran was interesting in itself, a more unusual and larger find was Sir 51:13-20, 30 on cols. XXI-XXII of the *Psalms Scroll* from cave 11 (11QP<sup>a</sup>).<sup>9</sup> An even more extensively preserved discovery was a substantial part of a scroll of the *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, found at Masada on April 8, 1964 and soon published by Yigael Yadin.<sup>10</sup> Alexander

<sup>7</sup> James P. Hyatt, "The Dead Sea Discoveries: Retrospect and Challenge," *JBL* 76 (1957): 6; the address is reprinted in Harold W. Attridge and James C. VanderKam, eds., *Presidential Voices: The Society of Biblical Literature in the Twentieth Century* (SBLBSNA 22; Atlanta/Leiden: Brill, 2006), 100. Hyatt's lecture and Herbert May's 1962 presidential address ("Cosmological Reference in the Qumran Doctrine of the Two Spirits and in Old Testament Imagery," *JBL* 82 [1963]: 1-14) are the only times the Dead Sea Scrolls have appeared in the title of the SBL presidential address.

<sup>8</sup> Maurice Baillet, Józef T. Milik and Roland de Vaux, *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân* (DJD III; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 75-77.

<sup>9</sup> James A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QP<sup>a</sup>)* (DJD IV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), 42-43.

<sup>10</sup> Yigael Yadin, *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society



Di Lella was able to use the cave 2 fragments in his dissertation published as *The Hebrew Text of Sirach: A Text-Critical and Historical Study*.<sup>11</sup> J. Priest found in Sir 45:25 the kind of thought that could be developed into Qumran's dual messianism: "Ben Sira holds to the 'two covenants' as the men of Qumran did to the 'two Messiahs' and it is apparent that for him as for them the priestly element is in the forefront."<sup>12</sup> Manfred Lehmann had maintained, even before the existence of the Hebrew fragments from cave 2 had been announced, that *Ben Sira* was important for the study of the Scrolls and pointed to a series of connections between them.<sup>13</sup>

John Strugnell contributed a significant essay to the study of the *Ben Sira* scroll from Masada.<sup>14</sup> In his response to Yadin's publication, he writes: "... we propose (a) to try to define how the scribe vocalised his text by observing more closely his remarkably consistent orthographic practice; (b) to improve certain readings (often producing a text no longer equivalent, as was that of Yadin, to that of the Geniza manuscript B); and (c) to ask whether certain further traces, apparent in the various photographs provided in Yadin's volume and sometimes even more clearly visible on its dust jacket, do not correspond to fragmentary letters in the manuscript which should be recorded in the final edition" (109). He offered a long series of detailed notes on spelling practices, readings, and other points about the preserved remains. A number of his suggestions were to be adopted by Qimron in his list of improved readings (see above), at a time when Qimron had access to the results of more advanced photographic techniques than were available when Strugnell made his proposals based on early photographs.

---

and the Shrine of the Book, 1965). The edition is in both Hebrew and English. The book is an offprint from *ErIsr* 8 (Sukenic volume) which did not appear until 1967. Yadin's edition was reprinted in "The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada," in *Masada VI* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1999), 151-252. There it is supplemented with "Notes on the Reading," by Elisha Qimron (227-31) and "Ben Sira: A Bibliography of Studies, 1965-1997," compiled by Florentino García Martínez (233-52). Qimron's improved readings include some from Józef T. Milik ("Un fragment mal placé dans l'édition du Siracide de Masada," *Bib* 47 [1966]: 425-6), Patrick Skehan (review in *JBL* 85 [1966]: 260-62), Joseph Baumgarten (review in *JQR* 58 [1967-1968]: 323-7), and John Strugnell (see below), as well as some of his own.

<sup>11</sup> Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Hebrew Text of Sirach: A Text-Critical and Historical Study* (Studies in Classical Literature 1; The Hague: Mouton, 1966), 78-81. He was also aware of the cave 11 *Psalms Scroll* and the Masada copy, though they were not yet published. See also his "Qumrân and the Geniza Fragments of Sirach," *CBQ* 24 (1962): 245-67.

<sup>12</sup> J. Priest, "Ben Sira 45, 25 in the Light of the Qumran Literature," *RevQ* 17 (1964): 111-18 (118).

<sup>13</sup> Manfred Lehmann, "Ben Sira and the Qumran Literature," *RevQ* 9 (1961): 103-16. See 113-15 on Ben Sira in relation to the notion of two messiahs.

<sup>14</sup> John Strugnell, "Notes and Queries on 'The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada,'" *ErIsr* 9 (1969): 109-19.

*Apocryphal Psalms*

Besides the poem paralleling Sir 51:13-20, 30, one of the truly noteworthy features of 11QPs<sup>a</sup>, published in DJD IV (1965),<sup>15</sup> was the presence of psalms not found in the Masoretic Psalter but attested in other authoritative collections of Psalms: Psalm 151 known from Greek and Syriac copies (col. XXVIII, 3-14 = Syr. I), and Psalms 154 (col. XVIII, 1-16 = Syr. II) and 155 (col. XXIV, 3-17 = Syr. III) attested in a few Syriac sources. All of these were thus shown to be based on Hebrew originals (see DJD IV, 53-76).<sup>16</sup> Psalm 151 in the scroll consists of two parts (designated A and B), while the form of the psalm preserved in the Septuagint combines the two.

John Strugnell also wrote a weighty study of these poems.<sup>17</sup> His essay is a remarkably detailed foray into their textual history and transmission (Syriac Psalm 151 was based on the Septuagint, but Syriac Psalms 152-155 are direct translations from Hebrew), with responses to other studies, suggestions about errors that may have given rise to readings, and the like.

*Jubilees and its Calendar*

It was perceived very early that calendaric matters were of some significance to the Qumran writers and that the teachings about the calendar in the Scrolls were related to those in the *Book of Jubilees* which deals with the topic in detail.<sup>18</sup> One indication that *Jubilees* and the Scrolls might be related was the fact that fragments from the lost Hebrew original of the book were known to exist in cave 1. In 1949 Roland de Vaux published a fragment from the text of *Jubilees* (now called 1QJub<sup>a</sup>, 1Q17) in "La grotte des manuscrits hébreux" (see above). In this very early article, where he reported and discussed the data from the only manuscript cave then

<sup>15</sup> James A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPs<sup>a</sup>)* (DJD IV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965). Sanders also published *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967) where, in addition to the other material, he included Fragment E which had come to light after he completed work on DJD IV.

<sup>16</sup> See Sanders's earlier studies "Psalm 151 in 11QPs<sup>a</sup>," *ZAW* 75 (1963): 73-86; and "Two Non-Canonical Psalms in 11QPs<sup>a</sup>," *ZAW* 76 (1964): 57-75.

<sup>17</sup> John Strugnell, "Notes on the Text and Transmission of the Apocryphal Psalms 151, 154 (= Syr. II) and 155 (= Syr. III)," *HTR* 59 (1966): 257-81.

<sup>18</sup> The point was elaborated by Dominique Barthélemy in his remarkable article "Notes en marge de publications récentes sur les manuscrits de Qumran," *RB* 59 (1952): 187-218 (199-203). William Brownlee wrote an early essay relating *Jubilees* to the Scrolls: "Light on the Manual of Discipline (DSD) from the Book of Jubilees," *BASOR* 123 (October, 1951): 30-32. He suggested there, among other points, that *Jubilees'* association of the festival of weeks with covenant made it likely that the people of Qumran celebrated their covenant renewal ceremony on the occasion of that festival.

known—a cave that he and Gerald Lankester Harding had excavated from February 15 to March 5, 1949—he illustrated the variety of texts represented among the hundreds of fragments retrieved from the cave. In doing so, he included a fragment of Leviticus in paleo-Hebrew, of *Jubilees*, and of an unknown work. The *Jubilees* fragment led de Vaux to declare that it confirmed Hebrew as the original language of the book. Eliezer Sukenik then included the same fragment of *Jubilees* in *Megillot Genuzot*.<sup>19</sup> This transcription and photograph of 1Q17 eventually led to the first publication on the fragment by an American scholar. Charles Torrey, who had not seen either publication, received a transcription of the fragmentary Hebrew text in a letter from Enno Littmann. Torrey reproduced Littmann's transcription, declared it good Hebrew, and added: "... it will hardly be doubted that the fragment once formed part of a complete Hebrew text of the book. This is especially interesting because of recent discussion of the question of the original language of *Jubilees*, and the decision in favor of Aramaic."<sup>20</sup> For evidence that Aramaic was the language in which the book was composed Torrey pointed to Robert Pfeiffer's statement<sup>21</sup> and to his own review of Pfeiffer's book.<sup>22</sup> Torrey granted that the question of the original language remained open but thought "the decision must be given to the Aramaic, mainly for the reason already made plain, that it was from this language that the Greek version of the book was made." (41) How Torrey knew the lost Greek version arose from an Aramaic base is not further explained in the short essay. The many fragments of *Jubilees* published since—all in Hebrew—have shown how implausible his inference was. The first official publication of *Jubilees* fragments came in DJD I where Józef Milik presented editions of 1Q17-1Q18.<sup>23</sup>

Discussion of the *Jubilees*-Qumran calendar began outside North America but it soon picked up steam in the United States and Canada. Dominique Barthélemy (in the article cited above) and Annie Jaubert<sup>24</sup> worked

<sup>19</sup> Eliezer L. Sukenik, *Megillot Genuzot: from an Ancient Geniza found in the Judaeen Desert* (Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 1950), 2:53 (Hebrew).

<sup>20</sup> Charles C. Torrey, "A Hebrew Fragment of Jubilees," *JBL* 71 (1952): 39-41. The quotation above is on p. 39.

<sup>21</sup> Robert H. Pfeiffer, *History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1949), 70.

<sup>22</sup> Charles C. Torrey, review of R. H. Pfeiffer, *History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha*, *JAOS* 70 (1950): 116.

<sup>23</sup> See Dominique Barthélemy and Józef T. Milik, *Qumran Cave I* (DJD I; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 82-84.

<sup>24</sup> Annie Jaubert, "Le calendrier des Jubilés et la secte de Qumrân: Ses origines bibliques," *VT* 3 (1953): 250-64; "Le calendrier des Jubilés et les jours liturgiques de la semaine," *VT* 7 (1957): 35-61.

out the principles of the calendar well before any text explicitly mentioning the 364-day solar arrangement of Qumran was identified or published. Joseph Baumgarten brought his expertise to bear on the evidence in *Jubilees* once something about the Qumran calendar became known. He published two essays dealing with the subject during the period, showing that in *Jubilees* the day begins in the evening and raising some objections to Jaubert's claims about the presence of this calendar in the Hebrew Bible.<sup>25</sup> Julian Morgenstern and Solomon Zeitlin also addressed the calendar from their own points of view.<sup>26</sup> At this stage it was still possible for Julian Obermann of Yale University to argue that the calendar of the Scrolls was basically that of the Pharisees. On his view, the concern of these authors was with the Pharisaic claim to authority over a calendar which they believed God himself had fixed, not with a different reckoning of time.<sup>27</sup>

What really caught the fancy of writers west of the Atlantic Ocean was the possible relevance of the Qumran/*Jubilees* calendar to an old debate in gospel studies: how does one explain the discrepancies between the synoptic gospels and John for the chronology of Passion week. Jaubert had argued that the Qumran/*Jubilees* (= the old priestly) calendar lay behind the synoptic chronology, the luni-solar calendar of mainstream Judaism behind the one in John.<sup>28</sup> The hypothesis that there were two calendars at the time was not new; what was novel was having documentary evidence for a competing system of measuring time. A perusal of the bibliographies for this period indicates how much attention the theory received in the ecclesiastical press. In more academically oriented publications there were quite a number of cautious agreements. For instance, Patrick Skehan wrote

<sup>25</sup> Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Beginning of the Day in the Calendar of Jubilees," *JBL* 77 (1958): 355-60; his other essay appeared in Hebrew first ("The Calendar of the Book of Jubilees," *Tarbiz* 32 [1962-1963]: 317-28 [Hebrew]). Both papers were later included in his collection of essays, the second in English translation: *Studies in Qumran Law* (SJLA 24; Leiden: Brill, 1977), 124-30 and 101-14 respectively.

<sup>26</sup> Morgenstern concerned himself with the pentecontad character of the system and its origins ("The Calendar of the Book of Jubilees and Its Character," *VT* 5 [1955]: 34-76). Solomon Zeitlin ("The Beginning of the Day in the Calendar of Jubilees," *JBL* 78 [1959]: 153-6) rejected Baumgarten's proposal, maintaining instead that in *Jubilees* the day begins at dawn; on p. 157 in the same publication Baumgarten replied and further defended his view.

<sup>27</sup> Julian Obermann, "Calendaric Elements in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *JBL* 75 (1956): 285-97. To his credit, Obermann recognized that his conclusions had to be tentative as much of the material remained unpublished.

<sup>28</sup> Jaubert presented the case in *La date de la cène: Calendrier biblique et liturgie chrétienne* (Paris: Gabalda, 1957). The book was translated by Isaac Rafferty as *The Date of the Last Supper* (Staten Island: Alba House, 1965). Jaubert's earlier publication on the issue, one eventually included in the book, was "La date de la dernière Cène," *RHR* 146 (1954): 140-73.

that he "... inclines toward acceptance of the construction which is the end result of Mlle. J.'s investigation." He did, however, raise some questions, none of which he thought unanswerable.<sup>29</sup> Another example of a carefully supported acceptance of Jaubert's position came from James Walther of Western Theological Seminary.<sup>30</sup>

### *1970-Present*

The following survey of the scholarship published during these decades is divided into three parts.

#### *Continued Research*

Work on the three texts and issues highlighted above continued apace after 1970 and even expanded. For example, study of Sirach was enhanced by the appearance of Patrick Skehan and Alexander Di Lella's commentary which takes full account of all the textual finds for the book, including of course the Hebrew material from the Judean Desert.<sup>31</sup> The additional psalms in 11 QPs<sup>a</sup> continued to attract attention from experts,<sup>32</sup> and the study of the 364-day calendar and its possible relation to gospel chronology also drew more discussion.<sup>33</sup>

Another apocryphal work that elicited a number of studies is the Book of Tobit. Earlier announcements divulged that the book was represented in Qumran cave 4; the first publication concerning the material was by

<sup>29</sup> Patrick W. Skehan, "The Date of the Last Supper," *CBQ* 20 (1958): 192-9 (the quotation is from p. 197). The article is a review of Jaubert's book.

<sup>30</sup> James A. Walther, "The Chronology of Passion Week," *JBL* 77 (1958): 116-22.

<sup>31</sup> Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987).

<sup>32</sup> Much information is provided in Peter Flint, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997). See also the translations and notes in James H. Charlesworth and James A. Sanders, "More Psalms of David," in *OTP* 2 (1985): 609-24; and the helpful summary in Eileen M. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran: A Pseudepigraphic Collection* (HSS 28; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 5-20.

<sup>33</sup> For a summary of the calendrical texts from Qumran and the 364-day calendar, see James C. VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time* (The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls; London: Routledge, 1998). See also Joseph M. Baumgarten, "Some Problems of the Jubilees Calendar in Current Research," *VT* 32 (1982): 485-9. The data for the calendar and the gospel chronologies is carefully laid out in Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study* (rev. ed.; SBLRBS 20; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 180-86; there he also notes serious problems with Jaubert's hypothesis.

Józef Milik in whose lot the Tobit manuscripts fell (4Q196-4Q200).<sup>34</sup> The responsibility for the editions eventually came to Joseph Fitzmyer who published the five fragmentary manuscripts.<sup>35</sup> One of the fascinating facts about these copies is that four are in Aramaic and one (4Q200) is in Hebrew. There is a strong inclination today to see Aramaic as the original language, but Michael Wise, pointing to the idiomatic character of the Hebrew in 4Q200, argued that the case for an Aramaic original is not as strong as it may seem.<sup>36</sup> Because Fitzmyer shared with him the galleys of his DJD edition of the Tobit manuscripts, Carey Moore was able to use them in preparing his commentary on Tobit.<sup>37</sup>

### *The Work of John Strugnell*

The second phase of work on the non-sectarian Scrolls and related matters saw an explosion of publications regarding pseudepigraphic texts from Qumran, as the amount of source material made available grew in size. Several scholars have played dominant roles in this period, but in North America the work of John Strugnell, met already in the first period, proved to be central to much that was accomplished—whether through editing texts, directing dissertations, or stimulating research. His death (November 30, 2007), which occurred as this essay was being prepared, provides an appropriate occasion to recognize the crucial part he played in Qumran research in general and North American scholarship in particular.

John Strugnell (1930-2007) was born in Barnet near London on May 25, 1930. He eventually took a degree from Jesus College, Oxford, and was pursuing further studies in Oriental languages, when, in 1954, after nomination by Godfrey Driver, he was appointed a member of the international team charged with editing the finds from Qumran cave 4. His connections with the United States began not long after the appointment. In 1956-1957 he took a position at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, and he was a member of the faculty at Duke University from 1960-1967. At that point he received an appointment at Harvard Divinity School, first

<sup>34</sup> Józef T. Milik, "La patrie de Tobie," *RB* 73 (1966): 522-30.

<sup>35</sup> Published in Magen Broshi et al., in consultation with James C. VanderKam, *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 7-76.

<sup>36</sup> Michael Wise, "A Note on 4Q196 (papTob Ar<sup>a</sup>) and Tobit i 22," *VT* 43 (1993): 566-70. Fitzmyer also issued a detailed study: "The Aramaic and Hebrew Fragments of Tobit from Cave 4," *CBQ* 57 (1995): 655-75. In it he concluded the Hebrew was more likely to be a translation of the Aramaic (669-72), a view also held by Milik.

<sup>37</sup> Carey Moore, *Tobit: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 40A; New York: Doubleday, 1996).

as a visiting professor and from 1968 until 1996 as professor of Christian Origins. In 1984 he became the editor-in-chief of the Scrolls and of the series Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (DJD), holding the position until 1990 when poor health led to his removal.

Strugnell's name would have been familiar to experts well before 1970 in his capacity as a member of the editorial team and as a publishing scholar. In addition to his own essays, he had translated into English Milik's introduction to the Scrolls.<sup>38</sup>

It is well known that the members of the editorial team were assigned "lots" of manuscripts for preliminary work and eventual publication. In the lists of the manuscripts from Qumran, Strugnell's lot begins with 4Q364 (one of the *Reworked Pentateuch* copies) and continues unbroken through 4Q481f (unclassified fragments). Included within that impossibly long list of texts are several works that do or at least appear to belong in the apocrypha/pseudepigrapha category (the names are taken from the list in DJD XXXIX):

- 4Q368, 4Q377 *Apocryphal Pentateuch* A, B
- 4Q369 *Prayer of Enosh* (?)
- 4Q370 *Admonition on the Flood*
- 4Q371-4Q373 Narrative and Poetic Composition<sup>a-c</sup> (formerly *Apocryphon of Joseph*)
- 4Q374 *Exodus/Conquest Tradition*
- 4Q375-4Q376 *Apocryphon of Moses*<sup>a-b?</sup>
- 4Q378-4Q379 *Apocryphon of Joshua*<sup>a-b</sup>
- 4Q380-4Q381 Non-Canonical *Psalms* A, B
- 4Q382 pap *paraKings* et al.
- 4Q383-4Q391 *Apocryphon of Jeremiah, Pseudo-Ezekiel*
- 4Q410 *Vision and Interpretation*
- 4Q411 *Sapiential Hymn*
- 4Q412 *Sapiential-Didactic Work A*
- 4Q415-4Q418<sup>a,c</sup>, 4Q423 *Instruction*<sup>a-g</sup>
- 4Q422 *Paraphrase of Genesis and Exodus*
- 4Q459 Narrative Work Mentioning Lebanon
- 4Q460 Narrative Work and Prayer
- 4Q464 *Exposition on the Patriarchs*
- 4Q470 Text Mentioning Zedekiah
- 4Q474 Text Concerning Rachel and Joseph
- 4Q481a *Apocryphon of Elisha*

Eventually Strugnell, breaking with precedent, was to associate others (including Jewish experts) in the work of editing these many texts. In fact,

<sup>38</sup> Milik, *Dix ans*, in English *Ten Years*.



though they were all published during his lifetime, only a few of them appeared under his name and therefore most of them were put in final form by those to whom he passed along the assignment together with his extensive notes. Nevertheless, his name does appear on the title pages of the following DJD volumes:

DJD X: Strugnell and Elisha Qimron are the authors of the volume devoted to 4Q394-4Q399 (the *Halakhic Letter* or 4QMMT). Strugnell had associated Qimron in the work, beginning in 1979.

DJD XII: Though Strugnell is listed among five contributors after the names of the editors (Eugene Ulrich and Frank Moore Cross), this is a mistake made by the press.<sup>39</sup>

DJD XIII: Strugnell and Harold Attridge are named as the editors of 4Q369 *Prayer of Enosh* (pp. 353-62)

DJD XIX: Strugnell contributed the editions of 4Q375-4Q376 (4QApocryphon of Moses<sup>a,b?</sup>) on pp. 111-36, and he was one of three editors of 4Q470 (Text Mentioning Zedekiah, pp. 235-44)

DJD XXX: The title page notes that the author, Devorah Dimant, used part of the transcriptions by Strugnell (of 4Q385-4Q390)

DJD XXXIV: Strugnell and Daniel Harrington (the latter collaborated on these sapiential texts beginning in 1992) are the authors of the editions (4Q415-4Q418, 1Q26 [4Q423 was edited by Torleif Elgvin]).

DJD XXII, XXIX, XXX should also be noted here: Strugnell's name does not appear on the title page as an editor, but each of these volumes contains words to this effect on that page: Partially based on earlier transcriptions and comments by John Strugnell (Milik's name is also included in DJD XXII). DJD XXXIV contains a statement that expresses the thoughts of many to whom Strugnell bequeathed the task of preparing final editions of Qumran texts in his lot. In his foreword, Emanuel Tov wrote:

This is also the place for a special word of thanks to J. Strugnell without whose work from the 1950s onwards, the DJD series and the publication efforts as a whole would not be where they are today. His insightful identifications, together with those of J.T. Milik, laid the basis for our understanding of the cave 4 manuscripts. Most of the volumes produced in recent years attest to their initial work. The present volume provides another witness to these almost incredible skills of identification. (xi; see also Devorah Dimant's similar statement in DJD XXX, xiii, and the one by Dana Pike and Andrew Skinner in DJD XXXIII, xiii)

Strugnell's considerable presence in the DJD series and his even more weighty role behind the editions hardly exhaust his contributions to work with the non-sectarian texts. He supervised a number of dissertations de-

<sup>39</sup> Personal communication from Ulrich.



voted to editions of Scrolls or studies of them. For just one example, Eileen Schuller, now of McMaster University, received from Strugnell the opportunity to edit 4Q380-4Q381 (Non-Canonical Psalms). Her editions appeared first in monograph form and later in DJD XI (1998).<sup>40</sup>

We should also note that in the early part of our period a new organization was formed to promote study of the pseudepigrapha: the Pseudepigrapha Seminar (later Pseudepigrapha Group) of the Society of Biblical Literature. The Seminar too enjoyed the influence and participation of John Strugnell in its formative years. The origins of the group go back to 1969, with the first session on the program of the Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting taking place in 1970. The initial meeting, under the name *The Pseudepigrapha Seminar*, was held in 1971. Among early leaders were not only John Strugnell but also Walter Harrelson, Robert Kraft, James Charlesworth, and George Nickelsburg. The task of the group was to promote research on the pseudepigrapha, not on the Qumran Scrolls, but the two could hardly be separated, and members of the group over the ensuing years took leading roles in editing and/or analyzing material from Qumran.

### *Three Pseudepigraphic Works*

Of those known previously, there are three major pseudepigraphs that were either found at Qumran or some of their sources were unearthed there. All three have received much attention since 1970; the following pages sketch some of the work that has been accomplished on these books. Since the first and third are also considered in the essay on Aramaic texts, they can be treated more briefly here.

#### *1 Enoch*

There was a lengthy delay in the publication of the relatively extensive Enoch material from Qumran. Milik mentioned the existence of a number of copies of Enochic texts in his early reports about the finds, but no scrap of text appeared in print until he published, first an article with some readings,<sup>41</sup> and then a lengthy essay and a book devoted to them.<sup>42</sup> Milik also

<sup>40</sup> Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran*. As Schuller notes in the Preface, Strugnell's "careful reading of numerous drafts, his generous sharing of time and insights, and his encouragement and support went far beyond what can be expected of a thesis director" (vii; many, including myself, would echo those sentiments). At that time, however, it was thought a revised form of her editions of 4Q380-4Q381 would appear in a DJD volume that Strugnell would edit (viii). That was not to happen.

<sup>41</sup> Józef T. Milik, "Hénoch au pays des aromates (ch. XXVII à XXXII): Fragments araméens de la grotte 4 de Qumran," *RB* 65 (1958): 70-77.

opened up the discussion of the related *Book of Giants*, first in an article<sup>43</sup> and later in his *The Books of Enoch* in which he included editions of the *Book of Giants* texts from Qumran.

The American scholar who has published the most extensively on *1 Enoch* together with the Qumran Aramaic fragments of it is George Nickelsburg. His Harvard dissertation (Frank Cross and John Strugnell were on the committee), which dealt with a number of passages in *1 Enoch* (especially the Epistle of Enoch), dates from 1967, when virtually none of the Qumran Enoch texts was available (for the published edition of the dissertation, Nickelsburg could refer to Milik's *HTR* article).<sup>44</sup> Nickelsburg received the assignment to write a commentary on *1 Enoch* for the new Hermeneia series, and he did the work of researching and writing the commentary over several decades. As the commentary was in preparation, he composed a lengthy series of articles about various aspects of *1 Enoch*, and he has, of course, included the Qumran material in his work. One of his best known publications is "Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6-11," an essay that, with Paul Hanson's "Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6-11," helped to place study of the material about the angels who sinned in a wider context. Both authors were able to build upon Milik's publication of Aramaic fragments in the article in *Harvard Theological Review*, although Milik's book was not available when they wrote.<sup>45</sup> The first volume of Nickelsburg's projected two-volume commentary was published in 2001.<sup>46</sup> Also James VanderKam has been a prominent figure in Enoch

<sup>42</sup> Józef T. Milik, "Problèmes de la littérature hénoclique à la lumière des fragments araméens de Qumrân," *HTR* 64 (1971): 333-78; *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976).

<sup>43</sup> Józef T. Milik, "Turfan et Qumran: Livre des Géants juif et manichéen," in Gert Jeremias, Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn and Hartmut Stegemann, eds., *Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt: Festgabe für Karl Georg Kuhn* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 117-27. The major studies by American scholars, both of whom offered full analysis of the fragments, are: John C. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* (HUCM 14; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992); and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran* (TSAJ 63; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997).

<sup>44</sup> George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (HTS 26; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972). The book has been reissued in an expanded edition (HTS 56; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Divinity School, 2006).

<sup>45</sup> The two essays appeared in *JBL* 96 (1977): 195-233 (Hanson) and 383-405 (Nickelsburg).

<sup>46</sup> George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1-36; 81-108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001).

research in the United States, with several volumes and a number of articles on the subject.<sup>47</sup>

Texts and Dates: The Qumran discoveries yielded the first copies of Enochic booklets in their original Aramaic language.<sup>48</sup> These texts have generated a number of detailed studies both of themselves and of their implications for the other versions in which the texts have survived.<sup>49</sup> They have also furnished welcome evidence pointing to very early dates for the Enochic *Book of the Watchers* and the *Astronomical Book*. Manuscripts of each booklet, copied by 150 BCE, show that they were among the oldest of the Jewish pseudepigrapha.<sup>50</sup>

Development of an Enochic Collection: Milik thought that 4QEn<sup>c</sup> (4Q204) included the *Book of the Watchers*, the *Book of Dreams*, the *Epistle of Enoch*, and probably also the *Book of Giants* (placed after the *Book of the Watchers*). He inferred that an earlier Enochic pentateuch embraced the *Book of the Watchers*, the *Book of Giants*, the *Book of Dreams*, the *Epistle of Enoch* on one scroll, with the *Astronomical Book* on a separate scroll. Centuries later, a work that he considered to be Christian, the *Book of Parables*, replaced the *Book of Giants* which was considered authoritative by the heretical Manichaeans.<sup>51</sup> Varied aspects of his daring reconstruction encountered a stormy reception in the reviews.<sup>52</sup> Whatever the place of the *Book of Giants*, 4QEn<sup>c</sup> (4Q204 with 4QEn<sup>d,e</sup> [4Q205-4Q206]) does doc-

<sup>47</sup> See James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984); *Enoch a Man for All Generations* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995); with George Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A New translation: Based on the Hermeneia Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004).

<sup>48</sup> Milik's discovery that the Qumran evidence points to distinct histories for the various literary constituents of *1 Enoch* led him to give each one a different name, a practice that has been accepted in subsequent discussion: The *Book of the Watchers* (= *1 Enoch* 1-36); the *Book of Parables* (= *1 Enoch* 37-71); the *Astronomical Book* (= *1 Enoch* 72-82), the *Book of Dreams* (= *1 Enoch* 83-90) and the *Epistle of Enoch* (= *1 Enoch* 91-105). Attached are two annexes, *1 Enoch* 106-107 relates the birth of Noah, and 108 offers another discourse of *Enoch*.

<sup>49</sup> Nickelsburg includes extensive textual notes at the beginning of each section of the commentary. Because their collection was finished before Milik's book appeared, Joseph Fitzmyer and Daniel Harrington were able to include only a few *Enoch* fragments and some of the *Book of Giants* in *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts* (BibOr 34; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1978). For a study of the implications of the Aramaic for the versions, see Erik Larson, "The Translation of Enoch: From Aramaic into Greek" (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1995).

<sup>50</sup> Milik (*The Books of Enoch*, 5, 7) dated 4QEn<sup>a</sup> (4Q201) to the first half of the second century BCE and 4QEnastr<sup>a</sup> (4Q208) to the late third or early second century BCE.

<sup>51</sup> Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 4, 57-58, 91-98, 309-10.

<sup>52</sup> See, for example, Jonas C. Greenfield and Michael E. Stone, "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes," *HTR* 70 (1977): 70-77.

ument the practice of copying different booklets of Enoch on the same scroll.

### Apocalypses

Two of the earliest Jewish apocalypses—the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (1 Enoch 93:1-10; 91:11-17) and the *Animal Apocalypse*<sup>53</sup>—are attested among the Qumran copies. Both of these have been important in the extensive discussion of the genre apocalypse and its development in Early Judaism.<sup>54</sup>

### *Astronomical Book*

The copies of the astronomical chapters document not only how different the Aramaic was from the Ethiopic translation (1 Enoch 72-82) but also the striking similarities between the teachings of the book and a primitive type of astronomy attested in a number of cuneiform texts.<sup>55</sup>

### *Epistle of Enoch*

Recently Loren Stuckenbruck has published a detailed commentary on this last part of 1 Enoch, and on the two final annexes. His volume summarizes many of the issues in recent scholarship on Enoch.<sup>56</sup>

### Place in Second Temple Judaism

One manifestation of the intense interest in the Enoch literature is the Enoch Seminar, organized by Gabriele Boccaccini of the University of Michigan but meeting in Italy every second year since 2001. The seminar has spawned a huge number of studies, many of them dealing in one way or another with the Qumran evidence for the Enoch literature.<sup>57</sup> Boccac-

<sup>53</sup> See the thorough study of Patrick Tillier, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (SBLEJL 4; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993). Strugnell was the advisor of Tillier's dissertation which lies behind the book.

<sup>54</sup> The central publication has been John J. Collins, ed., *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* (*Semeia* 14 [1979]). See also the chapter on Israeli Research.

<sup>55</sup> See, for instance, VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*, 76-109. The discussion is further elaborated and updated in VanderKam's commentary on 1 Enoch 72-82 in the forthcoming vol. 2 of Nickelsburg's Hermeneia commentary.

<sup>56</sup> Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91-108* (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007).

<sup>57</sup> There have been five meetings of the seminar at which a large number of North American scholars have participated. Many of the papers have been published: in the journal *Henoch* 24/1 (2002—first meeting); Gabriele Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005—second meeting); Gabriele Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007—third meeting); and Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba, eds., *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees* (Grand Rapids: Eerd-

cini has championed the view that one of the major streams of thought in the Second Temple period was Enochic Judaism; though they traced their ideological roots to it, the Qumran community eventually separated from its adherents.

### *Jubilees*

The existence of fragments belonging to several copies of *Jubilees* was known from very early times. Small pieces from two copies were published in DJD I, with fragments from three more copies in DJD III. Józef Milik, the original editor of the cave 4 copies, gave his transcriptions and notes to James VanderKam in 1990 and the two of them collaborated in publishing the seven or eight copies and three related texts in DJD XIII (1994; the cave 11 copy was officially published in DJD XXIII [1998]).<sup>58</sup> James VanderKam (1946-) has been the central figure in the American research of *Jubilees*. Educated at Harvard, he wrote his dissertation on *Jubilees*<sup>59</sup> and later published a critical edition of the Ethiopic version and a volume of translations with comments, as well as many articles on specific aspects of this work.<sup>60</sup>

The fragmentarily preserved manuscripts of *Jubilees* from Qumran have stimulated or been associated with research into several aspects of the book.

### Date

The earliest copy—the first hand of 4Q216 (ca. 125-100 BCE)<sup>61</sup>—has provided physical evidence that the book was written at an earlier time than had been assigned to it (ca. 110 BCE). All of the Hebrew texts show that

---

mans, 2009—fourth meeting). See also the related volume, Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins, eds., *The Early Enoch Literature* (JSJSup 121; Leiden: Brill, 2007). For Boccaccini's reconstruction of Second Temple thought, see, for example, his *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History, from Ezekiel to Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).

<sup>58</sup> James C. VanderKam in Harold Attridge et al., in consultation with James C. VanderKam, *Qumran Cave 4. VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (DJD XIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 1-140; Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11. II: (11Q2-18, 11Q20-31)* (DJD XXIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 206-20.

<sup>59</sup> VanderKam's dissertation was published as *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977).

<sup>60</sup> James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Edition* (CSCO 510; Scriptores Aethiopici 87; Leuven: Peeters, 1989); *The Book of Jubilees: Translation* (CSCO 511; Scriptores Aethiopici 88; Louvain: Peeters, 1989).

<sup>61</sup> VanderKam, "Jubilees," (DJD XIII), ii.

the Ethiopic text of *Jubilees* reflects the original text with considerable precision.<sup>62</sup>

### Scripture

Since *Jubilees* contains a large amount of material cited from Genesis-Exodus, it serves as a witness to a Hebrew text of these books in the second century BCE.<sup>63</sup> That text aligns more nearly with the Septuagint and Samaritan Pentateuch than with the Masoretic Text. *Jubilees* is not only a witness to a scriptural text but presents itself as divine revelation<sup>64</sup> and seems to have been considered authoritative in some circles.<sup>65</sup> According to most commentators, the book is cited as an authority alongside the Torah of Moses in the *Damascus Document* XVI, 2-4, and its teachings are reflected at Qumran in significant ways. One is the connection between covenant/covenant-renewal and the festival of weeks celebrated on day 15 of the third month in the 364-day calendar.<sup>66</sup> Nevertheless, there are differences between teachings of *Jubilees* and those of Qumran: an especially noticeable example is *Jubilees'* firm rejection of using a lunar calendar and the use of one in a series of Qumran texts (and *1 Enoch* 72-82).

### Law

*Jubilees* embeds laws and entire legal sections into its narrative; it offers, therefore, a convenient point of comparison with similar material in the Scrolls and elsewhere. Lawrence Schiffman has written extensively in this area. He includes *Jubilees* in what he terms the Sadducean/Zadokite approach or trend in legal rulings—a designation meant to distinguish it from the Pharisaic-Rabbinic approach. *Jubilees*, with the texts from Qum-

<sup>62</sup> All of the Qumran texts of *Jubilees* then in print were included in VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*.

<sup>63</sup> The evidence is collected and discussed in VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 103-205. See also his "Jubilees and the Hebrew Texts of Genesis-Exodus," *Textus* 14 (1988): 71-85.

<sup>64</sup> See Hindy Najman, "Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and Its Authority Conferring Strategies," *JSJ* 30 (1999): 379-410; *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (JSJSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003).

<sup>65</sup> See James C. VanderKam, "Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 5 (1998): 382-402; "Questions of Canon Viewed through the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Lee M. McDonald and James A. Sanders, eds., *The Canon Debate* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 91-109.

<sup>66</sup> For the covenant in *Jubilees*, see Betsy Halpern-Amaru, *Rewriting the Bible: Land and Covenant in Postbiblical Jewish Literature* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1994), 25-54; James C. VanderKam, "Covenant and Biblical Interpretation in Jubilees 6," in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery*, 92-104.

ran, presents a more stringent understanding of subjects such as sabbath law, although the writers of these texts naturally share many assumptions and basic teachings also evident in Rabbinic texts.<sup>67</sup> Joseph Baumgarten also continued to investigate particular points of law as they appear in the Scrolls, *Jubilees*, and other texts.<sup>68</sup>

### Exegesis and Themes

As it retells scripture, *Jubilees* interprets it. The writer's exegetical labors have captured much attention, in relation both to Qumran texts and other literature. A prominent place where many examples have been recorded and aligned with other witnesses is in the collections of ancient exegesis that James Kugel has compiled.<sup>69</sup> John Endres devoted a monograph to the way in which *Jubilees* retells the stories about Jacob and compared it with other interpretations.<sup>70</sup> James Scott has explored the place *Jubilees'* teaching about the division of the earth after the flood has in ancient geography,<sup>71</sup> while Gene Davenport and James Scott have published monographs about *Jubilees'* teaching regarding the future.<sup>72</sup> One of the intriguing features in the book—the prominence of women—has elicited several studies from

<sup>67</sup> For sabbath law, see Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (SJLA 16; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 77-133; for the Sadducee/Zadokite trend and *Jubilees*, note among his many publications Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Pre-Maccabean Halakhah in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Tradition," *DSD* 13 (2006): 353-4. See also the more general and comprehensive statement, Lawrence H. Schiffman, "To Live as a Jew," in *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 243-312.

<sup>68</sup> To name some examples of Baumgarten's publications: "The Laws of 'Orlah and First Fruits in the Light of Jubilees, the Qumran Writings, and Targum Ps. Jonathan," *JJS* 38 (1987): 195-202; "Purification after Childbirth and the Sacred Garden in 4Q265 and Jubilees," in George Brooke and Florentino García Martínez, eds., *New Qumran Texts and Studies* (STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 3-10. Baumgarten offered some cautions about a Sadducean identity of such laws in "Sadducean Elements in Qumran Law," in Eugene Ulrich and James C. VanderKam, eds., *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993), 27-36. See the chapters on the Qumran Halakhah in this volume.

<sup>69</sup> Among Kugel's several studies, mention should be made of *The Bible As It Was* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1997); and *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998).

<sup>70</sup> John C. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees* (CBQMS 18; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1987).

<sup>71</sup> James M. Scott, *Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity: The Book of Jubilees* (SNTSMS 113; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

<sup>72</sup> Gene L. Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees* (StPB 20; Leiden: Brill, 1971; Davenport posits a Qumran redaction of *Jubilees*); James M. Scott, *On Earth as in Heaven: The Restoration of Sacred Time and Sacred Space in the Book of Jubilees* (JSJSup 91; Leiden: Brill, 2005).



Betsy Halpern-Amaru, showing how this emphasis relates to the book's concern with the purity of the chosen line.<sup>73</sup>

### *Literature about the Sons of Jacob*

As is well known, the Greek text entitled the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* draws upon Jewish material, although an ancient Hebrew or Aramaic text for these testaments does not exist. Among the Qumran finds are some works that are Semitic-language sources for the Greek *Testaments*, though they contain no evidence they were in the literary form of testaments. The major text is the *Aramaic Levi Document*, while there is also a work that is associated with Naphtali (4Q215). That there was a work in Aramaic regarding Levi was known before the Qumran finds, but discovery of perhaps seven copies at Qumran has stimulated renewed interest in this work.

### Texts

The first publication of a copy of the *Aramaic Levi Document* was by Milik in DJD I;<sup>74</sup> the cave 4 copies were published by Stone and Greenfield in DJD XXII where what were earlier thought to be two copies (4Q213-4Q214) are divided into six.<sup>75</sup> However many copies there were, a significant amount of text is now available in the original language—some of it overlapping with previously available copies, some of it new.

### Order of the Text

With no other guide to the original order of the work available, experts have understandably turned to the Greek *Testament of Levi* for a model; however, there has been debate about how similar the two were. Robert Kugler has maintained that there was only one vision in the *Aramaic Levi Document*, though there are two in the *Testament of Levi*.<sup>76</sup> Others have found this

<sup>73</sup> Betsy Halpern-Amaru, "First Women, Wives, and Mothers in Jubilees," *JBL* 113 (1994): 609-26; and *The Empowerment of Women in the Book of Jubilees* (JSJSup 60; Leiden: Brill, 1999).

<sup>74</sup> Józef T. Milik, "1Q21. Testament de Lévi," in Dominique Barthélemy and Józef T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD I; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 87-91.

<sup>75</sup> Jonas C. Greenfield and Michael E. Stone in George J. Brooke et al., in consultation with James C. Vanderkam, *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD XXII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 1-72.

<sup>76</sup> Robert Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi* (SBLEJL 9; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996); *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 28-31.



unconvincing and have remained open to a two-vision sequence.<sup>77</sup> It is generally agreed that the *Aramaic Levi Document* was not testamentary in form.

### Semitic Sources for the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

The existence of both the *Aramaic Levi Document* and a Hebrew Naphtali text (4Q215) has evoked new debate about the sources for the Greek *Testaments* which clearly have Christian elements in their present form.<sup>78</sup> At the very least, more of what the later authors could draw from Aramaic and Hebrew works is now available.

### A Levi Tradition

The character Levi grew in stature as time passed, from a negative figure in Genesis to the ancestor of the priests elsewhere in the Bible. That trajectory continues in the *Aramaic Levi Document* and in *Jubilees* 30-32. This pre-Aharonic priesthood whose hero receives visions raises questions about rivalries between groups of clergy in Second Temple times.<sup>79</sup>

A suitable way in which to close this survey is to look briefly at an example of new pseudepigraphic material from Qumran. The manuscripts in question (4Q383-4Q391) have received different titles in the short history of research on them, but the preserved fragments deal with Jeremiah and Ezekiel. They too were part of Strugnell's lot, but in 1985 he invited Devorah Dimant to collaborate with him in the editorial work on them and later entrusted them to her for publication. Strugnell thought there was one work attested in many copies, and for a time Dimant agreed. Soon, however, she saw evidence in the fragments to posit three works (she also found a Pseudo-Moses among them), although she finally concluded there were two: an *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* and *Pseudo-Ezekiel* (see her editions in DJD XXX [2001]<sup>80</sup>), which differ from each other in content and form. The distinctive names (apocryphon and pseudo-) arise from their differing

<sup>77</sup> See, for example, Jonas C. Greenfield, Michael E. Stone, and Esther Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document* (SVTP 19; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 13-17.

<sup>78</sup> See H. Dixon Slingerland, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research* (SBLMS 21; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), esp. 44-115 for an overview of the debate about Jewish or Christian origins for the Testaments.

<sup>79</sup> See Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, throughout, especially the concluding comments on 222-6. For other studies of aspects of the tradition, see James Kugel, "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings," *HTR* 86 (1993): 1-64; James C. VanderKam, "Jubilees' Exegetical Creation of Levi the Priest," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 359-73.

<sup>80</sup> Devorah Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (DJD XXX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001).

relations to the biblical books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel.<sup>81</sup> In 2000 (before DJD XXX appeared) Monica Brady completed a dissertation in which she edited and assessed all of the material and concluded that the commonalities outweighed the differences, which are amenable to other explanations, and that there is more likely a single prophetic work represented in the copies.<sup>82</sup>

It appears that work on the Scrolls in North America will continue at a healthy clip. Centers for Scrolls research have been established in various places such as Trinity Western University in Langley, British Columbia (Martin Abegg and Peter Flint and, earlier, Craig Evans),<sup>83</sup> while James Charlesworth directs the Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project which is producing editions, translations, and textual notes on the major texts from Qumran.<sup>84</sup> The journal *Dead Sea Discoveries*, whose editor until recently was always in the United States, was established in 1994 and has become one of the leading outlets for Scrolls scholarship. Production of dissertations, monographs, and articles shows no sign of abating. With complete publication of the Scrolls and new tools for research, such as *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*,<sup>85</sup> the *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*,<sup>86</sup> and growing numbers of electronic resources, conditions for further work have never been better.

---

<sup>81</sup> In the volume Dimant presents 4Q383, 4Q385-4Q390. In her preface (xiii) she mentions Strugnell's early theory that there was one work represented (named eventually *Pseudo-Ezekiel*) and in the general introduction sketches the history of research and publication (their joint publications and later her own) on the copies, including how her views evolved (1-3). Mark Smith had edited 4Q384 and 4Q391 in Magen Broshi et al., in consultation with James C. VanderKam, *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 137-93.

<sup>82</sup> Monica L. W. Brady, "Prophetic Traditions at Qumran: A Study of 4Q383-391" (Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame, 2000). See the chapter on the Qumran research in Israel.

<sup>83</sup> Note too the series *Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature* of which Peter Flint and Martin Abegg, with Florentino García Martínez, are editors.

<sup>84</sup> To date, six volumes as well as a preliminary concordance have been published.

<sup>85</sup> Martin G. Abegg with James E. Bowley and Edward M. Cook, in consultation with Emanuel Tov, eds., *The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* (vol. 1, Parts 1 and 2; Leiden: Brill, 2003); *The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert* (vol. 3; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

<sup>86</sup> Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).



## AMERICAN SCHOLARSHIP ON JEWISH LAW IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

ALEX P. JASSEN

### *Introduction*

This article surveys research on Jewish law in the Dead Sea Scrolls as undertaken by scholars working in the United States.<sup>1</sup> Jewish law in the Dead Sea Scrolls encompasses diverse norms, practices, and observance ranging across religious, social, civil, and criminal aspects of law. At times, the legal material encountered in the Scrolls carries with it a statutory or prescriptive force, whether for the sectarian community of the Scrolls or for wider segments of Second Temple Judaism. At other times, the legal material in the Scrolls is better classified as distinctly literary or exegetical.<sup>2</sup>

The survey of research is divided into four chronological sections. The first section chronicles developments in the pre-Qumran stage of research (1910-1947), during which all research focused on the two manuscripts from the Cairo Genizah of what would later become known as the *Damascus Document*.<sup>3</sup> The second phase of research begins with the discovery of cave 1 in 1947. Though scholars in subsequent years were working with an incomplete corpus, several significant analyses of Jewish law in the Dead

---

<sup>1</sup> Many of the articles explored in this survey have been reprinted in collected volumes by the authors. In most cases, the articles are cited from the most recent printing in the collected volume with the original year of publication in parentheses.

<sup>2</sup> The range of material subsumed under this classification in many respects matches what later rabbinic Judaism refers to as “*halakhah*” (on which, see Louis Jacobs, “Halakhah,” *EncJud* 8:251). As scholars have noted, however, this term does not appear in the Dead Sea Scrolls and thus its use in reference to the Scrolls and the associated sectarian community is anachronistic (see John P. Meier, “Is There *Halaka* (the Noun) at Qumran?” *JBL* 122 [2003]: 150-55). At the same time, many scholars have employed the terminology – sometimes with appropriate reservations and sometimes without – as a useful technical term to convey the broad sense of law unique to ancient Judaism. In discussing these scholars’ work, the term *halakhah* will be employed. Otherwise, the more general term “Jewish law” is used.

<sup>3</sup> This text has been identified by a number of different titles. Following the discovery of the Qumran manuscripts, it came to be known as the *Damascus Document* on account of the references to Damascus as the destination of the sect in exile. On the shifting terminology, see Lawrence H. Schiffman, “From the Cairo Genizah to Qumran: The Influence of the Zadokite Fragments on the Study of the Qumran Scrolls,” in Charlotte Hempel, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context* (STDJ 90; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 451-66 (464-5).

Sea Scrolls appeared in the first three decades following the discovery of the Scrolls. The third phase of research ranges from Yigael Yadin's publication of the *Temple Scroll* to the full release of the Scrolls in the 1990s (1977-1994).<sup>4</sup> The publication of the *Temple Scroll* dramatically expanded the amount of textual material available to scholars interested in Jewish law and precipitated a renewed interest in its study. The fourth and current phase of research was initiated by the full release of the Dead Sea Scrolls in the early 1990s and continues into the present (1994-2010). Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship experienced a widespread reawakening in the 1990s and every field of inquiry – particularly Jewish law – felt the impact of the new access to the manuscripts and rapidly expanding bibliography on the Dead Sea Scrolls.

#### *1910-1947 – The Damascus Document and the Unknown Jewish Sect*

The discovery of the first Dead Sea Scrolls was not by a Bedouin shepherd in 1947 in the Judean desert. Already fifty years earlier, Solomon Schechter found among the manuscripts in the Cairo Genizah two manuscripts of what would later become known as the *Damascus Document*.<sup>5</sup> Research on Jewish law in the Dead Sea Scrolls was initiated by Schechter's publication in 1910 of the *editio princeps* of this text.<sup>6</sup> In this first stage of research, the

<sup>4</sup> The *Temple Scroll* was first published by Yigael Yadin in a Hebrew edition: *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, the Hebrew University, and the Shrine of the Book, 1977). An English edition appeared in 1983.

<sup>5</sup> On Schechter's discovery of the *Damascus Document*, see Norman Bentwich, *Solomon Schechter: A Biography* (Philadelphia: JPS, 1938), 159-60, 263-4; Raphael Levy, "First Dead Sea Scrolls Found in Egypt Fifty Years before the Qumran Discoveries," in Hershel Shanks, ed., *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Vintage, 1993), 63-78 (1982); Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Second Temple Literature and the Cairo Genizah," in *Qumran and Jerusalem: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 393-410 (400-406); Stefan C. Reif, *A Jewish Archive from Old Cairo: The History of Cambridge University's Genizah Collection* (London: Routledge, 2000), 113-16; "The Damascus Document from the Cairo Genizah: Its Discovery, Early Study and Historical Significance," in Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick, eds., *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery* (STDJ 34; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 109-31.

<sup>6</sup> Solomon Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries, Volume 1, Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910; repr. with prolegomenon by Joseph A. Fitzmyer; The Library of Biblical Studies; New York: Ktav, 1970). The two manuscripts are identified by the sigla T-S 10 K 6 and T-S 16.31, for which Schechter assigned the designators "A" and "B," respectively (ix [41]). The second volume published by Schechter in this edition is the Karaite work entitled *Fragments of the Book of the Commandments by Anan*. The 1970 reprint of Schechter's edition creates a continuous pagination that runs through Fitzmyer's prolegomenon and the two volumes that Schechter published. Refer-

bulk of scholarly activity focused on identifying the sectarian community standing behind this previously unknown text.<sup>7</sup> At the same time, several scholars recognized the centrality of Jewish law in the text and sought to explore its legal contents and illuminate the broader setting of this law.

Schechter and other scholars working on these manuscripts, of course, had no idea what was to come with the Qumran discoveries. At the same time, much of the early work on the *Damascus Document* laid the foundation for subsequent research bearing on the scrolls emerging from the Qumran caves. In particular, Schechter's *editio princeps* and Louis Ginzberg's studies on the text stand out for their sustained interest in understanding the legal aspects of the *Damascus Document*. These two works would become indispensable resource tools for all later scholars seeking to understand law in the *Damascus Document* and the Dead Sea Scrolls.

### *Solomon Schechter and the editio princeps of the Damascus Document*

Solomon Shneur Zalman Schechter (1847-1915) was born in the Romanian town of Foscani to a Hasidic (Chabad) family.<sup>8</sup> In 1875 Schechter departed the insular confines of the traditional Eastern European *yeshiva* to enter the critically oriented *Bet ha-Midrash* in Vienna. There, he encountered leading critical rabbinic scholars such as Isaac Hirsch Weiss (1815-1905), Meir Friedmann (1831-1908), and Adolf Jellinek (1820/21-1893). From Weiss and Friedmann, in particular, Schechter not only learned how to subject traditional Jewish texts to scientific inquiry, but the art of cre-

---

ences to Schechter's edition will first refer to the page numbers in the 1910 edition followed by the reprint pagination in parentheses.

<sup>7</sup> For helpful summaries of research on the *Damascus Document* prior to 1947 with emphasis on the scholarly interest in the identity of the sect, see Bentwich, *Solomon Schechter*, 264-6; Fitzmyer, "Prolegomenon," 14; Philip R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the 'Damascus Covenant'* (JSOTSup 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982), 3-14; Yaakov Sussmann, "The History of Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Preliminary Talmudic Observations on *Miqṣat Ma'āse ha-Torah* (4QMMT)," *Tarbiz* 49 (1992): 11-76 (11-22) (Hebrew); Schiffman, "From the Cairo Genizah to Qumran."

<sup>8</sup> Notwithstanding Schechter's stature as both a scholar and public figure, the only full biography of Schechter remains Bentwich, *Solomon Schechter*. See also the profile of Schechter in Cyrus Adler, "Solomon Schechter: A Biographical Sketch," *American Jewish Year Book* 18 (1916-1917): 25-67. An annotated bibliography of Schechter's writings can be found in Adolph S. Oko, *Solomon Schechter M.A., Litt.D.: A Bibliography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938). For a recent assessment of Schechter as a scholar, see Yaakov Sussmann, "Shneur Zalman (Solomon) Schechter as a Scholar," *Jewish Studies* 38 (1998): 213-30 (Hebrew).

ating a critical edition of a rabbinic text.<sup>9</sup> In 1879, Schechter moved to Berlin to study at the *Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums*, where he continued to merge his exceptional command of traditional Jewish texts with the critical approaches to Jewish texts being advocated by the leading adherents of Jewish *Wissenschaft*.

A new phase of Schechter's intellectual biography began in 1882, when he moved to London to become the tutor of Claude Goldsmid Montefiore (1858-1938), whom he had met at the *Hochschule*. In 1890 Schechter transitioned into his first formal academic position as Lecturer in Talmudics at Cambridge University.<sup>10</sup> It was during his time at Cambridge that Schechter learned of the remarkable treasures languishing in the storeroom of the Ben Ezra synagogue in old Cairo (Fustat). In 1896, he journeyed to Cairo and brought back to Cambridge thousands of fragments he found in the Cairo Genizah. The decipherment and publication of many of these texts constituted a central occupation of Schechter alongside his other scholarly work and growing status as a public figure. In 1902, Schechter accepted the invitation to become President of the reorganized Jewish Theological Seminary of America in New York, a post he held until his death in 1915.

In 1910 Schechter published the *editio princeps* of the Genizah manuscripts of the *Damascus Document* under the title *Fragments of a Zadokite Work* as volume one of a two-volume edition entitled *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*.<sup>11</sup> The edition consisted of a general introduction, a Hebrew transcription of all pages of the two manuscripts, an English translation with Schechter's comments and annotations, two lists of additions and corrections, and a source index. Schechter included photographs of two pages from the manuscripts (Ms A, p. 1; Ms B, p. 20). Examination of the *editio princeps* reveals Schechter's abiding interest in aspects of Jewish law in the text. Notwithstanding the poor state of the medieval manuscripts and difficulty encountered in properly organizing the damaged pages, Schechter asserts in his general introduction that the text should be divided into

---

<sup>9</sup> Weiss produced critical editions of the *Sifra* (1862) and the *Mekhilta* (1865). Friedmann published several critical editions: *Sifre* (1864); *Mekhilta* (1870); *Pesikta Rabbati* (1880); *Baraita de-Meleket ha-Mishkan* (1908); and *Tanna de-vei Eliyahu* (1902). Schechter gravitated toward Friedmann and his great respect and admiration for his teacher is clearly conveyed in Schechter's obituary for Friedmann: "Lector Meir Friedmann," in *Seminary Addresses and Other Papers* (Cincinnati: Ark, 1915), 135-43 (1908-1909).

<sup>10</sup> In 1892, Schechter would be appointed to the position of Reader in Rabbinics at Cambridge. In 1899, Schechter also assumed the position of Professor of Hebrew at University College, London.

<sup>11</sup> See Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*.

two equal sections: the “Hagada” and “Halacha.”<sup>12</sup> Here, Schechter draws on the readily available, albeit imprecise, terminology provided by rabbinic literature to distinguish between legal and non-legal material.<sup>13</sup>

By the time Schechter published the *editio princeps* of the *Damascus Document*, he had himself produced three critical editions of rabbinic texts.<sup>14</sup> His approach in these three editions draws on the model of his teachers Weiss and especially Friedmann. The edition of the *Damascus Document* represents Schechter’s attempt to apply a modified version of this model to a non-rabbinic text. Thus, the majority of Schechter’s commentary on the *Damascus Document* consists of philological analysis and suggestions regarding possible textual emendations. His treatment of the legal passages draws upon his vast erudition in Second Temple literature, classical and medieval rabbinic literature, as well as Samaritan, Karaite, and Falasha legal texts.

At the same time, one can detect in Schechter’s commentary an imbalance between his extensive analysis of the text itself and his less developed attempt to place the elements in the text – legal and non-legal – in broader literary and historical context.<sup>15</sup> Schechter does not attempt to identify how all the diverse comparative sources fit together and what the newly available evidence of the *Damascus Document* offers the broader conversation on the history and development of Jewish law. Schechter hints at his disinterest in pursuing these questions in a concerted way in a note in the introduction. In the context of discussing the possible Sadducean origins of the sect, Schechter observes:

It need hardly be pointed out that there are both in the Hagada and in the Halacha of our Sect features which strikingly recall the famous hypothesis of Geiger regarding the Sadducees and the Old Halacha. But this hypothesis is still so underdeveloped in its details, that it seems better to leave the subject in abeyance. It is a further and larger question whether we have to deal with

---

<sup>12</sup> Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, xii (44). For Schechter’s discussion of the difficulties regarding the arrangement of the pages, see *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, ix-x (41-42); and Fitzmyer, “Prolegomenon,” 17-18.

<sup>13</sup> Chaim Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1954), x-xi, would later classify these two sections as the “Admonition” and “Laws.”

<sup>14</sup> Solomon Schechter, ed., *Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan* (Vienna, 1887); *Agadath Shir ha-Shirim* (London, 1896); *Midrash ha-Gadol: Bereshit* (Cambridge, 1902). He also published together with Simeon Singer, *Talmudical Fragments in the Bodleian Library* (Cambridge, 1896). This edition only contains a transcript of two Talmudic fragments with a brief four-page introduction.

<sup>15</sup> On this characterization of Schechter’s critical editions more broadly, see Bentwich, *Solomon Schechter*, 265.



a sort of counter-tradition or with an interpretation claiming to go back to primitive Judaism.<sup>16</sup>

Schechter alludes to the attempt by Abraham Geiger (1810-1874) to create a history of *halakhah* by distinguishing between “Old Halakhah” and “New Halakhah.”<sup>17</sup> The former, argues Geiger, is associated with the sectarian strands of Second Temple Jewry (e.g., the Sadducees, the *Book of Jubilees*) and is preserved among some segments of early rabbinic Judaism (e.g., the School of Shammai), while the latter is identified with the mainstream Pharisaic-rabbinic tradition.<sup>18</sup> It is not clear what exactly Schechter found problematic about Geiger’s theory.<sup>19</sup>

Later scholars working with the benefit of historical hindsight have noted how Geiger’s theory posits a historically false linear development of Jewish law.<sup>20</sup> Indeed, it is a text such as the *Damascus Document* that complicates Geiger’s hypothesis so profoundly by demonstrating the diversity that characterizes Jewish law already in the Second Temple period.<sup>21</sup> Whether Schechter himself would have advocated a similar criticism of Geiger or characterization of the *Damascus Document* is not clear. In a letter dated September 6, 1910 to his friend and colleague Samuel Poznanski (1864-1921), a Polish rabbi and renowned scholar of Karaite Judaism, Schechter explains the cursory nature of his note in the *editio princeps* regarding Geiger by indicating that he hopes to return to the issue of Geiger’s theory in a more systematic treatment.<sup>22</sup> This proposed work, however, was never undertaken.

<sup>16</sup> Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, xxi n. 35 (53).

<sup>17</sup> Geiger’s theory is articulated in *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der innern Entwicklung des Judentums* (Breslau: Hainauer, 1857).

<sup>18</sup> On the influence of Geiger’s theory on later scholarship, see Aharon Shemesh, *Halakhah in the Making: The Development of Jewish Law from Qumran to the Rabbis* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 3-4.

<sup>19</sup> The same laconic assessment of Geiger’s theory is repeated in Schechter, “Dr. Büchler’s Review of Schechter’s ‘Jewish Sectaries,’” *JQR* 4 (1914): 449-74 (454).

<sup>20</sup> See Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Halakhah and History: The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to Recent Scholarship,” in *Qumran and Jerusalem*, 63-78. Scholars have further noted how Geiger’s model of historical development frames the activity of the Pharisees and later rabbis as a much-needed transformation of established *halakhah* in concert with the exigencies of first century Jewish society. Geiger’s portrait of the Pharisees/rabbis as engaged in a process of religious reform provides historical precedent for the still-contentious activity of Geiger and other proponents of Reform Judaism in the nineteenth century. See Ismar Schorsch, *From Text to Context: The Turn to History in Modern Judaism* (Hanover, N.H.: Brandeis University Press, 1994), 186-7.

<sup>21</sup> Schiffman, “Halakhah and History,” 67-68.

<sup>22</sup> See Abraham Ya’ari, *Solomon Schechter’s Letters to Samuel Poznanski* (Jerusalem: Bamberger and Warhman, 1943), 47-49 (48) (Hebrew).

While Schechter's larger treatment of the history of *halakhah* was never produced, we do get some sense of how he locates the laws of the *Damascus Document* in broader historical context. This comes as part of Schechter's reply to Adolph Büchler's (1867-1939) critique of his work.<sup>23</sup> Among Büchler's arguments in favor of a medieval dating for the *Damascus Document*, he notes that many of the laws of the *Damascus Document* correspond with rabbinic law, which he thus interprets as evidence of rabbinic influence on the sect.<sup>24</sup> The main thrust of Schechter's rebuttal of this argument is to affirm the incoherent logic of this argument – why must correspondence indicate that the sect was influenced by the rabbis? Schechter singles out the particular law in the *Damascus Document* (XIII, 4-7) regarding the competing roles of the Overseer (מבקר) and the priest regarding the identification of the cleanliness or uncleanness of a person with skin disease. In the *Damascus Document*, the Overseer makes the judgment regarding the skin disease, though the priest is required to make the official pronouncement regarding the affected person. This is the case, asserts the *Damascus Document*, even if the priest is "ignorant." In his commentary, Schechter alludes to the parallel rabbinic tradition in the *Sifra* that likewise makes even an ignorant priest responsible for the pronouncement.<sup>25</sup> The agreement of the rabbis and the *Damascus Document*, argues Schechter in response to Büchler, "only proves that this was a very old Halakah."<sup>26</sup>

For Schechter, the appearance of many of the same laws in later rabbinic literature attests to the antiquity of the laws as found in the rabbinic texts. This is true whether the rabbinic law is in agreement or disagreement with the sectarian view. Thus, the debates between the sect and its Pharisaic opponents continue in later rabbinic Judaism just as the later rabbis sometimes agree with the legal position earlier advocated by the sectarians. In making this argument, Schechter positions his view of the history of Jewish law as aligned with what Aharon Shemesh has recently characterized as the "reflective" model. In this model, rabbinic traditions preserve the legal position of their Second Temple forbears – the Pharisees. Moreover, rabbinic texts preserve evidence of longstanding debates on legal issues, many of which are now more fully illuminated by the polemical language preserved in the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>27</sup> While the specific example of the priest

<sup>23</sup> See Adolph Büchler, "Schechter's 'Jewish Sectaries,'" *JQR* 3 (1913): 429-85; and Schechter, "Dr. Büchler's Review."

<sup>24</sup> Büchler, "Schechter's 'Jewish Sectaries,'" 452-7.

<sup>25</sup> See *Sifra Tazri'a* 1.9 (on Lev 13:2); *m. Neg.* 3:1.

<sup>26</sup> Schechter, "Dr. Büchler's Review," 466.

<sup>27</sup> See Shemesh, *Halakhah in the Making*, 5.

in CD XIII, 4-7 reflects *agreement* between the sectarian and rabbinic approaches, Schechter's basic premise is to demonstrate the historical continuity of Jewish law and legal debates from the Second Temple period to rabbinic Judaism.

Schechter's vision of the broad historical continuity of Jewish law can be further detected in the way in which the legal material in the *Damascus Document* becomes the crucial factor in Schechter's identification of the sectarian community and its location in the historical development of Jewish sectarianism. As noted above, nearly every analysis of the *Damascus Document* between Schechter's *editio princeps* and the discovery of the Qumran caves in 1947 has offered a new identification for the sect.<sup>28</sup> Indeed, this same debate would continue after the first scrolls from cave 1 were deciphered and remains a central object of inquiry in Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship.<sup>29</sup> What is often forgotten in the recounting of this long sweep of scholarly work is Schechter's reliance on Jewish law in the *Damascus Document* as the linchpin for his identification of the sect as a Dosithean outgrowth of an originally Zadokite community. The same constellation of legal elements in the text points for Schechter to the Second Temple period provenance of the text and its markedly anti-Pharisaic approach.

Schechter's identification of the primary opponents of the sect as the Pharisees is based on two premises. First, he suggests that the pejorative designation of the sectarian opponents as "builders of the wall" is likely an allusion to the Pharisaic attempts to "make a fence around the Torah" (*m. Abot* 1:1).<sup>30</sup> While the linguistic and conceptual foundations of this connection could be debated, Schechter notes that the accusations leveled against the sectarian opponents with regard to the performance of Jewish law and ritual "leave no doubt that the object of the Sect's general abuse was mainly the Pharisees."<sup>31</sup>

In working through the evidence in support of this proposition, Schechter attempts simultaneously to align the approach of the *Damascus Document* with sectarian attitudes and the view of the opponents with the Pharisees. Schechter singles out the polemical nature of the text toward polygamy/divorce (CD IV, 20-V, 6), the laws of menstruant separation

<sup>28</sup> See the summaries of research quoted in n. 7 above.

<sup>29</sup> See the most recent treatment in John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009).

<sup>30</sup> See Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, xvii (49). This point is further articulated in the commentary on the use of the designation in CD IV, 19.

<sup>31</sup> Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, xvii (49).

(CD V, 6-7), and uncle-niece marriage (CD V, 7-11).<sup>32</sup> He locates these three specific issues in the context of deeply contested debates between Pharisees and the sectarian Samaritans and Karaites. Schechter draws on further examples from the legal portion of the *Damascus Document*: the Sabbath laws (CD X, 14-XI, 18), dietary laws and related rules of Levitical impurity (CD XII, 11-18), and more tentatively the annulment of vows (CD XVI, 6-12).

In his search for the elusive identity of the sectarian community, Schechter's overriding methodology is to amass as much evidence as possible that points toward a sectarian origin for the legal positions advocated in the *Damascus Document*. Thus, Schechter conflates correspondence with legal perspectives in the *Book of Jubilees* and Karaite and Samaritan texts in order to generate a decidedly "sectarian" identity for the sect. Schechter draws on the close relationship between the *Damascus Document* and *Jubilees* to reinforce his proposition regarding the antiquity of the sectarian community standing behind the text.<sup>33</sup> The distinction Schechter draws between the polemical attitude toward Pharisaic law and the correspondence with *Jubilees* leads Schechter to the one historical conclusion that he asserts "beyond any doubt." The historical origins of the sectarian community of the *Damascus Document* belong alongside the same cluster of ancient sectarian groups responsible for *Jubilees* and related pseudepigraphic works such as the book of *I Enoch* and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Moreover, all of these sectarian groups – especially the sect of the *Damascus Document* – must be distinguished from the normative Pharisees.<sup>34</sup>

In contrast to the certainty with which he articulates his conclusion regarding ancient Jewish sectarianism, Schechter repeatedly emphasizes the tentative nature of his suggested identification of the sectarian community of the *Damascus Document*. Schechter crafts a historical scenario where an ancient Zadokite group morphs into the Dosithean sect, a historically nebulous sectarian movement with connections to the Samaritans.<sup>35</sup> The latter

<sup>32</sup> Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, xvii-xviii (49-50).

<sup>33</sup> See Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, xv (47).

<sup>34</sup> Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, xxvi (58). For the suggestion that Schechter's portrait of ancient Jewish sectarianism is informed by his perspective on traditional Judaism as a bulwark against both Reform Judaism and Christianity, see Maxine L. Grossman, "Schechter's Zadokites: Ancient Jewish Authority in Nineteenth-Century Perspectives," in Hayim Lapin and Dale B. Martin, eds., *Jews, Antiquity, and the Nineteenth-Century Imagination* (Bethesda: University Press of Maryland, 2003), 123-40.

<sup>35</sup> On the Dositheans and the complicated reconstruction of their history, see Stanley J. Isser, *The Dositheans: A Samaritan Sect in Late Antiquity* (SJLA 17; Leiden: Brill, 1976), and earlier literature cited therein.

group eventually disappears and leaves traces of its identity only among the Falashas.<sup>36</sup> Again, the linchpin in Schechter's proposal is the legal content of the *Damascus Document*. In particular, he finds points of correspondence between several of the polemically charged laws from the *Damascus Document* and the description of an ancient Jewish sect of Zadokites in the Karaite Yaqūb al-Qirqisānī's *Books of Lighthouses and Watchtowers* (*Kitāb al-anwār wal-marāqib* – ca. 937).<sup>37</sup> He notes in particular how Qirqisānī describes the Zadokites as rejecting divorce and advocating for a divergent (i.e., 30-day month) calendar, both positions consistent with the law of the *Damascus Document*. Because the later Karaite accounts of Zadokite law do not agree in their entirety with the *Damascus Document*, Schechter argues that the latter should be construed as “containing extracts from a Zadok book, representing features contained in the copies of these authorities.”<sup>38</sup>

In order to account for the presence of this text in the Genizah long after the disappearance of the Zadokites, Schechter proposes that the sect eventually was “absorbed by the Dosithean sect.”<sup>39</sup> In this sense, Schechter expands his inquiry beyond purely legal elements through an attempt to connect the chronology of column one of the *Damascus Document* with the purported historical origins of the Dositheans as found in medieval chroniclers.<sup>40</sup> At the same time, Schechter follows the same line of argumentation as earlier advanced regarding the *halakhah* of the Zadokites: the laws of the *Damascus Document* display significant agreement with what is known about the Dosithean approach to the calendar, Sabbath law, sectarian organization, dietary laws, and possibly remarriage.<sup>41</sup> Thus, in his opinion the Dosithean sect is the best possible candidate for the post-Zadokite identity of the community. As the Dositheans disappear from history, traces of their *halakhah* are preserved among the Falashas. This feature therefore explains the similarities between the laws of the *Damascus Document* and Falasha *halakhah*.

Schechter's conclusions are significant for what he correctly apprehends a half-century before the discovery of the Qumran texts and almost a century before the full release of the Dead Sea Scrolls. For Schechter, the *Damascus Document* preserves the perspective of a group from the Second Temple pe-

<sup>36</sup> See Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, xviii-xxvi (50-58).

<sup>37</sup> Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, xviii (50), incorrectly identifies the date of composition as “637,” clearly a typographical error.

<sup>38</sup> Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, xxi (53). This feature explains Schechter's choice for the title as “*Fragments of a Zadokite Work*.”

<sup>39</sup> Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, xxvi (58).

<sup>40</sup> Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, xxiii-xxiii (54-55).

<sup>41</sup> Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, xxiii-xxiv (55-56).

riod as evinced by the consistent polemical tone directed at legal positions clearly identifiable as Pharisaic. Schechter's astute observations regarding the competing approaches to Jewish law and the polemically charged nature of these debates would be significantly reinforced by the contents of the Qumran manuscripts. Schechter's use of both the *Damascus Document* and the *Book of Jubilees* in order to identify diverse varieties of Judaism (i.e., non-Pharisaic) presages much of the rethinking of the contours of Second Temple Judaism that would develop throughout the twentieth century. Most significantly, Schechter's insistence that the disagreement among ancient Jewish groups centers around proper observance of the law would prove to be especially prescient in light of the evidence provided by the broader collection of Dead Sea Scrolls.

### *Responses to Schechter's editio princeps*

Scholarly reaction to Schechter's *editio princeps* was universal in its excitement regarding the previously unknown text and its potential contribution to the history of Judaism. At the same time, Schechter's identification of the text as stemming from Zadokite/Dosithean origins was subjected to such an intense level of scrutiny that Schechter's biographer Bentwich would characterize the debate as "fiercer and more voluminous than that about Ben Sira."<sup>42</sup>

Aside from a brief article published in 1914 responding to criticism of his work by Büchler, Schechter would never return to the text.<sup>43</sup> Schechter asserts in this article that he is collecting all the responses to his work and hopes to publish a second edition, which will include his full response to this criticism as well as a facsimile of the manuscripts.<sup>44</sup> Neither this second edition nor Schechter's proposed study on the history of *halakhah* would ever be undertaken due to his death in 1915.

---

<sup>42</sup> Bentwich, *Solomon Schechter*, 160. For bibliography of the competing views, see above, n. 7. On the controversy regarding the Ben Sira Genizah manuscripts, see Stefan C. Reif, "The Discovery of the Cambridge Genizah Fragments of Ben Sira: Scholars and Texts," in Pancratius C. Beentjes, ed., *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research* (BZAW 255; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997), 1-22.

<sup>43</sup> Schechter, "Dr. Büchler's Review."

<sup>44</sup> Schechter, "Dr. Büchler's Review," 474. The issue of the facsimile is noted in the particular context of Robert H. Charles's (1855-1931) complaint that Schechter did not publish photographs of the manuscripts and arranged with Cambridge University to bar scholarly access to the manuscripts for five years after the publication of the *editio princeps*. Adler likewise mentions the proposed second edition in his defense of the provisional nature of Schechter's edition ("Solomon Schechter," 51).

A wealth of research on the *Damascus Document* appeared in the years after Schechter's publication of the text. While most scholars focused their attention on Schechter's identification of the sect, several ventured into further analysis of the legal material. Three particular contributions by American scholars concentrated on Jewish law in the text.

George Foot Moore (1851-1931)

In 1911, George Foot Moore published a review of Schechter's work.<sup>45</sup> Moore, Professor of the History of Religions at Harvard University, was at the time one of the leading biblical scholars in the United States.<sup>46</sup> Over the course of the next two decades, Moore's work on the history and thought of ancient Judaism would constitute a vigorous attack on earlier historians' caricature of first century Judaism as mired in rigid legalism in contrast to the vibrant spirituality of Christianity.<sup>47</sup> Much of Moore's article reviews Schechter's presentation of the text, though he devotes considerable attention to George Margoliouth's (1853-1924) theory regarding the Christian identity of the sect.<sup>48</sup> Moore rejects Schechter's theory on the identity of the sect based on what he characterizes as a lack of solid evidence. Moreover, he clearly demonstrates the incomprehensibility of Margoliouth's approach. Regarding the legal content of the *Damascus Document*, Moore adds little to Schechter's presentation. Rather, he merely reinforces Schechter's characterization of the centrality of the law for the sect and its polemical attitude toward Pharisaic legal positions.

One can detect in Moore's analysis a subtle attempt to characterize the *Damascus Document* as part of the holistic portrait of first century Judaism that would be so central to his later systematic treatments of Judaism. For Moore, "the things which the sect esteems of vital importance lie wholly in

---

<sup>45</sup> George Foot Moore, "The Covenanters of Damascus: A Hitherto Unknown Jewish Sect," *HTR* 4 (1911): 330-77. Though not stated, this article is undoubtedly an outgrowth of Moore's "communication" entitled "A Hitherto Unknown Jewish Sect: Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries I*," which was delivered at the 123<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the American Oriental Society (Cambridge, Mass.; April 19-20, 1911). See "Proceedings of the American Oriental Society," *JAOS* 31 (1911): i-ix (viii).

<sup>46</sup> On Moore, see F. Stanley Lusby and Steven Fine, "George Foot Moore," *EncRel* 9:6176-7; Morton Smith, "The Work of George Foot Moore," *Harvard Library Bulletin* 15 (1967): 169-79.

<sup>47</sup> See especially George F. Moore, "Christian Writers on Judaism," *HTR* 14 (1921): 197-254. On this aspect of Moore's work, see especially Ed P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977), 33-36.

<sup>48</sup> Moore is reacting specifically to Margoliouth's work: "The Sadducean Christians of Damascus," *Athenaeum* 4335 (November 26, 1910): 657-9. For bibliography of Margoliouth's further writings espousing this view, see Fitzmyer, "Prolegomenon," 30.



the sphere of the law.”<sup>49</sup> While the Christian expositors of Judaism upon whom Moore later heaps such scorn would undoubtedly condemn the sectarian community to an identity rooted in rigid legalism, Moore’s portrait of the sect and its “polemic zeal” for the law is far more nuanced. What is particularly interesting about Moore’s treatment is the equal weight he provides in his review of the legal material in the text alongside his explication of the purported history of the sect, its eschatological worldview, and ethical sensibilities. Thus, Moore expends considerable effort outlining the main elements of the sectarian laws of the *Damascus Document*. This approach is consistent with his later argument that pre-Christian Judaism should be studied for its own sake, rather than the piecemeal approach that is usually found in Christian writers seeking to uncover the Jewish setting (i.e., legalism) from which Christianity emerges.

Moore would return to the *Damascus Document* once more in his later synthetic overview of early Judaism.<sup>50</sup> Unlike his earlier treatment of the *Damascus Document*, Moore asserts in this work that he is interested primarily in the legal content of the text.<sup>51</sup> While his 1911 review essentially agrees with Schechter regarding the anti-Pharisaic approach of the text, Moore’s later work is clearly influenced by Ginzberg’s subsequent argument in favor of Pharisaic origins.<sup>52</sup> This change of orientation leads Moore to the conclusion that, with the exception of the issue of forbidden marriages, the differences between the sect and the Pharisees “are not wider than existed between the leading legal lights in the first and second centuries.” The major difference, argues Moore, is the slightly stricter approach taken in sectarian law. Thus, the sect’s “affinities are throughout with the Pharisees,

<sup>49</sup> Moore, “The Covenanters of Damascus,” 373.

<sup>50</sup> George F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim* (3 vols.; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927-1930), 1:200-204; 2:27, 32-33, 121-2.

<sup>51</sup> Moore, *Judaism*, 1:200.

<sup>52</sup> His reliance on Ginzberg is clearly stated in Moore, *Judaism*, 1:201 n. 1, 203. Moore and Ginzberg enjoyed a close relationship that seems to have grown considerably in this period. Moore turned to Ginzberg for help in acquiring the necessary tools to enter into the world of rabbinic literature, and indeed, Ginzberg’s assistance is readily acknowledged throughout Moore’s *Judaism* by the initials “L.G.” On this relationship, see Smith, “George Foot Moore,” 176; Eli Ginzberg, *Keeper of the Law: Louis Ginzberg* (Philadelphia: JPS, 1966), 283-4; Shuly Rubin Schwartz, “The Schechter Faculty: The Seminary and ‘Wissenschaft des Judentums’ in America,” in Jack Wertheimer, ed., *Tradition Renewed: A History of the Jewish Theological Seminary* (2 vols.; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1997), 1:295-325 (302-3). Ginzberg, *Keeper of the Law*, 269 notes that Louis Ginzberg’s study contained a photograph of his father’s tombstone as well as photographs of three men: Schechter, Nöldeke, and Moore (on his relationship to Schechter and Nöldeke, see below).



not with any other variety of Judaism.”<sup>53</sup> The sect and the Pharisees are all part of the same generally homogenous ancient Judaism, which Moore draws under the larger umbrella of Pharisaic Judaism.

#### Kaufmann Kohler (1843-1926)

The second significant engagement with Schechter’s work in the United States came from Kaufmann Kohler, a Reform rabbi and president of the Hebrew Union College from 1903 to 1921.<sup>54</sup> As both a scholar and leading American rabbi, Kohler carried on both a personal and professional relationship with Schechter.<sup>55</sup> Kohler’s primary focus in his review is to argue in favor of viewing the *Damascus Document* as a pastiche of sectarian perspectives in contrast to the normative views of the Pharisees. In this respect, Kohler builds on the similar broad portrait of the text outlined by Schechter, though he views the text as representative of a much wider system of sectarian Judaism.

Kohler’s treatment of the legal material likewise expands upon Schechter’s initial outline of the wider setting of laws in the *Damascus Document*. In dialogue with both later rabbinic and Christian evidence, Kohler presents expansive analyses of various laws related to civil and criminal jurisdiction, Levitical laws of purity and sanctity, non-Jews, the Sabbath, vows, dietary laws, and forbidden marriages.<sup>56</sup> In most cases, Kohler’s methodology is to accentuate the distinction between the “sectarian” laws as reflected in the *Damascus Document* and the approach to the same issue as found in later rabbinic evidence. Moreover, unlike Schechter, Kohler plots the legal material along the historical trajectory suggested by Geiger. Like Geiger, Kohler’s palpable distaste for the pre-rabbinic sectarian *halakhah* is readily apparent. Similarly, Kohler follows Geiger in presenting the Pharisees as

<sup>53</sup> Moore, *Judaism*, 1:201.

<sup>54</sup> Kaufmann Kohler, “Dositheus, the Samaritan Heresiarch, and His Relations to Jewish and Christian Doctrines and Sects (A Study of Professor Schechter’s Recent Publication),” *AJT* 15 (1911): 404-35. On Kohler, see Max J. Kohler, “Biographical Sketch of Dr. K. Kohler,” in David Philipson, David Neumark, and Julian Morgenstern, eds., *Studies in Jewish Literature Issued in Honor of Professor Kaufmann Kohler* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1913), 1-10. A bibliography of Kohler’s writings prepared by Adolph S. Oko appears in the same volume (266-301).

<sup>55</sup> Schechter delivered an address at the Judean Banquet in honor of Kohler (March 26, 1903), in which he opens with several kind words directed at Kohler (Schechter, “Higher Criticism – Higher Anti-Semitism,” *Seminary Addresses*, 35-39). See further Ben-twich, *Solomon Schechter*, 336-40. In his 1911 article, Kohler alludes to correspondence with Schechter regarding the *Damascus Document* that took place eight years earlier (“Dositheus,” 406).

<sup>56</sup> Kohler, “Dositheus,” 417-28.

the champions of a “progressive and democratic” Judaism stripped of its undesirable sectarian elements.<sup>57</sup>

As with Moore, one can detect in Kohler’s portrait of the *Damascus Document* several intersecting meta-historical issues. Kohler frames the debates regarding *ancient* Jewish law and practice with language and imagery strongly suggestive of the debates over *modern* Jewish law and practice in which Kohler was so centrally involved.<sup>58</sup> Kohler’s general interest in the text is representative of broader trends in early Reform scholarship on the Genizah. Kohler and other Reform rabbis were able to recover from the Genizah a lost world of pre-modern Judaism that did not always look like the traditional Judaism of the Middle Ages.<sup>59</sup> Thus, the *Damascus Document* and other Genizah material offered an alternative to the dominant discourse of modern Orthodox Judaism as representative of longstanding Jewish practice. In the case of the *Damascus Document*, for example, Kohler attempts to find an ethic that corresponds with modern progressive sensibilities. Thus, in the section on “civil and criminal administration,” Kohler characterizes the sectarian laws regarding vows (CD XV, 1-3; XVI, 6-14), lost goods (CD IX, 8-16), expulsion from the sect (CD IX, 16-23), and informers (CD IX, 1) as reflecting “the lesson of brotherly love, of fostering peace by open rebuke, and of helpful support to the needy.” Only Kohler’s selective reading of the text, however, can make the *Damascus Document* a 2,000-year-old precursor to modern liberalism.

While Kohler finds some legal material in the *Damascus Document* attractive, he is far more interested in painting the law of the text as uniquely sectarian in contrast to Pharisaic law. By adopting Geiger’s model of Old and New Halakhah, Kohler thus rehearses Geiger’s own attempts to portray the reform-minded Pharisees as the precursors to modern Reform Judaism.<sup>60</sup> For example, Kohler contrasts the “rigorous” attitudes toward a menstruant found in sectarian law with the more lenient approach of the Pharisees, which emphasizes “principles of human dignity and of domestic happiness.”<sup>61</sup> By framing the sectarian debates with the Pharisees in these terms, Kohler turns on its head the dominant discourse of modern Orthodoxy – modern Orthodox Judaism becomes aligned with the rigid law

<sup>57</sup> Kohler, “Dositheus,” 431.

<sup>58</sup> This approach is tentatively suggested by Reif, “The Damascus Document,” 124.

<sup>59</sup> See Richard A. Freund, “How the Dead Sea Scrolls Influenced Reform Judaism,” *AJAJ* 61 (2009): 115-43 (115-18).

<sup>60</sup> On this assessment of Geiger’s theory, see the discussions cited in n. 20 above.

<sup>61</sup> Kohler, “Dositheus,” 420.

of sectarian Judaism and Reform Judaism is identified as the heir to the progressive Pharisees.

Louis Ginzberg (1873-1953)

The most ambitious early attempt to understand the *Damascus Document*, both in general terms and with regard to its legal content, was produced by Louis Ginzberg, Schechter's junior colleague at the Jewish Theological Seminary.<sup>62</sup> Ginzberg's life and scholarship offer another portrait of the path from the *yeshivot* of Eastern Europe to the critical scholarship of Western Europe and eventually to the new center of Jewish life and scholarship in America. Ginzberg was born in Kovno, Lithuania, and was reared in the educational system of Lithuanian Jewry. As a teenager in Frankfurt, Ginzberg acquired a thorough education in German, classical languages, mathematics, and science. After a period of study at the University of Berlin and then the University of Strassbourg under the tutelage of the leading Semitist Theodor Nöldeke (1836-1930), Ginzberg received a doctorate in 1898 from the University of Heidelberg for a dissertation entitled *Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern*.<sup>63</sup>

Shortly after completing his doctorate, Ginzberg immigrated to the United States in 1899 to take a proposed position at Hebrew Union College, though this appointment never materialized.<sup>64</sup> In 1900, Ginzberg took up a position as editor of rabbinic literature for the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, for which he also wrote many of the individual entries.<sup>65</sup> In 1902, Schechter invited Ginzberg to join the faculty of the Jewish Theological Seminary as Professor of Talmud, a position he held for the rest of his life. While at

<sup>62</sup> For biographical details on Ginzberg, see Louis Finkelstein, "Louis Ginzberg," *PAAJR* 23 (1954): xliv-lxiii (also appeared in *American Jewish Year Book* 56 [1955]: 573-9); Ginzberg, *Keeper of the Law*; David Golinkin, "Louis Ginzberg," *EncJud* 7:613-14; Rubin Schwartz, "The Schechter Faculty," 296-304. For bibliography of Ginzberg's scholarship, see Boaz Cohen, "Bibliography of Prof. Louis Ginzberg," in *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1945), 19-47.

<sup>63</sup> The details of Ginzberg's path from Berlin to his doctorate at Heidelberg are recounted in Ginzberg, *Keeper of the Law*, 41-58. See also Hillel I. Newman, "Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, and the Church Fathers," in Görgo F. Hasselhoff, ed., *Die Entdeckung des Christentums in der Wissenschaft des Judentums* (SJ 54; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 183-94.

<sup>64</sup> On this set of developments, see Ginzberg, *Keeper of the Law*, 60-63. Eli Ginzberg (63) cites his father's theory that the offer was rescinded for two reasons: the rumor of Ginzberg's espousal of biblical higher criticism and fear among the Hebrew Union College faculty that Ginzberg would influence students toward Orthodoxy.

<sup>65</sup> The *Jewish Encyclopedia* – a crowning achievement of fledgling American scholarship – was published in 12 volumes by Funk and Wagnells (New York, 1901-1906). Ginzberg is listed in volume one as editor of "Department of Rabbinical Literature" (vol. 1, v). Cohen, "Bibliography," identifies Ginzberg as the author of 405 entries.

JTS, Ginzberg produced an unprecedented level of scholarship in Talmud, Midrash, and Geonic literature and also exerted considerable influence in the training of Conservative rabbis and the formation of Conservative *halakhah*.

Ginzberg first outlined his interpretation of the *Damascus Document* in a series of thirteen articles published between 1911 and 1914 under the title “Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte” in *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*.<sup>66</sup> By 1916, Ginzberg had pulled together all of the articles into a single book-length monograph. The volume, dedicated to the memory of Solomon Schechter, would not be published until 1922.<sup>67</sup> In his Preface (dated to January 1916), Ginzberg remarks on his intentions to add substantial portions to the manuscript, which he declined to do on account of the difficulties involved in getting American scholarship published in Europe.<sup>68</sup> Indeed, it would take until 1922 even for his manuscript to be self-published. In a postscript (dated to July 1921), Ginzberg expresses his wish that the planned second half of the book would not suffer a similar delay.<sup>69</sup> Unfortunately, it would take fifty more years and a team of four translators before Ginzberg’s complete research on the *Damascus Document* would be made available, both in its complete form and in an English translation.<sup>70</sup>

By the time Ginzberg penned the preface to the book version of his study in 1916, he had clearly read enough work on the *Damascus Document* to contend, “that the sectarian Halakah is completely ignored by those who think that a knowledge of details can be dispensed with in judging Jewish history and literature is not surprising.”<sup>71</sup> Ginzberg’s comments here are directed both at the lack of interest in the history of *halakhah* among scholars of Jewish *Wissenschaft* and the growing body of scholarly literature on the

<sup>66</sup> *MGWJ* 55:2 (1911): 666-98; 56 (1912): 33-48, 285-307, 417-48, 546-66, 664-89; 57 (1913): 153-76, 284-308, 394-418, 666-96; 58 (1914): 16-48, 143-77, 395-429.

<sup>67</sup> *Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte*, Erster Teil (New York, 1922). The volume was printed by Karl Angermayer in Pressburg (then part of Czechoslovakia), as indicated on the verso of the title page. This edition was reprinted in 1972 by the Georg Olms Verlag, based in Hildesheim.

<sup>68</sup> Ginzberg, *Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte*, vii-viii.

<sup>69</sup> Ginzberg, *Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte*, viii.

<sup>70</sup> Louis Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (Moreshet 1: New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1976). The translation from the German was undertaken by Ralph Marcus, Harold L. Ginsberg, Zvi Gotthold, and Arthur Hertzberg. Chapters 8-10 represent Ginzberg’s previously unpublished work. In addition to Ginzberg’s work, the volume contains a general introduction by Eli Ginzberg, notes by Saul Lieberman and Harold Ginsberg, and source and subject indices produced by Tovia Preschel.

<sup>71</sup> Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect*, xviii.

*Damascus Document*.<sup>72</sup> Thus, he positions his work as an attempt “to attain clarity about the Halakah in these fragments, for this alone is capable of dispelling the darkness that surrounds them.”<sup>73</sup>

Ginzberg’s analysis of the legal material pervades the entire volume. Among the material first published in *MGWJ* and the 1922 book, Ginzberg’s extensive “Textual and Exegetical Notes” draw on his encyclopedic knowledge of Second Temple texts, rabbinic literature, and medieval Karaite literature. In elucidating the relationship between the *Damascus Document* and this body of comparative literary evidence, Ginzberg clarifies many of the issues involved in the legal portions of the text. The next section of Ginzberg’s early studies (“The Halakah of the Fragments”) constitutes “a comprehensive survey of the sectarian Halakah and its relation to the standard Halakah and to those of other sects.”<sup>74</sup> Ginzberg’s introductory remarks to this section clarify the reason for the polemical tone in the Preface regarding the study of *halakhah*. Ginzberg detects an imbalance with regard to scholarly analysis of the *Damascus Document* and theories regarding the origins of the sect. With rhetorical flare, Ginzberg asserts: “it was not dogma but law that was apt to produce lasting schisms in Judaism.”<sup>75</sup> Like Schechter, Ginzberg asserts that careful analysis of Jewish law must be central to any inquiry into the *Damascus Document*. More specifically, law, not theology, holds the key to understanding the text as a whole and its origins.

Ginzberg frames his analysis of the law around three overarching inquiries. The central question that Ginzberg poses is whether “the Halakah of the fragments [is] distinct from that found in rabbinic sources.” In the same breath, he emphasizes that rabbinic *halakhah* must not be regarded as a single entity. Rather, rabbinic tradition allowed for significant variation in principle and in practice, which “is not to be taken as an indication of sectarianism.”<sup>76</sup> In contrast, Ginzberg outlines his second general inquiry as an attempt to understand what should be classified as “sectarian Halakah.” Ginzberg identifies the defining characteristic of “old sectarian

---

<sup>72</sup> On Ginzberg’s attitude toward the role of *halakhah* in Jewish *Wissenschaft*, see especially his comments in “An Introduction to the Palestinian Talmud,” in *On Jewish Law and Lore* (Philadelphia: JPS, 1955), 3-57 (48-49). A less pronounced criticism is found in his essay in the same volume, “The Significance of the Halachah for Jewish History,” 77-124 (78). Ginzberg’s assessment of research on the legal portions of the *Damascus Document* can be seen in his review of scholarship in *An Unknown Jewish Sect*, 304-37.

<sup>73</sup> Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect*, xviii.

<sup>74</sup> Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect*, xviii.

<sup>75</sup> Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect*, 105.

<sup>76</sup> Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect*, 105.

Halakah” (in contrast to medieval Karaism) as the “deliberate ignoring” of laws that had acquired a high level of authority in the early period of Pharisaic Judaism.<sup>77</sup> Ginzberg’s third inquiry is an outgrowth of the first two. He poses the question as to the relationship of the law preserved in the *Damascus Document* with “heretical Halakah.” Here, he has in mind the possible historical connections raised by Geiger between Sadducean (i.e., Second Temple period) and Karaite (i.e., medieval) law.

The nature of Ginzberg’s first overarching question and associated caveat clearly has in mind his eventual conclusion regarding the Pharisaic origins of the *Damascus Document*. Through his analysis, Ginzberg marshals a wealth of data from rabbinic literature – some already introduced in his notes on the text – that is identified as in concert with the legal positions of the *Damascus Document*. Ginzberg’s method is more than merely to identify the parallels (as with Schechter), but to underscore how these parallels point to a shared origin for the law of the *Damascus Document* and rabbinic *halakhah*. At times, the clear correspondence reinforces Ginzberg’s argument. Thus, for example, Ginzberg correctly notes that the extension of the Sabbath to earlier in the day in the *Damascus Document* (X, 14-17) corresponds with the nearly identical rabbinic requirement known as “*tosefet shabbat*.”<sup>78</sup>

Another example can be found in CD XIII, 4-7, which Ginzberg observes assigns the primary responsibility of assessing skin diseases to the Overseer, similar to the assignment of this role to the sage in rabbinic *halakhah*. In this instance, however, one can see the competing methodologies of Schechter and Ginzberg regarding comparative rabbinic evidence. As noted above, Schechter merely assumes that the law as found in rabbinic tradition is rooted in an older tradition, which is likewise reflected in CD XIII, 4-7. For Ginzberg, in contrast, the Overseer becomes a proto-rabbi and this example provides further evidence in favor of the Pharisaic identity of the sectarian community.

Where the *Damascus Document* and rabbinic law do not agree, Ginzberg widens the scope for what can be construed under the umbrella of rabbinic law. For example, CD X, 10-11 prohibits ritual immersion in dirty water, which is otherwise permitted in rabbinic law. Ginzberg calls attention to a rabbinic tradition that prohibits the use of water that has changed from its natural color (*m. Miqw. 7:3*), thereby providing a potential context for the

<sup>77</sup> Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect*, 106. Ginzberg is assuming here the “normative” nature of Pharisaic Judaism in the late Second Temple period.

<sup>78</sup> Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect*, 108.

inclusion of CD X, 10-11 within the framework of Pharisaic law.<sup>79</sup> Elsewhere, Ginzberg resorts to mere speculation to make the connection work. On the prohibition against consuming fish blood in CD XII, 13-14, Ginzberg observes that the prohibition is in accord with “old Halakah” but that the rabbis permit the consumption of fish blood. Thus, he merely speculates that some “rigorous” Pharisees may have restricted it as well.<sup>80</sup> With this approach, Ginzberg concludes that the *Damascus Document* reflects a “Pharisaic book of law” emanating from a “rigorous” stream of Pharisaism.<sup>81</sup>

In spite of his vigorous defense of the Pharisaic identity of the law in the *Damascus Document*, Ginzberg concedes the presence of two laws that fall into his definition of “sectarian/heretical” *halakhah* and are thus diametrically opposed to the Pharisaic approach – the prohibition against niece marriage (CD V, 7-11) and polygamy (CD IV, 20-V, 6). Ginzberg proposes that only one potential “heretical” sect from antiquity could be identified as adherents of this legal position – the Sadducees.<sup>82</sup> The introduction of these two laws and the potential Sadducean origins of the sect lead Ginzberg into his most focused discussion of Schechter’s theory on the origins of the sect. In a series of arguments, Ginzberg proceeds to draw out the many weaknesses of Schechter’s interpretation of the evidence from Qirqisānī and its application to the *Damascus Document*.<sup>83</sup> In dispelling the argument for Sadducean origins, Ginzberg is still left with the presence of two “heretical/sectarian” laws that do not fit the Pharisaic model. His response to this issue is two-fold. First, he adduces evidence that some Sadducees agreed with the restriction against niece marriage and did not restrict polygamy. Thus, these two laws should not be identified as Sadducean; rather, “they are as anti-Sadducean as they are anti-Pharisaic.”<sup>84</sup>

Ultimately, Ginzberg can find no evidence to align these two laws with the Pharisees and thus he resorts to speculation. Ginzberg suggests that it is possible that these two laws represent “an early Pharisaic point of view, which was given up by the later Pharisees.”<sup>85</sup> Ginzberg’s tentative identification of a pro-Pharisaic, anti-Sadducean stance for these two laws is then expanded into his analysis of additional laws in which there is disagree-

---

<sup>79</sup> Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect*, 51.

<sup>80</sup> Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect*, 79, 126.

<sup>81</sup> Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect*, 127.

<sup>82</sup> Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect*, 130.

<sup>83</sup> Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect*, 130-34.

<sup>84</sup> Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect*, 135.

<sup>85</sup> Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect*, 135.



ment between the Pharisees and ancient sectarians. In this sense, Ginzberg's methodology is strikingly similar to Schechter's. Whereas Schechter sought to demonstrate the overall sectarian and anti-Pharisaic nature of the law, Ginzberg argues for the exact opposite. Ginzberg concludes that not only does the law of the *Damascus Document* agree with rabbinic *halakhah*, it specifically does so in all cases where alternative positions are advocated by the Sadducees, the Dositheans, or any other sect.<sup>86</sup> Thus, Ginzberg's systematic analysis leads him to the exact opposite conclusion that Schechter reached: the law is in essential agreement with Pharisaic *halakhah* and displays no traces of sectarian *halakhah*.

Like Schechter, Ginzberg would never return to the *Damascus Document* in earnest. To be sure, Ginzberg's later publications often refer to Schechter's *editio princeps* and the book version of his own work. Thus, for example, in his portrait of Schechter delivered at Schechter's memorial in 1916 and published in 1928, Ginzberg opines on the broader significance of the text for the history of *halakhah*: "The future historian of the Halakah will have to take his starting point from the Halakah of the *Documents*, the binding link between biblical and rabbinical law."<sup>87</sup> It is ironic, however, that Ginzberg does not follow his own advice in his own attempt to map out the history of *halakhah*. His essay "The Significance of the Halachah for Jewish History" represents a lecture delivered during the 1929-1930 academic year when Ginzberg served as a visiting professor at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. In this long essay on the history of *halakhah*, Ginzberg only once refers to the *Damascus Document* in the context of demonstrating the antiquity of the mishnaic law restricting the sale of animals to non-Jews (*m. Pesah* 4:3; *Abod. Zar.* 1:6).<sup>88</sup>

### 1947-1977 – *The Discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran*

In the course of his analysis of the *Damascus Document*, Schechter expresses the hope that future discoveries will provide greater insight into the history of the sectarian community.<sup>89</sup> Schechter's wish would be fulfilled with the discovery of the first Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947. The story of the discovery of the Scrolls and their publication history has been told many times and need

<sup>86</sup> See especially, Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect*, 143.

<sup>87</sup> Ginzberg, "Solomon Schechter," 245.

<sup>88</sup> Ginzberg, "Significance of Halachah," 83-84.

<sup>89</sup> Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, vi (40).



not be repeated here.<sup>90</sup> A sub-narrative to the early history of scholarship on the Dead Sea Scrolls is the general lack of interest in matters of Jewish law among early scholars working on the Scrolls.<sup>91</sup> As is well known, the editorial team entrusted with the publication of the cave 4 fragments was neither equipped to analyze the legal material in these texts nor displayed any serious interest in doing so. The lack of availability of the legal texts from cave 4 prevented scholars with the requisite expertise in Jewish law from introducing this new material into their scholarly work.

Notwithstanding this state of affairs, scholarly research on Jewish law in the Dead Sea Scrolls did progress. The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls renewed interest in the *Damascus Document*, which had essentially been ignored by scholars following the initial burst of excitement and scholarship in the 1910s and 1920s. Scholars immediately recognized the connections between the sect of the *Damascus Document* and the newly discovered Qumran Scrolls, a connection that would be solidified by the discovery of ancient copies of the text in caves 4, 5, and 6 in 1952.<sup>92</sup> Solomon Zeitlin's publication of a facsimile edition of the Genizah manuscripts and Chaim Rabin's commentary on the text laid the foundation for subsequent research on this text from the 1950s onward – all essentially without the aid of the cave 4 fragments.<sup>93</sup> At the same time, several new texts with legal content would emerge from cave 1 and enter the scholarly domain beginning in the 1950s. The *Community Rule* (1QS) – then generally referred to as the *Manual of Discipline* – contains significant material of interest to scholars of Jewish law.<sup>94</sup> Similarly, the appendix to this text in the cave 1 manuscript

---

<sup>90</sup> Most recently, see Weston W. Fields, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Full History, Volume 1* (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

<sup>91</sup> On broader trends in early scholarship, see Sussmann, "The History of Halakha"; Schiffman, "Halakhah and History"; Steven D. Fraade, "Qumran *Yahad* and Rabbinic *hăbūrāh*: A Comparison Reconsidered," *DSD* 16 (2009): 433-52.

<sup>92</sup> On these connections, see Fitzmyer, "Prolegomenon," 14-15.

<sup>93</sup> Solomon Zeitlin, *The Zadokite Fragments: Facsimile of the Manuscripts in the Cairo Genizah Collection in the Possession of the University Library, Cambridge, England* (JQRMS 1; Philadelphia: Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1952); Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents*. Milik's early brief description of the cave 4 manuscripts focused mainly on their contribution to the order of the Genizah manuscripts (*Ten Years*, 151-2 n. 3). The fragmentary manuscripts from caves 5 and 6 were published in Maurice Baillet, Józef T. Milik, and Roland de Vaux, *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân* (DJD III; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 128-31, 181.

<sup>94</sup> The *editio princeps* of the *Community Rule* was published in Millar Burrows, with the assistance of John C. Trever and William H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and St. Mark's Monastery, Volume II, Fascicle 2: Plates and Transcription of the Manual of Discipline* (New Haven: ASOR, 1951).

– the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa) – provides further legal material.<sup>95</sup> In addition to the two rule scrolls, the *War Scroll* (1QM) preserves many aspects of Jewish law, particularly in the realm of ritual purity.<sup>96</sup> In this early period, only one cave 4 text containing significant legal content would enter the public domain. In 1968, John M. Allegro published the *editio princeps* of the fragmentary 4Q Ordinances (4Q159), which incorporates legal interpretation into its paraphrase of several scriptural passages.<sup>97</sup>

With this small group of texts as the primary body of evidence for Jewish law in the Dead Sea Scrolls, a range of scholars set out to elucidate their legal content and their context within both the sectarian community and the broader setting of ancient Judaism. Most attention focused on potential connections to both rabbinic Judaism and medieval Karaism. Yet, the study of Jewish law in this period was irregular in frequency. When individual studies did appear, they tended to remain isolated in the small scholarly circles and rarely stimulated wider scholarly conversations. Beginning in the 1960s and 1970s, however, the work of Joseph Baumgarten and Lawrence Schiffman began to reverse this trend and offered the first attempt at broader and comprehensive analysis of Jewish law in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

### *Placing the Dead Sea Scrolls in Dialogue with Rabbinic Law and Literature*

Saul Lieberman (1898-1983)

One of the earliest attempts to understand the newly discovered Dead Sea Scrolls in light of later rabbinic literature was undertaken by Saul Lieberman, Professor of Talmud and Dean of the Rabbinical School at the Jewish Theological Seminary.<sup>98</sup> In his 1951 article, Lieberman draws on both the *Damascus Document* and the *Community Rule* to illuminate three puzzling passages in the *Tosefta*.<sup>99</sup> Each of the *Tosefta* passages refers to a set

<sup>95</sup> The *editio princeps* of the *Rule of the Congregation* was published in Dominique Barthélemy and Józef T. Milik, *Qumran Cave I* (DJD I; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 108-18.

<sup>96</sup> The *editio princeps* of the *War Scroll* was published in Eliezer Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes and the Hebrew University, 1955).

<sup>97</sup> John M. Allegro, with the collaboration of Arnold A. Anderson, *Qumran Cave 4.I* (DJD V; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 6-9. A preliminary edition appeared in "An Unpublished Fragment of Essene Halakhah (4Q Ordinances)," *JSS* 6 (1961): 71-73.

<sup>98</sup> On Lieberman, see Elijah J. Schochet and Solomon Spiro, *Saul Lieberman: The Man and His Work* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 2005).

<sup>99</sup> Saul Lieberman, "Light on the Cave Scrolls from Rabbinic Sources," *PAAJR* 20 (1951): 395-404; repr. in Saul Lieberman, *Texts and Studies* (New York: Ktav, 1974), 190-99.

of practices, which are labeled as דרך אחרת (lit. “another way”), rendered by Lieberman as “heterodoxy.” Lieberman appeals to evidence from the Scrolls to suggest that the heterodox practices identified by the *Tosefta* refer to the sectarian community of the Scrolls and related ancient sectarian groups.

Lieberman explores several practices labeled by the rabbis as heterodoxy: (1) the filtering of wine and vinegar, which he interprets as a practice directed as removing miniscule larvae that are permitted to be consumed according to rabbinic *halakhah*; (2) the recitation of a blessing over the sun; (3) the use of the divine name El in blessing, which Lieberman explains as a deliberate attempt to avoid using the Tetragrammaton. In all three cases, Lieberman points to evidence either from the Scrolls or from Josephus’ description of the Essenes that seems to align with the heterodox practices condemned by the rabbis. Although Lieberman is not fully convinced of the Essene identity of the sect, he does appeal to Josephus’ description of the Essenes offering prayers to the sun (*J.W.* 2.128) as part of his broader goal of identifying the practices mentioned in the *Tosefta* as both ancient (i.e., Second Temple period) and sectarian.

Lieberman’s use of the Dead Sea Scrolls and related texts to explain the rabbinic texts never explicitly engages with the obvious chronological difficulties involved in assuming that the early rabbis were aware of sectarian practices from Second Temple times. Indeed, Lieberman’s historical schema not only assumes that knowledge of these practices persisted, but that a group engaging in these practices was still in existence in the second century and was thus the target of rabbinic criticism.<sup>100</sup> As an indirect response to this issue, Lieberman addresses the still-lingering issue of the connection between sectarian law and medieval Karaite *halakhah*. He draws on Paul Kahle’s theory that some of the sectarian scrolls were found in the caves in the eighth century and eventually made their way to Karaites, who incorporated the sectarian teachings into their own thought and practice.<sup>101</sup> In advocating this historical reconstruction, Lieberman argues for the ongoing existence of groups espousing related sectarian practices from the Second Temple period all the way to the Middle Ages.

Lieberman’s dual interests in the connection between rabbinic literature and the Scrolls and the tendency toward extreme piety in ancient Judaism resurfaces in his 1952 article.<sup>102</sup> This article compares sectarian practices found in the *Community Rule* with evidence about the *ḥaburah* as found in

<sup>100</sup> Lieberman, “Light on the Cave Scrolls,” 402.

<sup>101</sup> See Paul Kahle, “The Age of the Scrolls,” *VT* 1 (1951): 38-48.

<sup>102</sup> Saul Lieberman, “The Discipline in the So-Called Dead Sea Manual of Discipline,” *JBL* 71 (1952): 199-206; repr. in Lieberman, *Texts and Studies*, 200-207.

early rabbinic sources.<sup>103</sup> In this regard, Lieberman seeks to redirect analysis of sectarian practices away from the usual comparative analysis of the *Community Rule* and the description of Essene regulations in Josephus. He asserts that the reason for this redirection is the more closely related linguistic setting of the Scrolls (Hebrew) and rabbinic descriptions of the *ḥaburah* (Hebrew/Aramaic) than the Scrolls and the description of the Essenes in Josephus (Greek). Though not stated, Lieberman's analysis makes clear another reason. Like Schechter and Ginzberg before him, Lieberman takes for granted that any identification of the sect must focus on its legal teachings rather than purely theology. While reading the Scrolls with Josephus can illuminate the theology and some regulations, the legal teachings can only be properly understood in dialogue with rabbinic texts. As in his previous article, Lieberman never outlines a methodology for placing the Scrolls and rabbinic texts in dialogue, only remarking that "an examination and analysis of the rabbinic statements on the subject will yield many details which may shed light on the Dead Sea Scrolls and vice versa."<sup>104</sup>

In addition to the many similarities between the sectarian community and the *ḥaburah*, Lieberman does note differences, such as the lack of a formal vow for members of the *ḥaburah* and the seemingly conflicting attitude toward outsiders. On these differences, however, Lieberman very subtly notes that differences exist between the sectarian community and the Essenes. As in his earlier article, Lieberman is never entirely convinced of the Essene hypothesis. If similarities and difference exist for both the Essene hypothesis and the purported connections to the *ḥaburah*, why should the former be regarded as any more plausible than the latter? On this very point, Lieberman offers a cautionary note regarding the reconstruction of early Jewish sectarianism: "the various sects with which Palestine of the first century swarmed might have had much in common although these differed from one another in basic and cardinal principles."<sup>105</sup> In making this assertion, Lieberman essentially discounts the plausibility that the sectarian community of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the *ḥaburah* are identical. But, the same hesitation he exhibits in this regard must also be asserted in any attempts to assign an Essene identity to the sect. Thus, he concludes, "it is therefore precarious to ascribe our documents definitely to any of the known three major Jewish sects."<sup>106</sup>

<sup>103</sup> Lieberman's study is treated in the context of other early discussions of the Scrolls and the *ḥaburah* in Fraade, "Qumran *Yahad*," 438-42.

<sup>104</sup> Lieberman, "Discipline," 199.

<sup>105</sup> Lieberman, "Discipline," 205.

<sup>106</sup> Lieberman, "Discipline," 206. Though see his note (n. 77) here on this statement:

Lieberman's two articles introduce several overlapping concerns. Foremost, he is interested in providing greater clarity to the world of early Jewish sectarianism and its ongoing presence in Jewish history. Lieberman's primary objective is to demonstrate the value of early rabbinic literature in any assessment of the Scrolls. His methodology, though never fully outlined, assumes that later rabbinic texts contain echoes of the world inhabited by the ancient sectarians. As such, Lieberman tacitly asserts, scholarly approaches to the Scrolls have much to gain by incorporating rabbinic texts into a broader comparative frame of analysis.

Jacob Neusner (1932-)

Not long after Lieberman published his analysis of the Scrolls and the *ḥaburah*, Jacob Neusner undertook a similar comparative analysis of the aspects of fellowship in ancient Judaism.<sup>107</sup> While this work focuses primarily on the fellowship of the *ḥaburah*, Neusner's 1959 article "Qumran and Jerusalem: Two Jewish Roads to Utopia" introduces the Dead Sea Scrolls as a portrait of another model for fellowship in ancient Judaism.<sup>108</sup> Unlike Lieberman, Neusner's placement of the *ḥaburah* and the Yahad in dialogue is intended to highlight the differences between the two groups as each pursued a related shared goal. Thus, he describes the *yahad* as striving for "revolutionary Utopianism," while the *ḥaburah* sought "social Utopianism."<sup>109</sup>

As examples of the distinction he draws, Neusner notes that the *ḥaburah* lived their life of extreme piety within the main cities inhabited by other Jews, whereas the *yahad* retreated to solitude in the desert to avoid the perceived contamination of the rest of Jewish society.<sup>110</sup> Neusner also contrasts the competing views on the initiation of new members into the fellowship. The *yahad*, asserts Neusner, maintained overly strict rules for admission. In contrast, Neusner's romantic notion of the *ḥaburah* presents them as

---

"Although, we must admit, their affinity to the regulations of the Essenes can by no means be disregarded."

<sup>107</sup> On Neusner, see William Scott Green, "Jacob Neusner," *EncJud* 15:124-5. Neusner's research on the *ḥaburah* and the *yahad* was initiated while he was a graduate student at Columbia University.

<sup>108</sup> Jacob Neusner, "Qumran and Jerusalem: Two Jewish Roads to Utopia," *JBR* 27 (1959): 284-90. See also "The Fellowship (חבורה) in the Second Jewish Commonwealth," *HTR* 53 (1960): 125-42; *Fellowship in Judaism. The First Century and Today* (London: Valentine, Mitchel, 1963; repr. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2005); "ḤBR and N'MN," *RevQ* 5 (1964): 119-22. Neusner's work is discussed in Fraade, "Qumran *Yahad*," 445-7.

<sup>109</sup> Neusner, "Qumran and Jerusalem," 284.

<sup>110</sup> Neusner, "Qumran and Jerusalem," 285-6.

welcoming “any Jew who undertook to nourish his body in a manner appropriate to the sanctity of the soul.”<sup>111</sup>

Neusner’s portrait of the *yahad* is essentially to provide a contrasting model to the *haburah*. Yet, it provides an important insight into the nature of the *yahad* and the core of its sectarian identity. Like the *haburah*, the *yahad* strove to achieve a heightened degree in its performance of Jewish law. Indeed, for the *yahad*, this was so central to its identity that the early members felt unable to function in Jerusalem surrounded by what they deemed to be improper observance of Jewish law. As in the reconstruction of the sect by Schechter and Ginzberg, Neusner’s portrait makes Jewish law the defining rubric for the origins and worldview of the sectarian community.

Neusner would return to the comparative analysis of the Dead Sea Scrolls and rabbinic literature in a 1973 article examining the law of testimony in CD IX, 17-22.<sup>112</sup> This passage in the *Damascus Document* treats the procedure for when only one person witnesses a crime. Biblical law (Deut 19:15) seems to require the presence of two witnesses in order to prosecute the offender. Neusner’s study focuses on the diverse ways that the *Damascus Document* and rabbinic law formulate a law of testimony in light of the biblical requirement of two witnesses. Within the framework of this comparative study, Neusner is interested in several broader methodological issues. Foremost, he calls attention to Ginzberg’s attempts to align the law of the *Damascus Document* with a presumed normative and monolithic Pharisaic-rabbinic *halakhab*.

In his analysis of the *Damascus Document*, Neusner follows the interpretation presented in an article by Baruch Levine (1930-) that appears in the same volume immediately preceding Neusner’s article.<sup>113</sup> The *Damascus Document* envisions a situation where a person commits the same crime on multiple occasions. If each of the multiple offenses is observed by only a single witness, the multiple offenses may be combined into a single case and thus the criminal act is construed as having been observed by multiple witnesses in accordance with biblical law. In this way, the *Damascus Docu-*

<sup>111</sup> Neusner, “Qumran and Jerusalem,” 287. The characterization given here of Neusner’s description as “romantic” approximates Fraade’s similar assessment of Neusner’s model (“Qumran *Yahad*,” 447).

<sup>112</sup> Jacob Neusner, “By the Testimony of Two Witnesses’ in the Damascus Document IX, 17-22 and in Pharisaic-Rabbinic Law,” *RevQ* 8 (1973): 197-218. See also Neusner’s response to Nachum L. Rabinovitch’s criticism of his treatment of the rabbinic parallels in “Damascus Document IX, 17-22 and Irrelevant Parallels,” *RevQ* 9 (1978): 441-44.

<sup>113</sup> Baruch A. Levine, “Damascus Document IX, 17-22: A New Translation and Comments,” *RevQ* 8 (1973): 195-6. For other articles by Levine see n. 151.

*ment* responds to the seemingly limiting nature of the biblical requirement. Neusner then turns his attention to the rabbinic evidence. He undertakes a nuanced analysis of a range of rabbinic legends that respond to the practical situation of crimes being committed without sufficient evidentiary proof by assuming that God will mete out the appropriate punishment on the offender.

The payoff of this approach can be found in Neusner's methodologically informed analysis of rabbinic texts, which emphasizes historical and literary development for both Pharisaic and rabbinic law. When the *Damascus Document* and the rabbinic traditions are placed in dialogue, the historian of *halakhah* can clearly see two divergent approaches undertaken in the quest to make biblical law a living institution. Neusner's preliminary analysis in this direction surely warrants his conclusion that the law of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pharisaic-rabbinic tradition "has yet to be worked out both in detail and in a critical manner."<sup>114</sup>

### *Revisiting the Karaite Connection*

One of the central questions explored by scholars of the *Damascus Document* in the pre-Qumran phase was the relationship between the sectarian community and medieval Karaism. The identification of the *Damascus Document* as medieval based on affinities with Karaite literature was first voiced by Adolf Büchler in the pre-Qumran phase and reiterated after the discovery of the Qumran Scrolls with polemical zeal by Solomon Zeitlin (1892-1976) and his student Sidney Hoenig (1907-1979).<sup>115</sup> In the context of their repeated insistence on the medieval origins of the Scrolls, Hoenig and to a lesser extent Zeitlin offer analysis of the legal content in the *Damascus Document* and the Qumran Scrolls.<sup>116</sup> In all cases, they attribute affinities

<sup>114</sup> Neusner, "By the Testimony of Two Witnesses," 216.

<sup>115</sup> See Büchler, "Schechter's 'Jewish Sectaries,'" and Schechter, "Dr. Büchler's Review." Zeitlin already made this claim with regard to the *Damascus Document* in 1926 ("Review of R. Travers Herford, *The Pharisees*," *JQR* 16 [1926]: 383-94 [385]) and it is the main point of his introduction to the facsimile edition of the text published in 1952 (see Zeitlin, *The Zadokite Fragments: Facsimile*). Zeitlin's and Hoenig's arguments for the medieval dating of the Scrolls appeared in several articles in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*. See also Solomon Zeitlin, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Modern Scholarship* (Philadelphia: Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1956).

<sup>116</sup> See especially Zeitlin, *The Zadokite Fragments*, 1-32; and more episodic challenges based on *halakhah* in Zeitlin, "The Hebrew Scrolls: A Challenge to Scholarship," *JQR* 41 (1951): 251-75 (259-61); "The Hebrew Scrolls and the Status of Biblical Scholarship," *JQR* 42 (1951): 133-92 (172-3); "The Propaganda of the Hebrew Scrolls and the Falsification of History (continued)," *JQR* 46 (1955): 116-80 (138-9). For Hoenig, see Sidney B. Hoenig,



between Karaite *halakhah* and the law of the Scrolls to the direct Karaite influence on the authors of the sectarian scrolls. Hoenig's identification of the Karaite parallels, as with the many parallels earlier adduced by Büchler and others, has much merit to it. Yet, his insistence that these parallels can only be understood as evidence of the Karaite identity of the *Damascus Document* obfuscates a much more complicated set of questions.

A less polemically charged and far more methodologically rigorous analysis of the Karaite connection was undertaken by Norman Golb (1928-). Golb completed his doctorate at Johns Hopkins University in 1956 with a dissertation entitled "The Cairo Damascus Covenant and Karaite Literature" written under the direction of William F. Albright.<sup>117</sup> In the ensuing years, Golb published a series of articles that explore the connections between the newly discovered Dead Sea Scrolls and medieval Karaite literature.<sup>118</sup> As in the pre-Qumran studies, close analysis of sectarian law and Karaite *halakhah* constitutes a significant portion of Golb's analysis.

Golb frames his first contribution as a response to the question: "are the literary and doctrinal relationships between CDC [*Damascus Document*]

"On the Age of Mature Responsibility in 1QSa," *JQR* 48 (1958): 371-5; "Halakhic Implications of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Tradition* 1 (1958): 64-76; "The Age of Twenty in Rabbinic Tradition and 1QSa," *JQR* 49 (1959): 209-14; "Qumran Rules of Impurities," *RevQ* 6 (1969): 559-67; "An Interdict against Socializing on the Sabbath," *JQR* 62 (1971): 77-83.

<sup>117</sup> After the completion of his doctorate, Golb would serve as a Warbury Fellow at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem (1955-1957), and as a visiting professor at the University of Wisconsin (1957-1958), before taking a position as Professor of Medieval Jewish Studies at Hebrew Union College (1958-1963). From 1963, he has been a member of the faculty of the University of Chicago (since 1988, as Ludwig Rosenberger Professor of Jewish History and Civilization). On Golb and his early work on the Dead Sea Scrolls, see Jason Kalman, "Optimistic, Even with the Negatives: The Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion and the Dead Sea Scrolls 1948-1993," *AJAJ* 61 (2009): 1-114 (43-46).

<sup>118</sup> See Norman Golb, "Literary and Doctrinal Aspects of the Damascus Covenant in the Light of Karaite Literature," *JQR* 47 (1957): 354-74; "The Dietary Laws of the Damascus Covenant in Relation to those of the Karaites," *JJS* 8 (1957): 51-69; "Who were the Magāriya," *JAOS* 80 (1960): 347-59; "The Qumran Covenanters and the Later Jewish Sects," *JR* 41 (1961): 38-50. In this first article, Golb refers to a forthcoming work comparing the Sabbath laws of the *Damascus Document* and Karaite literature, though no such work was ever published ("Literary and Doctrinal Aspects," 364 n. 51). He identifies the 1961 article as a distillation of content from a forthcoming book entitled *Qumran Sectarians and the Karaites: Studies in Their Relationship*, which likewise never appeared ("Qumran Covenanters," 50 n. 18). Kalman, "Optimistic, Even with the Negatives," 100 n. 288, provides a complete list of the conference papers on the Scrolls presented by Golb between 1958 and 1960. Golb's studies appeared at roughly the same time as the similar attention to the Karaite connection undertaken by Naphtali Wieder (1905-2001). See especially *The Judaean Scrolls and Karaism* (London: East and West Library, 1962). Golb, "The Qumran Covenanters," 49 n. 2 refers to Wieder's earlier articles, but otherwise does not interact with his work. In recent years, the Israeli scholar Yoram Erder has treated this issue in detail. See the chapter on Israeli research in this volume.



and the Dead Sea Literature closer or more distant than those between CDC and Karaite literature?"<sup>119</sup> Golb is not merely addressing the issues of connections, but responding to the still lingering questions regarding the antiquity of the *Damascus Document*. Golb presents a close analysis of the literary style and legal and doctrinal content of the *Damascus Document* in dialogue with an epistle written by the tenth century Karaite Sahl b. Maṣṣliḥ. Golb identifies this document as representative of a Karaite epistolary genre, "which has as its purposes the winning over of new members and the refutation of opposing views."<sup>120</sup> Golb concludes his analysis by reiterating that the many connections between the Scrolls and Karaite literature demonstrate the antiquity of Karaite ideas and practices. In making this claim, Golb turns on its head the standard use of the Karaite connection: rather than proving the medieval nature of the *Damascus Document*, the similarities force scholars to rethink the early period of Karaism.<sup>121</sup>

Golb's treatment of the legal content in the first article receives more focused analysis in his second contribution on dietary laws in the *Damascus Document* and Karaite literature, also published in 1957. Golb focuses on the dietary laws enumerated in CD XII, 11-15, which according to Golb: (1) prohibits the consumption of animal flesh, with specific attention to "legs of bees" and "living things that creep in the water"; (2) requires the draining of blood in order to consume permitted fish; and (3) requires locusts to be killed using a modified form of ritual slaughter. In nearly all cases, the laws of the *Damascus Document* agree with Karaite practice against rabbinic *halakhah*. Golb calls attention to a wide range of Karaites who are described as prohibiting the consumption of animal flesh.<sup>122</sup> So too, he adduces evidence from Karaite writings for some form of ritual slaughter of fish and locusts. On the specific issue of "living things that creep in the water," Golb notes the Karaites were critical of the rabbis for only prohibiting "creeping things" that live on the land, a polemical tone similarly apparent in the *Damascus Document*. The one exception he notes is the polemical restriction on bee legs, which he suggests refers to bee-particles found in honey. The rabbis permit the consumption of bee-particles in honey and no Karaites voice opposition to this ruling, though

---

<sup>119</sup> Golb, "Literary and Doctrinal Aspects," 354.

<sup>120</sup> Golb, "Literary and Doctrinal Aspects," 355.

<sup>121</sup> Golb, "Literary and Doctrinal Aspects," 374.

<sup>122</sup> Golb, "Dietary Laws," 55-56. He includes in an appendix the relevant passages from Qirqisānī that describe many of these Karaites.

Golb notes that some Karaites seem to have been meticulous in keeping bee-particles out of honey.<sup>123</sup>

In his conclusions, Golb nuances the conclusions reached in his earlier article. The close similarities between the dietary laws in the *Damascus Document* and among the Karaites lend themselves to two possible conclusions. Either the origins of Karaism must be located earlier than assumed (as suggested in the earlier article) or the Karaites drew inspiration from earlier sources such as the *Damascus Document*. In his 1961 article, Golb returns to this question and makes a number of significant observations regarding the legal connections. First, he notes that, upon closer examination, the laws and doctrines of the Dead Sea Scrolls only appear “sporadically” in Karaite writings and that it is therefore “impossible to detect in the early Karaite codes profound literary influence.”<sup>124</sup> Golb therefore posits that some sectarian documents were available to Karaite Jews living in Palestine in the ninth and tenth centuries. The more haphazard nature of this relationship thus explains both the important connections and their limited nature.

For Golb, as with Schechter and Ginzberg previously, legal material holds the key to any historical reconstruction. Golb observes that legal material from the Dead Sea Scrolls is parallel to the earliest Karaite literature in the eighth century, thereby suggesting to Golb a relationship “of a profounder sort ... a historical relationship.”<sup>125</sup> Golb therefore offers a new reconstruction of the historical development of Jewish sectarianism. The Essenes (the purported authors of the sectarian texts) were not completely annihilated in the first century as generally thought. Rather, they lived on after their amalgamation with other early Jewish sects, though many of their original beliefs and practices persisted.<sup>126</sup> The remnants of the ancient Essenes, argues Golb, migrated eastward beginning in the second century CE on account of the deteriorating conditions in Palestine. As these groups integrated into their new surroundings in the Sassanian empire, their peculiar doctrines and practices became entrenched. Eventually, their practices and beliefs became known to the Karaites in the region and over time exerted considerable influence on Karaite practice.<sup>127</sup> This historical model, asserts Golb, clarifies how ancient sectarian legal views could serve as a source for medieval Karaite *halakhah*.

---

<sup>123</sup> Golb, “Dietary Laws,” 57.

<sup>124</sup> Golb, “Qumran Covenants,” 44.

<sup>125</sup> Golb, “Qumran Covenants,” 44.

<sup>126</sup> Golb, “Qumran Covenants,” 45-47.

<sup>127</sup> Golb, “Qumran Covenants,” 47-49.

*Toward a Comprehensive Understanding of Jewish Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls*

In all the treatments examined thus far, the legal elements of the Scrolls figure significantly. Yet, the contributions of individual scholars as well as the larger body of scholarship in the aggregate represents only a piecemeal approach to a much wider set of questions. No attempt is made by any of these scholars to arrive at a comprehensive understanding of Jewish law in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Such an approach requires methodological refinement with regard to how the legal elements in the Scrolls should be studied and how best to draw upon relevant comparative rabbinic and Karaite literature. Two American scholars working in this early period embarked upon research programs directly aimed at addressing this still pressing set of questions in Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship.

Joseph M. Baumgarten (1928-2008)

Joseph Baumgarten, like Schechter and Ginzberg before him, brought to his study of the Dead Sea Scrolls the world of traditional Talmudic scholarship and critical academic training.<sup>128</sup> Ordained as an Orthodox rabbi in 1950, Baumgarten went on to pursue a doctorate at Johns Hopkins University under the direction of Albright. He completed his doctorate in 1954 with a dissertation entitled “The Covenant Sect and the Essenes.” In 1955, Baumgarten assumed a position as Professor of Post-Biblical and Rabbinic Literature at Baltimore Hebrew College and shortly thereafter also began a long tenure as a congregational rabbi at Bnai Jacob Congregation in Baltimore. Baumgarten’s interest in the Dead Sea Scrolls was wide-ranging. The study of Jewish law in the Scrolls, however, would come to dominate Baumgarten’s scholarly career and represent his signature contribution to the field.

Over the course of nearly twenty-five years beginning in 1953, Baumgarten published a wide range of scholarly articles on law in the Scrolls. In 1977, he pulled together his most significant studies on Jewish law into a single volume.<sup>129</sup> Although these articles were all written independently

<sup>128</sup> For biographical sketches of Baumgarten, see Daniel R. Schwartz, “Joseph M. Baumgarten: An Appreciation,” in Florentino García Martínez, Moshe Bernstein, and John Kampen, eds., *Legal Texts and Legal Issues, Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995, Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten* (STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), xv-xviii; Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Joseph M. Baumgarten, 1928-2008,” *SBL Forum*, n.p. [cited Dec 2008] <http://sbl-site.org/Article.aspx?ArticleID=794>. A full bibliography prepared by Florentino García Martínez of Baumgarten’s writings up to 1997 can be found in the Festschrift published in his honor (xix-xxv).

<sup>129</sup> Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Studies in Qumran Law* (SJLA 24; Leiden: Brill, 1977).

of one another, their combination in a single volume illustrates well the significance of Baumgarten's body of work during this time period and the foundation he laid for the future study of law in the Scrolls. In the volume, Baumgarten groups his thirteen articles on Jewish law under the following headings: (1) Rabbinic Methodology and Qumran;<sup>130</sup> (2) Purity and the Temple;<sup>131</sup> (3) The Calendar;<sup>132</sup> (4) Jurisprudence.<sup>133</sup> These section headings reflect the degree to which Baumgarten's work up to this point actually constituted the methodologically rigorous approach to Jewish law that had been lacking for three decades of research on the Scrolls.

Baumgarten introduces his collected essays as restarting the long-dormant scholarly approach undertaken by Ginzberg. In light of the Qumran Scrolls now available for study, Baumgarten asserts: "it is more apparent than ever that without careful evaluation against the norms of halakha as distilled in rabbinic sources, the religious regimen which governed the Essene community will never be fully comprehensible."<sup>134</sup> While such a statement was clearly assumed by Schechter and Ginzberg in their analysis of the *Damascus Document*, this approach had all but been abandoned in general approaches to the Qumran Scrolls. The contributions in the volume illustrate well Baumgarten's complete control of the relevant Second Temple period and rabbinic sources in dialogue with the available Qumran texts necessary to achieve his stated goals.

Baumgarten's vision for how this undertaking should be done is briefly outlined in the first article in the volume, his 1958 review of Chaim Ra-

---

<sup>130</sup> Joseph M. Baumgarten, "Qumran Studies," in *Studies in Qumran Law*, 3-12 (1958); "The Unwritten Law in the Pre-Rabbinic Period," in *Studies in Qumran Law*, 13-35 (1972).

<sup>131</sup> Joseph M. Baumgarten, "Sacrifice and Worship among the Jewish Sectarians of the Dead Sea (Qumran) Scrolls," in *Studies in Qumran Law*, 39-56 (1953); "The Essenes and the Temple – A Reappraisal," in *Studies in Qumran Law*, 57-74 (1977 – new article); "The Exclusion of *Netinim* and Proselytes in 4Q Florilegium," in *Studies in Qumran Law*, 75-87 (1972); "The Essene Avoidance of Oil and the Law and Purity," in *Studies in Qumran Law*, 88-99 (1967).

<sup>132</sup> Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Calendar of the Book of Jubilees and the Bible," in *Studies in Qumran Law*, 101-14 (1962); "The Counting of the Sabbath in Ancient Sources," in *Studies in Qumran Law*, 115-25 (1966); "The Beginning of the Day in the Calendar of Jubilees," in *Studies in Qumran Law*, 124-50 (1958); "4Q Halakah<sup>a</sup> 5, the Law of *Ḥdash*, and the Pentecontad Calendar," in *Studies in Qumran Law*, 131-42 (1976).

<sup>133</sup> Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Duodecimal Courts of Qumran, the *Apocalypse*, and the Sanhedrin," *Studies in Qumran Law*, 145-71 (1976); "Does *TLH* in the Temple Scroll Refer to Crucifixion?" *Studies in Qumran Law*, 174-82 (1972); "On the Testimony of Women in 1QSa," in *Studies in Qumran Law*, 183-6 (1957). A fourteenth article not directly related to law is also included: "Some Notes on the Ben Sira Scroll from Masada," in *Studies in Qumran Law*, 187-92 (1968).

<sup>134</sup> Baumgarten, "Preface," *Studies in Qumran Law*, ix.

bin's book *Qumran Studies*.<sup>135</sup> In the course of his discussion of Rabin's reliance on Ginzberg, Baumgarten assesses the lasting significance of Ginzberg's work and how best to go about rethinking the comparison with rabbinic texts following the discovery of the Qumran Scrolls. Baumgarten repeats the widely accepted view that Ginzberg's identification of the *Damascus Document* as Pharisaic can no longer be sustained. Renewed attention to the *Damascus Document* and the evidence of the Qumran Scrolls, argues Baumgarten, supports an Essene provenance for the Scrolls. Yet, the many *correct* parallels that Ginzberg adduces cannot be ignored. They demonstrate "the wide extent of the legal traditions and terminology which the Scrolls do have in common with Pharisaic halakah."<sup>136</sup> Ginzberg's identification of the sect as "hyper-Pharisees," asserts Baumgarten, is unnecessary. The evidence adduced by Ginzberg merely demonstrates the existence of another group in the Second Temple period that advocated a related, but far more stringent, approach to Jewish law. The similarities *and* the differences are critical to outlining the relationship between the Essenes and the Pharisees, and by implication the broader contours of Jewish law both in the Scrolls and in the Second Temple period.

Baumgarten's second article on methodology attempts to arrive at a richer understanding of the legal system of the sectarian scrolls in dialogue with Second Temple period legal literature and later rabbinic *halakhah*.<sup>137</sup> In particular, he is interested in the ways in which law is transmitted in the Second Temple period and how this inquiry informs the rabbinic strictures against writing down *halakhah*. Thus, Baumgarten is interested not just in the *content* of ancient Jewish law, but also in the method of its *transmission*. He surveys the relevant evidence from Second Temple and rabbinic sources that suggest that the Pharisees transmitted law orally while other groups in the Second Temple period did commit legal teachings to writing.

Baumgarten's analysis of the contribution of the Qumran texts represents the first attempt to outline the principles of law found in the sectarian community. Thus, he observes that the sectarian community, in contrast to the later rabbis, appealed to ongoing revelation as the source for legal development.<sup>138</sup> Moreover, Baumgarten notes the repeated use of the term *דרש* ("to seek") in the context of the formulation of law. He argues that this verbal root should not be understood in its later rabbinic sense to imply exegetical engagement with Scripture, but rather as a continuation of biblical and

<sup>135</sup> Chaim Rabin, *Qumran Studies* (SJ 2; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957).

<sup>136</sup> Baumgarten, "Qumran Studies," 11.

<sup>137</sup> Baumgarten, "The Unwritten Law," 13-35.

<sup>138</sup> "The Unwritten Law," 29-31.

Second Temple uses where it refers to seeking God.<sup>139</sup> This is consistent with Baumgarten's insistence that sectarian law relies on revelation rather than exegesis. Baumgarten's approach in this article is repeated in the rest of the volume where he turns his attention to the substance of Jewish law in the Scrolls. In all cases, his close analysis of the sectarian scrolls is informed by his vast knowledge of relevant Second Temple and rabbinic sources. As such, the full history of *halakhah* that eluded Geiger and other early scholars of Jewish law (including Schechter and Ginzberg) finally comes into focus in Baumgarten's capable hands.

Lawrence H. Schiffman (1948-)

Baumgarten's early efforts to outline the basic principles and substance of Jewish law in the Scrolls laid the foundation for the systematic analysis of Jewish law undertaken by Lawrence Schiffman.<sup>140</sup> Schiffman completed a doctorate at Brandeis University in 1974 under the direction of the biblical scholar Nahum Sarna with a dissertation entitled "The Halakhah at Qumran." In 1972, Schiffman joined the faculty of New York University, where he would exert considerable influence on Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship through his direction of many dissertations in both Dead Sea Scrolls and rabbinics. Like his predecessors, Schiffman draws upon his training in rabbinics to understand aspects of law in the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>141</sup>

In 1975, Schiffman published a slightly revised version of his dissertation as a monograph with the same name.<sup>142</sup> Nearly thirty years after the discovery of the first Dead Sea Scrolls and following three decades of non-stop scholarship on nearly every aspect of the Qumran corpus, this work represents the first monograph-length study of law in the Scrolls. Schiffman addresses a range of questions first encountered in the work of Schechter and Ginzberg, and provisionally undertaken in Baumgarten's collected studies. Schiffman frames his work as a contribution to the quest for the identity of the sect.<sup>143</sup> In the years following the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls,

<sup>139</sup> "The Unwritten Law," 31-33.

<sup>140</sup> See Drew Silver, "Lawrence H. Schiffman," *EncJud* 18:131-2.

<sup>141</sup> Unlike Schechter, Ginzberg, and Baumgarten, Schiffman's Talmudic training did not occur in traditional *yeshivot*. Schiffman's Talmudic studies were central to his graduate studies at Brandeis and thus he represents a new generation of scholars who could acquire a thorough training in rabbinics at a secular university.

<sup>142</sup> Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (SJLA 16; Leiden: Brill, 1975). Two chapters from the dissertation on "Biblical *Midrash Halakhah* at Qumran" and "Rabbinic Oral Law and Transmission and Qumran" do not appear in the monograph. These two chapters represent part of Schiffman's attempt to locate exegetical traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls in a broader historical framework of the development of *halakhah*.

<sup>143</sup> Schiffman, *Halakhah at Qumran*, 1-2.

the use of legal elements in the Scrolls to identify the sectarian community was only rarely encountered.

Schiffman's second goal is to reconstruct the underlying principles of the sectarian system of law. More specifically, it is to ascertain the sources of law in the Dead Sea Scrolls. By what methods did the sectarian community supplement biblical law? This question seeks to understand both the sect's conceptual model of authority for its innovations and the exegetical framework of its engagement with Scripture. In introducing these issues, Schiffman positions his work as also contributing to the broader history of *halakhah*. As he notes, rabbinic Judaism traces its legal innovations to an Oral Torah presumed to be transmitted in an unbroken chain from Moses to the rabbis. Thus, he poses the question "did the sect have an Oral law" and if not, what alternative system was in place?<sup>144</sup>

Schiffman's work affirms that much profit can be gained by viewing law in the Dead Sea Scrolls not merely within the broader framework of the chronologically connected legal texts of Second Temple Judaism, but also against the comparative lens of later rabbinic literature and relevant Samaritan, Karaite, and Falasha legal texts. Again, this approach shares much with the pre-Qumran methodology of Schechter and Ginzberg. The most significant difference in Schiffman's comparative approach is his control of the chronological issues. Schiffman's use of the comparative sources is not in order to locate the identity of the sect among the rabbis or Karaites. Rather, he assumes that the Scrolls are part of a larger history of Jewish law and thus the often unclear nature of the legal material cannot be approached in isolation. For Schiffman, "the comparative method is really the only way in which the complex legal texts from Qumran can be unraveled."<sup>145</sup> Moreover, as in Baumgarten's work, Schiffman seeks to place the evidence of the Scrolls along a broader trajectory of the history of *halakhah*. Thus, the Dead Sea Scrolls and rabbinic literature are exegetically and historically mutually illuminating.

In his quest to understand the legal system of the sectarian scrolls, Schiffman undertakes a detailed analysis of "halakhic terminology."<sup>146</sup> Three particular parts of this discussion are critical to the model he presents. First, he focuses on the contrast created in several sectarian texts (especially 1QS V, 7-12) between the "revealed" (נגלה) and "hidden" (נסתר) law. With the ability to explore these terms in several different texts, he argues that this

<sup>144</sup> Schiffman, *Halakhah at Qumran*, 2.

<sup>145</sup> Schiffman, *Halakhah at Qumran*, 13-14.

<sup>146</sup> Schiffman, *Halakhah at Qumran*, 23-32.



encapsulates the sectarian view regarding the origins of law. While a body of law is “revealed” to all Israel in the Torah, the “hidden” laws are only disclosed to special individuals and communities over the course of time. Most significantly, the sect sees itself as the present beneficiary of this “progressive revelation.” While the sect therefore authorized its legal system through present-time revelation, this was undertaken in conjunction with exegetical engagement with Scripture.<sup>147</sup> Among the many types of exegesis Schiffman detects in the Scrolls are the close reading of a scriptural text (פרוש) and the reading of one scriptural text in light of another (דרש). Following the inspired exegetical engagement with Scripture, sectarian law was collected into rule books known as *serakhim*. Thus, in contrast to the Oral Torah of the rabbis, the sect derived its law from a system of inspired exegesis of Scripture.

With this new understanding of the principles of sectarian law and exegesis, Schiffman undertakes a comprehensive analysis of the unit of Sabbath laws in the *Damascus Document*. One can see the ghosts of the half-century of pre-Qumran research on the *Damascus Document* throughout the pages of Schiffman’s analysis, which essentially amounts to a philological and comparative literary commentary on the text. Unlike Schechter, Ginzberg, Büchler, and others, Schiffman does not approach the text with preconceived notions about the identity of its authors. More significantly, Schiffman is able to integrate into his analysis a wealth of new material from the Qumran Scrolls.

In his conclusion, Schiffman comes full circle to where he started: what can the law tell us about the identity of the sect? Unlike his predecessors and contemporaries who sought to make a positive identification of the *Damascus Document* and Qumran Scrolls with *the Pharisees*, or *the Essenes*, or *the Karaites*, Schiffman notes that the *halakhah* demands a more nuanced approach. The data does not match perfectly with our knowledge of any of these groups, though certain groups such as the Pharisees emerge as less likely candidates. Ultimately, Schiffman’s approach, like Lieberman in his 1952 article, is to remain agnostic about the identity and to challenge the field to reserve judgment in light of the still conflicting nature of *all* the evidence.

---

<sup>147</sup> In this way, Schiffman’s observations differ from Baumgarten’s similar identification of the revealed nature of sectarian law.



*1977-1994 – The Emergence of Jewish Law as a Field of Dead Sea Scrolls  
Scholarship*

For two reasons, 1977 represents a turning point in the study of law in the Dead Sea Scrolls. That year marks the appearance of Baumgarten's collected essays on the heels of Schiffman's major monograph two years earlier. The cumulative effect of Baumgarten's and Schiffman's efforts created the very field of Jewish law in the Dead Sea Scrolls, which they would both sustain for many years with a constant flow of publications. At the same time, the end of 1977 witnessed the publication by Yigael Yadin of his three-volume edition of the *Temple Scroll*.<sup>148</sup> Yadin had published material from the *Temple Scroll* in the decade since its discovery, and both Baumgarten and Schiffman early on interacted with this work.<sup>149</sup> The full *editio princeps* of the text, however, was a major boon both to general Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship and the particular study of Jewish law. Not only did scholars have access to the full text, Yadin's extensive commentary on the text squarely positioned the text as a *legal* text and his work laid the foundation for further inquiry into its legal elements. This period also witnessed the publication of several texts with legal significance by Maurice Baillet in *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* (DJD) VII (1982), and the first public introduction of 4QMiqṣat Ma'āse Ha-Torah (4QMMT) (1984).<sup>150</sup> The bulk of research on Jewish law throughout the 1980s – both in the United States and elsewhere – focused on integrating the *Temple Scroll* and related new texts into broader understandings of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Jewish law.

---

<sup>148</sup> Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (Hebrew).

<sup>149</sup> See, e.g., Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Essene Avoidance of Oil and the Laws of Purity"; "Does *TLH* in the Temple Scroll Refer to Crucifixion?" (both appear in *Studies in Qumran Law*); Schiffman, *Halakhah at Qumran*, 8-9.

<sup>150</sup> The most significant texts appearing in DJD VII are 4QRitual de mariage (4Q502); 4QRitual de purification (4Q512); 4QOrdonnances<sup>b-c</sup> (4Q513-4Q514). See Maurice Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482-4Q520)* (DJD VII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982). On 4QMMT, see Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, "An Unpublished Halakic Letter from Qumran," in Judith Amitai, ed., *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology: Jerusalem, April 1984* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1984), 400-407; and an article by the same name in the *Israel Museum Journal* 4 (1985): 9-12. Several references to the text and brief excerpts appear in earlier publications by Milik under the title 4QMishnique.

### *Integrating the Temple Scroll*

Yadin's presentation of the text was immediately subject to critical responses by Levine and Schiffman.<sup>151</sup> Though they emphasized different aspects of the text, both Levine and Schiffman argued against Yadin's identification of the *Temple Scroll* as stemming from the community associated with the primary sectarian scrolls (e.g., the *Community Rule*, the *Damascus Document*). Levine shows that the *Temple Scroll* in several respects is distinct enough from the Qumran Scrolls to warrant its identification outside of the community that authored the *Community Rule* and the *Damascus Document*. At the same, both Schiffman and Levine highlight the *sectarian* nature of the text in a more general sense. Thus, the law of the *Temple Scroll* is viewed as representative of broader trends in Second Temple Judaism.<sup>152</sup>

### Jacob Milgrom (1923-2010)

Jacob Milgrom represents a significant contributor to the ongoing interpretation of the *Temple Scroll*. Milgrom and Levine are representative of an emerging trend, whereby the study of law in the Dead Sea Scrolls begins to attract the attention of scholars whose primary interests are in the field of biblical studies. Both Milgrom and Levine had significant training in rabbinics and are able to draw upon this knowledge to understand the *Temple Scroll* both as an expansion of biblical law and in the broader framework of the history of Jewish law.<sup>153</sup> Milgrom's many early studies on the *Tem-*

<sup>151</sup> Baruch A. Levine, "The Temple Scroll: Aspects of Its Historical Provenance and Literary Character," *BASOR* 232 (1978): 5-23; Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Temple Scroll in Literary and Philological Perspective," in William S. Green, ed., *Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Volume II* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1980), 143-58. See also Schiffman's review of Yadin's English edition in *BA* 48 (1985): 122-6, where he discusses his own views and reviews some early responses to Yadin's Hebrew *editio princeps*. On Levine's research on the *Temple Scroll*, see also "Preliminary Reflections on the Temple Scroll," in Jacob Neusner, ed., *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Holy Things: Part Six: The Mishnaic System of Sacrifice and Sanctuary* (SJLA 30; Leiden: Brill, 1980), 17-20; "A Further Look at the Mo'adim of the Temple Scroll," in Lawrence H. Schiffman, ed., *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (JSPSup 8; JSOT/ASOR Monographs 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 53-66.

<sup>152</sup> This view should be contrasted with another early American contribution to integrating the *Temple Scroll*: Ben Zion Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1982). Wacholder (1924-2011) agrees with Yadin in the Qumran sectarian provenance, but suggests that the *Temple Scroll* was regarded as a messianic Torah written by the Teacher of Righteousness in order to replace the present Torah in the eschatological age.

<sup>153</sup> Levine received extensive Talmudic training as a young man at the Telshe Yeshivah (Cleveland, Ohio) and pursued further Talmudic studies with Lieberman at the Jewish Theological Seminary, where he also received rabbinic ordination (see Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Baruch A. Levine: A Brief Biography," in Robert Chazan, William H. Hallo, and Lawrence

*ple Scroll* are focused on illuminating the laws of the *Temple Scroll* in the context of their interpretation and expansion of biblical law. His publications on the *Temple Scroll* are wide ranging, though he displays a particular interest in the *Temple Scroll*'s laws of purity.<sup>154</sup>

Alongside his interest in explicating the meaning of the laws in the *Temple Scroll* and their relationship to the biblical base-text, Milgrom attempts to ascertain the exegetical principles that underlay the laws in the *Temple Scroll*. In this respect, Milgrom's work represents an expansion of many of the overarching questions introduced by Schiffman in *The Halakhah at Qumran*: what role do scriptural texts play in the formulation of law in the Dead Sea Scrolls and what hermeneutic principles and techniques are operating in this process? The introduction of the *Temple Scroll* into this set of questions provides the first half of this inquiry with a clear-cut answer. The *Temple Scroll*'s laws are so heavily indebted to scriptural material that a large portion of the text constitutes a rewriting of the Deuteronomic law code. Thus, Milgrom's analysis pushes further in seeking to uncover the nature of the exegetical relationship between the *Temple Scroll* and its target scriptural texts.

In Milgrom's many articles treating the subject, he detects four primary exegetical techniques: conflation, harmonization, homogenization, and ap-

---

H. Schiffman, eds., *Ki Baruch Hu: Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Judaic Studies in Honor of Baruch A. Levine* [Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1999], ix-xiii). Milgrom similarly received rabbinic ordination from the Jewish Theological Seminary (see Drew Silver, "Jacob Milgrom," *EncJud* 14:233). While both incorporate their knowledge of rabbinics into their scholarly work, their disciplinary setting is clearly within biblical studies.

<sup>154</sup> Jacob Milgrom, "Appendix: The Shoulder for the Levites," in Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1:169-76; "Studies in the Temple Scroll," *JBL* 97 (1978): 501-23; "The Temple Scroll," *BA* 41 (1978): 105-20; "'Sabbath' and 'Temple City' in the Temple Scroll," *BASOR* 232 (1978): 25-27; "Further Studies in the Temple Scroll," *JQR* 71 (1980): 1-17, 89-106; "New Temple Festivals in the Temple Scroll," in Truman G. Madsen, ed., *The Temple in Antiquity: Ancient Records and Modern Perspectives* (Provo: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 1984), 125-33; "The Qumran Cult: Its Exegetical Principles," in George J. Brooke, ed., *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll, Manchester, December, 1987* (JSPSup 7; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 165-80; "The Scriptural Foundations and Deviations in the Laws of Purity of the Temple Scroll," in Schiffman, *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 83-100; "Deviations from Scripture in the Purity Laws of the Temple Scroll," in Shemaryahu Talmon, ed., *Jewish Civilization in the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (JSPSup 10; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 159-67; "First Day Ablutions in Qumran," in Treballe Barrera and Vegas Montaner, *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 2:561-70; "The Concept of Impurity in Jubilees and the Temple Scroll," *RevQ* 16 (1993): 277-84; "On the Purification Offering in the Temple Scroll," *RevQ* 16 (1993): 99-101; "Qumran's Biblical Hermeneutics: The Case of the Wood Offering," *RevQ* 16 (1993-1994): 449-56; "The City of the Temple," *JQR* 85 (1994): 125-8.

plication.<sup>155</sup> In the case of “conflation,” the legal text unites several related scriptural passages that appear separately in the scriptural text. The related technique of “harmonization” involves the similar merging of multiple scriptural passages that are in conflict with one another. “Homogenization” refers to the extension of a law regarding objects, animals, or persons to all representatives of that species. “Application” indicates the updating of biblical law that seems to be no longer applicable. Milgrom focuses considerable attention on “homogenization” and suggests that this exegetical technique is identical to the later rabbinic *binyan ab*, whereby a particular scriptural passage is construed as a general principle and is therefore extended to all similar cases.

### Joseph M. Baumgarten

The *Temple Scroll* was also integrated into Baumgarten’s ongoing work on Jewish law.<sup>156</sup> His 1980 article<sup>157</sup> represents a landmark study on how the laws in the *Temple Scroll* and related texts can be exploited to reconstruct the legal positions of groups in the Second Temple period, particularly the Pharisees and the Sadducees. Baumgarten explores four sets of examples where the purity laws of the *Temple Scroll* and related texts seem to align with positions that later rabbinic literature ascribes to the Sadducees against the view of the Pharisees: (1) the issue of *tebul yom* – whether an individual who has immersed during the day must also wait until nightfall to be considered fully pure; (2) the status of animal bones – whether animal bones are associated with the same degree of uncleanness as carrion; (3) the law of streams – whether a liquid stream poured from a pure vessel into an impure

<sup>155</sup> These four categories along with a small number of examples are outlined in Milgrom, “Qumran’s Biblical Hermeneutics,” 449-50. For earlier studies exploring these issues, see “The Qumran Cult: Its Exegetical Principles”; “The Scriptural Foundations and Deviations”; “Deviations from Scripture.”

<sup>156</sup> Two of Baumgarten’s early studies on the *Temple Scroll* appear in his *Studies in Qumran Law*. In addition to the specific articles surveyed here, see his two reviews of Yadin’s edition in *JBL* 97 (1978): 584-9; and *BASOR* 264 (1986): 91-92; as well as further publications related to the *Temple Scroll*: “Hanging and Treason in Qumran and Roman Law,” *ErIsr* 16 (1982): 7-16; “Exclusions from the Temple: Proselytes and Agrippa I.,” *JJS* 33 (1982): 215-25; “On the Non-Literal Use of *Ma’aser/Dekate*,” *JBL* 103 (1984): 245-51; “The First and Second Tithes in the Temple Scroll,” in Ann Kort and Scott Morschauer, eds., *Biblical and Related Studies Presented to Samuel Iwry* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1985), 5-15; “The Laws of ‘Orlah’ and First Fruits in the Light of Jubilees, the Qumran Writings, and Targum Ps. Jonathan,” *JJS* 38 (1987): 195-202; “The Calendars of the Book of Jubilees and the Temple Scroll,” *VT* 37 (1987): 71-78.

<sup>157</sup> Joseph M. Baumgarten, “The Pharisaic-Sadducean Controversies about Purity and the Qumran Texts,” *JJS* 31 (1980): 157-70. A similar attempt in this direction can be found in Manfred R. Lehmann, “The Temple Scroll as a Source of Sectarian Halakhah,” *RevQ* 9 (1977-1978): 579-87.

vessel has the effect of rendering the source vessel impure; and (4) the need for ritual immersion of the menorah. In the first two cases, the laws of the *Temple Scroll* all agree with the stringent approach assigned by the rabbis to the Sadducees. In the third case, Baumgarten appeals to a brief passage from 4QMMT published by Milik in DJD III (now 4QMMT B 55-58), in which the strict sectarian view agrees with the approach assigned to the Sadducees in rabbinic sources and the opposing lenient view is aligned with the view associated with the Pharisees. In the fourth case, it is actually the Pharisees who are stricter in their expectation that the menorah be ritually immersed while the Sadducees insist that it is not obligatory. Baumgarten notes that this particular case is not found in the Scrolls but offers several plausible explanations for how the lenient view of the Sadducees would actually align with the sectarian position.<sup>158</sup>

Baumgarten further observes how the relevant rabbinic texts frame these disputes in highly polemical terms. In subsequent publications, Baumgarten would further demonstrate the importance of early rabbinic debates for understanding the material found in the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>159</sup> In demonstrating the plausible antiquity of many disputes in tannaitic texts through the evidence of the Scrolls, Baumgarten (echoing Lieberman) asserts that they reflect a stage in the history of halakhic debate that is continued in early rabbinic Judaism, thus invalidating Neusner's assertions.<sup>160</sup>

### Lawrence H. Schiffman

Schiffman undoubtedly represents the most prolific contributor to the study of the *Temple Scroll*.<sup>161</sup> In thirty-three articles appearing in his collected essays, Schiffman concentrates broadly on illuminating the origins of the

---

<sup>158</sup> He returns to this issue in a later article: "Immunity to Impurity and the Menorah," *JSIJ* 5 (2006): 141-5.

<sup>159</sup> Contra Jacob Neusner, *The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70* (3 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1971).

<sup>160</sup> For Baumgarten's studies that further explore these issues, see "Halakhic Polemics in New Fragments from Qumran Cave 4," in Amitai, *Biblical Archaeology Today*, 390-99; "Qumran and the Halakhah in the Aramaic Targumim," *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies: Panels Sessions, Bible Studies and Ancient Near East* (1985): 45-60; "Recent Qumran Discoveries and Halakhah in the Hellenistic-Roman Period," in Talmon, *Jewish Civilization*, 147-58.

<sup>161</sup> Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll* (ed. Florentino García Martínez; STDJ 75; Leiden: Brill, 2008). The articles in this volume range from 1985 to 2002. Schiffman is also completing a commentary on the *Temple Scroll* that will appear in the Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project edited by James H. Charlesworth (6 vols. to date; Louisville: Westminster John Knox; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994-).

*Temple Scroll*,<sup>162</sup> its relationship to the sectarian community<sup>163</sup> and to other Second Temple Jewish writings,<sup>164</sup> and its description of the future temple.<sup>165</sup> Schiffman focuses considerable energy toward elucidating the many laws of the text,<sup>166</sup> with particular attention to sacrificial law<sup>167</sup> and purity regulations.<sup>168</sup>

<sup>162</sup> Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Law of the *Temple Scroll* and its Provenance," in *Courtyards*, 3-18 (1988); "The Theology of the *Temple Scroll*," in *Courtyards*, 19-32 (1994); "The *Temple Scroll* and the Nature of its Law: The Status of the Question," in *Courtyards*, 33-52 (1994). See also "The Unfinished Scroll: A Reconsideration of the End of the *Temple Scroll*," *DSD* 15 (2008): 67-78.

<sup>163</sup> Lawrence H. Schiffman, "*Miqṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah* and the *Temple Scroll*," in *Courtyards*, 123-48 (1989-1990); "The Relationship of the *Zadokite Fragments* to the *Temple Scroll*," in *Courtyards*, 149-62 (2000); "The Laws of Vows and Oaths (Num 30, 3-16) in the *Zadokite Fragments* and the *Temple Scroll*," in *Courtyards*, 557-72 (1991). See also "The Prohibitions of the Skins of Animals in the *Temple Scroll* and *Miqṣat Ma'ase ha-Torah*," *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies (Division A)* (1990): 191-8.

<sup>164</sup> Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Septuagint and the *Temple Scroll*: Shared 'Halakhic' Variants," in *Courtyards*, 85-98 (1992); "The Sacrificial System of the *Temple Scroll* and the *Book of Jubilees*," in *Courtyards*, 99-122 (1985); "The *Temple Scroll* and the Halakhic Pseudepigrapha of the Second Temple Period," in *Courtyards*, 163-4 (1999); "Descriptions of the Jerusalem Temple in Josephus and the *Temple Scroll*," in *Courtyards*, 175-88 (2001); "The Prohibition of Judicial Corruption in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Philo, Josephus, and Talmudic Law," in *Courtyards*, 189-212 (1998). See also "The *Temple Scroll* and the Systems of Jewish Law of the Second Temple Period," in Brooke, *Temple Scroll Studies*, 239-56; "The Book of Jubilees and the *Temple Scroll*," in Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba, eds., *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 99-115.

<sup>165</sup> Lawrence H. Schiffman, "*Ir Ha-Miqdash* and its Meaning in the *Temple Scroll* and Other Qumran Texts," in *Courtyards*, 53-66 (1998); "The Architectural Vocabulary of the *Copper Scroll* and the *Temple Scroll*," in *Courtyards*, 67-82 (2002); "Architecture and Law: The Temple and its Courtyards in the *Temple Scroll*," in *Courtyards*, 215-32 (1989); "The Construction of the Temple according to the *Temple Scroll*," in *Courtyards*, 233-52 (1996); "The Furnishings of the Temple according to the *Temple Scroll*," 253-68 (1992); "The House of the Laver in the *Temple Scroll*," in *Courtyards*, 269-80 (1999); "Sacred Space: The Land of Israel in the *Temple Scroll*," in *Courtyards*, 281-94 (1993).

<sup>166</sup> "The Deuteronomic Paraphrase of the *Temple Scroll*," in *Courtyards*, 443-70 (1992); "Laws Concerning Idolatry in the *Temple Scroll*," in *Courtyards*, 471-86 (1994); "The King, His Guard, and the Royal Council in the *Temple Scroll*," in *Courtyards*, 487-504 (1987); "Laws of War in the *Temple Scroll*," in *Courtyards*, 505-18; "Law Pertaining to Women in the *Temple Scroll*," in *Courtyards*, 519-40 (1992); "Priestly and Levitical Gifts in the *Temple Scroll*," in *Courtyards*, 541-56 (1999).

<sup>167</sup> "Sacral and Non-Sacral Slaughter according to the *Temple Scroll*," in *Courtyards*, 297-314 (1995); "The Milluim Ceremony in the *Temple Scroll*," in *Courtyards*, 315-32 (1994); "The Case of the Day of Atonement Ritual," in *Courtyards*, 333-40; "Some Laws Pertaining to Animals in *Temple Scroll*, Column 52," in *Courtyards*, 341-52 (1997); "'*Ölä* and *hattät*' in the *Temple Scroll*," in *Courtyards*, 353-64 (1995); "*Shelamim* Sacrifices in the *Temple Scroll*," in *Courtyards*, 365-77 (1989).

<sup>168</sup> "Exclusion from the Sanctuary and the City of the Sanctuary in the *Temple Scroll*," in *Courtyards*, 381-402 (1986); "The Impurity of the Dead in the *Temple Scroll*," in *Courtyards*, 403-24 (1990); "Pharisaic and Sadducean *Halakhah* in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Case of the *Ṭevul Yom*," in *Courtyards*, 425-42 (1994).



Schiffman locates the formation of the *Temple Scroll* in the second half of the reign of John Hyrcanus or early in the reign of Alexander Janneus (ca. 110-90 BCE).<sup>169</sup> In contrast to the sectarian insistence on progressive revelation, Schiffman argues that the *Temple Scroll* conceives of a single revelation of Sinai, the contents of which are embodied in both the “canonical” Torah and its supplement, the *Temple Scroll*.<sup>170</sup> The expansion of biblical law is achieved through its rewriting in the *Temple Scroll*. Moreover, the *Temple Scroll*’s use of the first person divine voice rather than the mediating voice of Moses adds greater authority to the *Temple Scroll*’s claim that its rewritten Torah represents the revealed word of God – a phenomenon Schiffman describes as “divine pseudepigrapha.”<sup>171</sup> While the *Temple Scroll* disagrees with sectarian literature regarding the origins of law, its method of expanding biblical law through rewriting corresponds to the literary forms and exegetical techniques found in the sectarian legal texts.<sup>172</sup>

In spite of the many differences with the law and ideology of the sectarian community, Schiffman identifies significant agreement between the law of the *Temple Scroll* and related laws in 4QMMT and the *Damascus Document*.<sup>173</sup> Thus, he offers a more nuanced view of the origins of the text and relationship to the broader sectarian corpus of legal texts.<sup>174</sup> Schiffman sees the Sadducean character of the *Temple Scroll* as the key to understanding the correspondence with 4QMMT and the *Damascus Document* and the reason for its preservation in the sectarian library. Schiffman contends that all three texts “stem from the Sadducean heritage of those who founded the sect.”<sup>175</sup> Yet, it is only with texts such as 4QMMT and the *Damascus Document* that the social dynamics of the sectarian community begin to emerge. In particular, the *Damascus Document* reflects vestiges of the Sadducean origins of the sectarian community as it is reconstituted around

<sup>169</sup> See “The Law of the *Temple Scroll* and its Provenance,” 8-10; and “The *Temple Scroll* and the Nature of its Law,” 44-47.

<sup>170</sup> See “The *Temple Scroll* and the Systems of Jewish Law of the Second Temple Period”; and “The Theology of the *Temple Scroll*.”

<sup>171</sup> See “The *Temple Scroll* and the Halakhic Pseudepigrapha of the Second Temple Period.”

<sup>172</sup> See especially “The Deuteronomic Paraphrase of the *Temple Scroll*.”

<sup>173</sup> See n. 163.

<sup>174</sup> This view is first voiced in “The *Temple Scroll* and the Systems of Jewish Law of the Second Temple Period,” 251-3; and further elaborated in “*Miqṣat Ma’ase Ha-Torah* and the *Temple Scroll*”; “Sacral and Non-Sacral Slaughter according to the *Temple Scroll*”; “The Laws of Vows and Oaths (Num 30, 3-16) in the Zadokite Fragments and the *Temple Scroll*”; “The Relationship of the *Zadokite Fragments* to the *Temple Scroll*”; “Pharisaic and Sadducean *Halakhah* in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Case of the Ṭevul Yom.”

<sup>175</sup> “The *Temple Scroll* and the Nature of its Law,” 43.

the figure of the Teacher of Righteousness.<sup>176</sup> For Schiffman, therefore, the *Temple Scroll*, 4QMMT and the *Damascus Document* are not merely individual legal texts from the Second Temple period. Rather, together they offer previously unavailable firsthand access to Sadducean law. Moreover, these texts shed considerable light on the legal positions of the Pharisees as reflected in the opposing views preserved in these texts.

### *Rereading Old Texts and Integrating New Texts*

As noted above, among the cave 1 texts, both the *Community Rule* (1QS) and the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa) contain significant material related to Jewish law. In the 1980s, Schiffman published two monographs and several associated articles that sought to integrate these two texts into the comprehensive understanding of Jewish law he began to undertake in *The Halakhah at Qumran*. The first monograph focuses on civil law in the sectarian legal texts.<sup>177</sup> In a second monograph Schiffman examines the *Rule of the Congregation*, which he identifies as “a messianic document picturing the ideal constitution of the sect in the end of days.”<sup>178</sup> The presence of women and marriage at Qumran seriously calls into question the identification of the community as the Essenes, who are described by the ancient sources as celibate. As in his earlier studies, Schiffman therefore argues that the legal elements demand more nuance with regard to the identification of the sect.

While Schiffman argues that the presence of texts reflecting marriage and women challenges the Essene hypothesis, Baumgarten offers a different approach that allows both for the presence of these texts and the identification of the community as Essene. In a paper delivered in 1985 (published in 1990), Baumgarten explores the tension between Josephus’ iden-

<sup>176</sup> See “The Laws of Vows and Oaths,” 572.

<sup>177</sup> Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony, and the Penal Code* (BJS 33; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983). Earlier material incorporated into this monograph includes: “The Qumran Law of Testimony,” *RevQ* 8 (1975): 603-12; and “Communal Meals at Qumran,” *RevQ* 10 (1979): 45-56. See also “Reproof as a Requisite for Punishment in the Law of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in Bernard S. Jackson, ed., *Jewish Law Studies II, the Jerusalem Conference Volume* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 59-74.

<sup>178</sup> Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SBLMS 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 8. Earlier articles incorporated into this monograph include: “The Eschatological Community of the *Serekh Ha-’Edah*,” *PAAJR* 51 (1984): 105-29; and “Purity and Perfection: Exclusion from the Council of the Community in the *Serekh Ha-’Edah*,” in Amitai, *Biblical Archaeology Today*, 373-89. The two monographs discussed here and *The Halakhah at Qumran* were later combined in a Hebrew edition: *Law, Custom, and Messianism in the Dead Sea Sect* (Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar, 1993) (Hebrew).



tification of celibacy among the Essenes and the growing awareness that many of the sectarian legal texts envision a world in which marriage is the norm.<sup>179</sup> In addition to the *Damascus Document* and the *Rule of the Congregation*, Baumgarten points to the recently published 4Q502 (4QRitual de mariage), which clearly assumes the presence of women and the practice of marriage within the sectarian community.<sup>180</sup> His analysis of the relevant textual data lends support to the idea that celibacy was not the norm among the sectarian community. Yet, the many laws regarding marriage promoted a culture of sexual abstinence that was indeed pursued by some individuals seeking a greater level of purity. Thus, the varying degrees of sexual activity among the various people under the umbrella of the sectarian community finds correspondence with Josephus' description of different approaches to celibacy among the Essenes.

Baumgarten's interest in the texts published in DJD VII can also be found in his article on the purification rituals preserved in 4Q512 and 4Q514.<sup>181</sup> Drawing on important parallel data in both Second Temple and rabbinic sources, Baumgarten demonstrates how these texts reflect a well-defined system of ritual purity and its association with spiritual wellbeing.

### *The Full Release of the Scrolls and Its Aftermath (1994-2010)*

Without a doubt, the single most important accomplishment for the study of law in the Dead Sea Scrolls has been the publication of the *editiones principes* of legal texts. In the case of some of these texts – for example, the cave 4 copies of the *Damascus Document* – scholars were aware of their existence, but knew little else. In other cases, new texts emerged that were previously unknown.

The existence of additional copies of the *Damascus Document* from cave 4 (4Q266-4Q273) was long known, though Milik's published discussion of the manuscripts only noted their contribution to the complicated arrangement of the medieval Genizah manuscripts.<sup>182</sup> When the cave 4 pub-

<sup>179</sup> "Qumran-Essene Restraints on Marriage," in Schiffman, *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1-24.

<sup>180</sup> For Baumgarten's understanding of 4Q502, see "4Q502: Marriage or Golden Age Ritual?" *JJS* 34 (1983): 125-35.

<sup>181</sup> Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Purification Rituals in DJD 7," in Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill; Jerusalem: Magnes, the Hebrew University, Ben-Zvi, 1992), 199-210.

<sup>182</sup> Milik, *Ten Years*, 151-2 n. 3.

lication team was reconstituted, the responsibility for the cave 4 *Damascus Document* manuscripts was assigned to Baumgarten, who published the *editio princeps* in DJD XVIII.<sup>183</sup> As the manuscripts demonstrate, the ancient version of the *Damascus Document* contains far more legal material than what is preserved in the medieval copies.<sup>184</sup> Baumgarten's presentation of the manuscripts and their new legal content is found not just in the *editio princeps* but in his many articles published throughout the 1990s. These articles explicate individual aspects of Jewish law emerging from the unpublished manuscripts with Baumgarten's usual appeal to a wide range of comparative Second Temple and rabbinic sources: skin disease,<sup>185</sup> *zab* impurity,<sup>186</sup> agrarian law,<sup>187</sup> pregnancy and fetal life,<sup>188</sup> disqualification of priests,<sup>189</sup> and the expanded penal code.<sup>190</sup>

<sup>183</sup> Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266-273)* (DJD XVIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996). Baumgarten also published these manuscripts in the Princeton series. A few fragments related to skin disease were published in volume 2 (1995) and the more complete cave 4 manuscripts appear in volume 3 (2006). See also Baumgarten, "The Damascus Document Reconsidered," and "A Response to the Discussion of DJD XVIII," in Kugler and Schuller, *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty*, 149-50; 199-201; and "Corrigenda to the 4Q MSS of the *Damascus Document*," *RevQ* 19 (1999): 217-25. Wacholder also incorporated the cave 4 manuscripts into a composite edition with the Genizah manuscripts: *The New Damascus Document: The Midrash on the Eschatological Torah of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Reconstruction, Translation and Commentary* (STDJ 56; Leiden: Brill, 2007).

<sup>184</sup> See Baumgarten's preliminary description of the new legal content in the cave 4 manuscripts in "The Laws of the Damascus Document in Current Research," in Magen Broshi, ed., *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992), 51-62; and "The Qumran Cave 4 Fragments of the Damascus Document," in Avraham Biran and Joseph Aviram, eds., *Biblical Archaeology Today 1990: Proceedings of the Second International Congress on Biblical Archaeology* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1993), 391-7.

<sup>185</sup> Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The 4Q Zadokite Fragments on Skin Disease," *JJS* 41 (1990): 153-65.

<sup>186</sup> Joseph M. Baumgarten, "Zab Impurity in Qumran and Rabbinic Law," *JJS* 45 (1994): 273-7.

<sup>187</sup> Joseph M. Baumgarten, "A Qumran Text with Agrarian Halakhah," *JQR* 86 (1995): 1-8.

<sup>188</sup> Joseph M. Baumgarten, "A Fragment on Fetal Life and Pregnancy in 4Q270," in David P. Wright, David N. Freedman and Avi Hurvitz, eds., *Pomegranates and Bells. Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 445-8.

<sup>189</sup> Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Disqualifications of Priests in 4Q Fragments of the 'Damascus Document': a Specimen of the Recovery of pre-Rabbinic Halakha," in Trebolle Barrera and Vegas Montaner, *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 2:503-13.

<sup>190</sup> Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Cave 4 Versions of the Qumran Penal Code," *JJS* 43 (1992): 268-76.

DJD XXXV contains thirteen legal texts from cave 4, many of which were published by American scholars.<sup>191</sup> Eric Larson, Manfred R. Lehmann, and Lawrence Schiffman prepared the edition of 4QHalakha A (4Q251), which contains several laws related to Sabbath observance and other legal issues. 4QHalakha B (4Q264a), a shorter composition containing Sabbath laws and perhaps additional laws, was published by Baumgarten.<sup>192</sup> Baumgarten also published 4QMiscellaneous Rules (4Q265), a text previously known as 4QSerekh-Damascus on account of contents that resemble legal material from both the *Community Rule* and the *Damascus Document*. The unique combination in 4Q265 of legal elements related to both rule texts as well as non-legal material is addressed in two further articles by Baumgarten.<sup>193</sup> Baumgarten also prepared the *editiones principes* for five manuscripts regarding ritual purity designated *Tohorot* (4Q274-4Q278),<sup>194</sup> 4QPurification Liturgy (4Q284), and 4QHarvesting (4Q284a).<sup>195</sup>

#### *4QMMT and the Identity of the Sect*

As discussed above, from the very beginning of research on the *Damascus Document*, Schechter and Ginzberg argued for the centrality of law in any identification of the sectarian community. With the newly available

<sup>191</sup> Several of the texts appearing in DJD XXXV were also published in volume 3 of the Princeton series (2006).

<sup>192</sup> See also Joseph M. Baumgarten, "A Proposed Re-interpretation of Qumran Shabbat Regulations," in Daniel Sivan, David Talshir and Chaim Cohen, eds., *Zaphenath-Paneah: Linguistic Studies Presented to Elisha Qimron on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Beer-Sheva: Beer-Sheva University Press, 2009), 9\*-13\*.

<sup>193</sup> Joseph M. Baumgarten, "Purification after Childbirth and the Sacred Garden in 4Q265 and Jubilees," in George J. Brooke, ed., *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris, 1992* (STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 3-10; "Scripture and Law in 4Q265," in Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon, eds., *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 25-33.

<sup>194</sup> Earlier publication of material from 4Q274 is found in Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Laws of Fluxes in 4QTohora<sup>a</sup> (4Q274)," in Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman, eds., *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1989-1990* (STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 1-9; "Liquids and Susceptibility to Defilement in New 4Q Texts," *JQR* 85 (1994): 91-101; Jacob Milgrom, "4QTohora<sup>a</sup>: An Unpublished Qumran Text on Purities," in Dimant and Schiffman, *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness*, 59-68. On 4Q276 and 4Q277, see also Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Red Cow Purification Rites in Qumran Texts," *JJS* 46 (1995): 112-19; "The Use of מִי נִהָרָה for General Purification," in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years*, 481-5.

<sup>195</sup> See earlier discussion in Baumgarten, "Liquids and Susceptibility to Defilement in New 4Q Texts."

4QMiqṣat Ma'āse Ha-Torah (4QMMT), Schiffman returned to the question of the identity of the sect in a series of treatments published in the 1990s.<sup>196</sup>

Schiffman follows the initial assessment of John Strugnell and Elisha Qimron that the document represents a letter sent from the early sectarian community to its former priestly colleagues in Jerusalem.<sup>197</sup> The text describes a series of ritual laws concerning which the early sectarian community disagreed with the priestly establishment and identifies this disagreement as the central reason for its withdrawal from the Temple.<sup>198</sup>

Schiffman also draws upon 4QMMT and its legal contents in order to offer a new suggestion regarding the identity of the sect.<sup>199</sup> In particular, Schiffman calls attention to several of the same parallels from *Mishnah Yadayim* that Baumgarten relies upon in his discussion of the polemical nature of the *Temple Scroll*.<sup>200</sup> Schiffman argues that the legal positions of the Sadducees as known from the *Mishnah* align with the view promoted in 4QMMT, while the Pharisaic view on these very issues in the *Mishnah* likewise agrees with the rejected position in 4QMMT. 4QMMT, Schiffman therefore proposes, indicates that the sectarian community should be

<sup>196</sup> In addition to the articles in the following notes, see Schiffman's summary of the historical importance of 4QMMT in *Reclaiming*, 83-89. For the edition of 4QMMT, see Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqṣat Ma'āse ha-Torah* (DJD X; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).

<sup>197</sup> See especially, Schiffman, "The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect," in *Qumran and Jerusalem*, 112-22 (1990). The early character of 4QMMT is further emphasized in Schiffman's analysis of the legal material in 4QMMT in relationship to other Dead Sea Scrolls legal texts: "The Place of 4QMMT in the Corpus of Qumran Manuscripts," in *Qumran and Jerusalem*, 123-39 (1996). On comparisons of the law of 4QMMT and the *Temple Scroll*, see above, n. 163.

<sup>198</sup> This aspect of 4QMMT is developed in Schiffman, "Community without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple," in *Qumran and Jerusalem*, 81-97 (1999).

<sup>199</sup> See Schiffman, "New Halakhic Letter," 119-22; "The Sadducean Origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls Sect," in Shanks, *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 35-49 (1990); *Reclaiming*, 86-88. See also the criticism of Schiffman's view in James C. VanderKam, "The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essenes or Sadducees?" in Shanks, *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 50-62 (1990).

<sup>200</sup> In this connection, see also the important analysis of the law in 4QMMT by Yaakov Sussmann, "The History of Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Sussmann's thorough comparison between 4QMMT and the Mishnaic evidence of the controversies between the Pharisees and the Sadducees influenced the entire discussion of this issue. See the chapter on Israeli research of Qumran *halakhab* in the present volume. The significance of the parallels in 4QMMT is questioned in Yaakov Elman, "Some Remarks on 4QMMT and the Rabbinic Traditions: Or, When is a Parallel not a Parallel?" in John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein, eds., *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (SBLSymS 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 99-128; "MMT B 3-5 and Its Ritual Context," *DSD* (1999): 148-56.

associated at least to some degree with the Sadducees. He further locates the historical setting of the debates as unfolding following the Maccabean revolt.

Following the full availability of 4QMMT, Baumgarten would return to the text to understand its contribution to sectarian law and the identity of the community.<sup>201</sup> In particular, he asserts that the exclusive focus on the law for determining the identity of the community is as misguided as the approaches it seeks to correct. A proper treatment, argues Baumgarten, must consider both law *and* theology.<sup>202</sup> Baumgarten long advocated for the Essene hypothesis.<sup>203</sup> In the face of his own identification of parallels with Sadducean law, he reaffirms the correctness of this approach. The correspondence between the sectarian writings and the rules, regulations, and worldview of the Essenes cannot be ignored. Moreover, Baumgarten notes that he is able to identify only three specific sectarian laws that can unequivocally be aligned with Sadducean approaches, all of which are in the realm of ritual purity.<sup>204</sup> On the contrary, Baumgarten finds seven instances where legal approaches ascribed to the Essenes by Josephus are affirmed in the sectarian scrolls.<sup>205</sup> Baumgarten argues that the convergence of Sadducean and sectarian purity law merely results from the Sadducean insistence on purity in the Temple and the sectarian approach that advocated for a similar rigorous application of purity law in its isolated community.

---

<sup>201</sup> See especially, Joseph M. Baumgarten, "Sadducean Elements in Qumran Law," in James VanderKam and Eugene Ulrich, eds., *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 27-36; "The 'Halakhah' in Miqṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah (MMT)," *JAOS* 116 (1996): 512-16; "La loi religieuse de la communauté de Qoumrân," *Annales - Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 51 (1996): 1005-25; "The Relevance of Rabbinic Sources to the Study of Qumran Law," *Proceedings of the Twelfth World Congress of Jewish Studies (Division A)* (1999): 73\*-78\*; "Tannaitic Halakhah and Qumran: A Re-evaluation," in Steven D. Fraade, Aharon Shemesh and Ruth A. Clements, eds., *Rabbinic Perspectives: Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 62; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 1-11.

<sup>202</sup> See Baumgarten, "Sadducean Elements," 31-32; "La loi religieuse de la communauté de Qoumrân," 1016; "Theological Elements in the Formulation of Qumran Law," in Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman and Weston W. Fields, eds., *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 33-41 (33-34).

<sup>203</sup> See his dissertation and collected essays in *Studies in Qumran Law*.

<sup>204</sup> Baumgarten, "Sadducean Elements," 34-35. A similar argument was later put forward by Devorah Dimant and Menahem Kister. See the chapter on Israeli research of the Qumran community and Qumran *halakhah* in the present volume.

<sup>205</sup> Baumgarten, "The Disqualifications of Priests," 503-5. Baumgarten's arguments from this paper are excerpted in "Some Remarks on the Qumran Law and the Identification of the Community," *QC* 1 (1990): 115-17. See also "La loi religieuse de la communauté de Qoumrân," 1016-18. The initial list is slightly augmented in "Theological Elements in the Formulation of Qumran Law," 35; "Tannaitic Halakhah," 3.

Baumgarten suggests that these practices reflect shared religious law in the Second Temple period.<sup>206</sup>

### *Purity and Holiness*

The issue of purity has long occupied Dead Sea Scrolls scholars, with significant early contributions by Baumgarten and Milgrom. Following the release of the Scrolls, the issue of ritual purity emerged as another area of significant research among American scholars, particularly in Baumgarten's work on the new cave 4 legal texts. One of the most ambitious attempts to address the issue of purity in the sectarian community and broader segments of ancient Judaism was undertaken by Hannah Harrington. In a 1992 dissertation written under Milgrom's direction, Harrington sets out to examine the impurity systems of the sectarian community in dialogue with rabbinic purity regulations.<sup>207</sup> Although still limited in the available Dead Sea Scrolls, Harrington's study is significant as another move toward a holistic analysis of sectarian law.

For the first question, her analysis follows the approach outlined by Milgrom in suggesting that the sectarian community relied upon the expansion of scriptural law through exegesis (especially homogenization) rather than appealing merely to customs or norms. Where the sectarian and rabbis diverge, Harrington argues, is in the level of stringency with which they apply and expand scriptural purity laws. The sectarians approach is to intensify scriptural purity law while the rabbis make every effort to minimize the harshness of the scriptural purity regulations.<sup>208</sup>

One particular area that has received considerable attention is the awareness of the intersection of ritual and moral impurity in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The most ambitious work in this area has been undertaken by Jonathan

<sup>206</sup> Baumgarten, "Sadducean Elements," 36.

<sup>207</sup> Harrington, *The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis: Biblical Foundations* (SBLDS 143; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993).

<sup>208</sup> Harrington's subsequent studies on purity in the Dead Sea Scrolls build on this initial work and integrate texts that would become available throughout the 1990s. See Harrington, "Holiness in the Laws of 4QMMT," in García Martínez, Bernstein, and Kampen, *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*, 109-28; "The Nature of Impurity at Qumran," in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years, 610-16; Holiness: Rabbinic Judaism and the Graeco-Roman World* (London: Routledge, 2001); *The Purity Texts* (CQS 5; London: T&T Clark, 2004); "Purity and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Current Issues," *Currents in Biblical Research* 4 (2006): 397-428; "Keeping Outsiders Out: Impurity at Qumran," in Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović, eds., *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen* (STDJ 70; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 187-203; "What is the Semantic Field of the Lexemes טהר and טמא in the Dead Sea Scrolls?" *RevQ* 24 (2009): 97-114.

Klawans.<sup>209</sup> He finds significant evidence in the Scrolls to provide greater nuance to the sectarian view that moral impurity generates ritual impurity. In response to Klawans, Martha Himmelfarb has argued that the attempt to read all the sectarian documents in light of this approach to impurity is misguided.<sup>210</sup> Rather, Himmelfarb proposes, the differing attitudes toward purity among the different texts should itself be a central criterion in the identification of sectarian and non-sectarian documents. For example, she detects a universalistic approach to purity in the *Damascus Document* that should better be classified as an expansion of a scriptural idea than a purely sectarian notion. In contrast, only the *Community Rule* and 4Q512 (*Ritual Purity B*) contain language combining both moral and ritual impurity, thus indicating their sectarian identity. For the latter texts, however, Himmelfarb further argues that moral sin and ritual impurity do not appear in the cause and effect relationship posited by earlier scholars. Rather, they stand side by side in an “evocative” – not legal – description of human failings.<sup>211</sup>

A related issue that emerges in the study of impurity is the potentially defiling status of non-Jews. Baumgarten detects content in the cave 4 fragments of the *Damascus Document* that suggests a contagious impure status for non-Jews. Thus, priests who have been held in captivity are presumed to have been profaned by contact with the uncleanness of non-Jews (4Q266 5 ii 5-7).<sup>212</sup> In contrast, Christine Hayes has argued that Second Temple texts do not assume that non-Jews are sources of ritual contagion.<sup>213</sup> Rather, sectarian texts such as 4QMMT and broader segments of Second Temple Judaism condemn intermarriage based on concerns of boundary marking and Jewish self-identity, what Hayes identifies as “genealogical impurity.”<sup>214</sup>

<sup>209</sup> See Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000). See also “Notions of Gentile Impurity in Ancient Judaism,” *AJSR* 20 (1995): 285-312; “The Impurity of Immorality in Ancient Judaism,” *JJS* 48 (1997): 1-16; “Idolatry, Incest, and Impurity: Moral Defilement in Ancient Judaism,” *JSJ* 29 (1998): 391-415; “Purity in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 377-402.

<sup>210</sup> Martha Himmelfarb, “Impurity and Sin in 4QD, 1QS, and 4Q512,” *DSD* 8 (2001): 9-37.

<sup>211</sup> A similar nuanced approach to this issue is advanced by Harrington, “The Nature of Impurity at Qumran,” who suggests that the sectarian texts make a distinction between some sources of ritual impurity (e.g., skin disease) that could reasonably be associated with moral sin. Other sources of ritual impurity, however, do not become combined with moral impurity.

<sup>212</sup> Baumgarten, “The Disqualifications of Priests.”

<sup>213</sup> Christine Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); “Intermarriage and Impurity in Ancient Jewish Sources,” *HTR* 92 (1999): 3-36.

<sup>214</sup> Strugnell and Qimron understand the ban on intermarriage in 4QMMT (B 77-82) as applying to priests and Israelites. See, however, Baumgarten, “The ‘Halakhah’ in



*Legal Exegesis*

The role of scriptural interpretation in the formation of law represents a recurring area of inquiry among many of the scholars discussed here.<sup>215</sup> Following the full release of the Scrolls, Milgrom's emphasis on homogenization as a legal-exegetical technique was further pursued by Harrington and Himmelfarb.<sup>216</sup> Moreover, Baumgarten offered two significant contributions outlining several examples of legal exegesis.<sup>217</sup> Steven D. Fraade returns to the question of the potential presence in the Scrolls of explicit legal exegesis – what the later rabbis identify as *midrash halakhah*.<sup>218</sup> Fraade comes to the same negative conclusions as previous scholars: with a few exceptions, sectarian law is rarely formulated with explicit appeal to scriptural exegesis. Yet, at the same time, he notes that the community clearly was capable of doing so as evinced, for example, by its exegetical technique in the *Pesharim*. Fraade asserts that the general absence of explicit legal exegesis in the Scrolls should be associated with the community's insistence on revelation as the ultimate basis for new law. While legal exegesis is not readily visible in the final product of sectarian legal activity, Fraade argues that the sectarians did engage in scriptural exegesis as they formulated law. Yet, the final form of presentation obscures the process that went into its creation. Moshe Bernstein's and Shlomo Koifman's extensive overview of

---

Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah (MMT)," 515-16, who suggests that the condemned intermarriage in 4QMMT is between Jews and non-Jews. According to either approach, Hayes's basic assessment stands.

<sup>215</sup> On Schiffman's work in this area, see above. On Milgrom, see the articles cited in n. 154 above. For other early American research in this area, see Elieser Slomovic, "Toward an Understanding of the Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *RevQ* 7 (1969): 3-15 (9-12); Moshe J. Bernstein, "Midrash Halakhah at Qumran? 11QTemple 64:6-13 and Deuteronomy 21:22-23," *Gesher* 7 (1979): 145-66; "בי קללת אלהים תלוי" (Deut 21:23): A Study in Early Jewish Exegesis," *JQR* 74 (1983): 21-45; Michael Fishbane, "Use, Authority, and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran," in Martin J. Mulder ed., *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (CRINT 2, 1; Assen: Van Gorcum; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1988), 339-77 (368-71).

<sup>216</sup> On Harrington, see above. On Himmelfarb, see "The Purity Laws of 4QD: Exegesis and Sectarianism," in Esther G. Chazon, David Satran and Ruth A. Clements, eds., *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone* (JSJSup 89; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 155-69.

<sup>217</sup> See Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Laws of the Damascus Document – Between Bible and Mishnah," in Baumgarten, Chazon, and Pinnick, *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery*, 17-26; "Common Legal Exegesis in the Scrolls and Tannaitic Sources," in Menahem Kister, ed., *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World* (2 vols.; Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi, 2009), 2:649-65 (Hebrew).

<sup>218</sup> Steven D. Fraade, "Looking for Legal Midrash at Qumran," in Stone and Chazon, *Biblical Perspectives*, 59-79. See also "Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran," *JJS* 44 (1993): 46-69.



the “forms” and “methods” of interpretation in the Scrolls have made the greatest effort toward outlining the underlying exegetical process.<sup>219</sup>

### *Conclusions*

Several critical themes recur throughout the hundred years of scholarship treated here. Already in the pre-Qumran stage of research, Schechter and Ginzberg recognized the inextricable link between Jewish law and the identity of the sectarian community. Though this approach would long lay dormant, it figures prominently in the work of Lieberman, Schiffman, and Baumgarten. Another pressing question addressed in varying degrees by all the scholars discussed here is the location of the Dead Sea Scrolls in the broader history of Jewish law. This question raises the methodological issue of what role later Jewish legal literature – especially rabbinic literature and Karaite texts – plays in illuminating the legal content of the scrolls. Though scholars disagree on many precise details, the combined efforts of the scholars treated here have demonstrated the indispensability of comparative rabbinic evidence for understanding Jewish law in the Dead Sea Scrolls. With the full availability of the Scrolls, scholars have now been able to sketch a comprehensive portrait of law in the Dead Sea Scrolls and locate it within the broader history of Jewish law in antiquity. It only took a hundred years and the miraculous discovery of a (second) hoard of ancient scrolls to realize the ambitious goals first outlined by Schechter and Ginzberg.

---

<sup>219</sup> Moshe J. Bernstein and Shlomo A. Koyfman, “The Interpretation of Biblical Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Forms and Methods,” in Matthias Henze, ed., *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 61-87.

THE ARAMAIC TEXTS AND THE HEBREW AND ARAMAIC  
LANGUAGES AT QUMRAN:  
THE NORTH AMERICAN CONTRIBUTION\*

MOSHE J. BERNSTEIN AND AARON KOLLER

*The Trailblazer: Joseph A. Fitzmyer*

One scholar, Joseph Fitzmyer, has dominated the study of the Qumran Aramaic texts in North America from the 1950s through today.<sup>1</sup> Fitzmyer (1920-) entered the Society of Jesus in 1938, and completed his doctorate on “The syntax of imperial Aramaic based on the documents found in Egypt,” at Johns Hopkins under William Foxwell Albright and Thomas O. Lambdin in 1956.<sup>2</sup> By then he had begun to publish on the recently discovered texts from Qumran, already emphasizing in those early publications the light the Scrolls could shed on early Christian literature.<sup>3</sup> These two interests – Aramaic and early Christianity – naturally led him to fo-

---

\* The authors thank Martin G. Abegg of Trinity Western University and Edward M. Cook of the Catholic University of America for their critical reading of earlier drafts of this essay.

<sup>1</sup> For a biographical appreciation, see Myles M. Bourke, “Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.: A Biographical Sketch,” *CBQ* 48 (1986): 375-8 (*CBQ* 48/3 was dedicated to him). Fitzmyer’s bibliography through 1989 can be found in Maurya P. Horgan and Paul J. Kobelski, eds., *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer* (New York: Crossroad, 1989), 390-412. He is currently Professor Emeritus of Biblical Studies at the Catholic University of America.

<sup>2</sup> See also Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “The Syntax of כּל כּלּא in the Aramaic Texts from Egypt and in Biblical Aramaic,” *Bib* 38 (1957): 170-84; reprinted in *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (SBLMS 25; Missoula: SBL and Scholars Press, 1979), 205-17. This volume, as well as Fitzmyer’s earlier volume of collected papers, *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London: G. Chapman, 1971), were reprinted together in Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Semitic Background of the New Testament* (The Biblical Resource Series; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997). The pagination of the original volumes was preserved in this reprint. We shall refer to the two volumes as *WACAE* and *ESBNT*, respectively.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “The Qumrân Scrolls, the Ebionites and Their Literature,” *TS* 16 (1955): 335-72 (= *ESBNT*, 435-80). Cf. also his later studies, “4Q Testimonia and the New Testament,” *TS* 18 (1957): 513-37 (= *ESBNT*, 59-89); “A Feature of Qumrân Angelology and the Angels of 1 Cor. xi. 10,” *NTS* 4 (1957-1958): 48-58 (= *ESBNT*, 187-204); “‘Now this Melchizedek...’ (Heb 7,1),” *CBQ* 25 (1963): 305-21 (= *ESBNT*, 221-43); “The Aramaic ‘Elect of God’ Text from Qumran Cave IV,” *CBQ* 27 (1965): 348-72 (= *ESBNT*, 127-60).

cus in particular on the texts in which they could be readily combined: the Aramaic texts, written in the language presumed to have been spoken by Jesus.<sup>4</sup>

His publications on the relationship between the Scrolls and early Christianity have continued for over a half century, and his emphasis on the value of the Aramaic texts in particular for this study has been a constant theme in his work.<sup>5</sup> One of Fitzmyer's fundamental arguments has been that, for elucidating the New Testament, not all dialects or periods of Aramaic are equivalent, and that it is the Aramaic of the first century which is most valuable. To that end, the Aramaic of Qumran is an incomparable resource. In a recent article on the Aramaic noun פֶּטְרָא and its possible value for understanding the background of the New Testament name "Peter," Fitzmyer categorically rejected arguments found in some studies based on the use of the lexeme פֶּטְרָא in "Aramaic." In these studies, he pointed out, the Aramaic evidence was always drawn from later targumic Aramaic texts; Fitzmyer's own analysis was based on the more contemporaneous evidence of Qumran Aramaic (see further below n. 46).<sup>6</sup>

Fitzmyer's work on the Aramaic Qumran corpus itself has included studies and editions of individual texts, grammatical and sociolinguistic analyses, and thematic studies. These diverse components of Fitzmyer's work are best epitomized in his studies of the *Genesis Apocryphon* that began with an article in *CBQ* and continued through three editions. The commentary is

---

<sup>4</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament," *NTS* 20 (1973-1974): 382-407 (= *WACAE*, 85-107); "Methodology in the Study of the Aramaic Substratum of Jesus' Sayings in the New Testament," in Jacques Dupont, ed., *Jésus aux origines de la christologie* (BETL 40; Gembloux: Duculot, 1975), 73-102; "The New Testament Title 'Son of Man' Philologically Considered," in *WACAE*, 143-60; "Aramaic 'Kepha' and Peter's Name in the New Testament," in Ernest Best and Robert McL. Wilson, eds., *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 121-32; "The Aramaic Background of Philippians 2:6-11," *CBQ* 50 (1988): 470-83; "Another Look at 'kephale' in 1 Corinthians 11.3," *NTS* 35 (1989): 503-11.

<sup>5</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament after Forty Years," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 609-20; "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, eds., with the assistance of Andrea E. Alvarez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998-1999), 2:599-621; collected essays in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000); *The One Who Is to Come* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007).

<sup>6</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Meaning of the Aramaic Noun כֶּפֶה/כִּפְתָא in the First Century and its Significance for the Interpretation of Gospel Passages," in J. E. Aguilar Chiu et al., eds., "Il Verbo di Dio è vivo": *Studi sul Nuovo Testamento in onore del cardinale Albert Vanhoye, S.I.* (AnBib 165; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2007), 35-43.

probably one of the most thorough on any Qumran text.<sup>7</sup> It contains not only an introduction to and detailed remarks on every aspect of the text together with a complete bibliography, but also a grammar of the Aramaic of the text as well as comparative observations about Aramaic more generally.

### *The Aramaic Texts from Qumran*

#### *Introduction*

The study of the Aramaic texts from Qumran did not begin in any real sense until the publication of the *Genesis Apocryphon* by Avigad and Yadin in 1956.<sup>8</sup> Previously, virtually the only Aramaic material to have been published were the fragments of 1Q20 (later identified as part of the scroll called the *Genesis Apocryphon*), 1Q21 (1QTLevi ar), 1Q23 (EnGiants<sup>a</sup> ar), 1Q24 (EnGiants<sup>b</sup> ar), 1Q32 (NJ ar), and some unclassified fragments in DJD I. At that point in the development of Qumran scholarship, fragmentary texts attracted very little attention since there were so many substantial ones that demanded scholarly investigation.

The two Aramaic texts from Qumran with the most substantial remains are the *Genesis Apocryphon* and the *Targum of Job*, and we shall therefore begin our discussion of North American contributions to the study of the Aramaic texts from Qumran with those two documents.

#### *Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20 [1QapGen ar])*

The total contribution of this continent to the study of the *Genesis Apocryphon* is, of course, overshadowed by Fitzmyer's three successive editions.<sup>9</sup> A perusal of the bibliography in the most recent edition, however, will suf-

<sup>7</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Some Observations on the Genesis Apocryphon," *CBQ* 22 (1960): 277-91; *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I: A Commentary* (BibOr 18; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966); 2d rev. ed., 1971; *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary* (3d ed.; BibOr 18B; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2004).

<sup>8</sup> Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press and Heikhal Ha-Sefer, 1956).

<sup>9</sup> We should note, however, that it was American John C. Trever, "Preliminary Observations on the Jerusalem Scrolls: D. The Unidentified Fourth Scroll," *BASOR* 111 (1948): 14-16, who first observed that the scroll was written in Aramaic, based on the words אִנְשָׁא לִיאֲרִיעָא in a piece of the manuscript now known as the "Trever fragment." In "Identification of the Aramaic Fourth Scroll from 'Ain Feshkha," *BASOR* 115 (1949): 8-10, he noticed, in column II of the *Apocryphon*, the occurrences of the names בתאנוש and למך, and "concluded that this must be the Apocryphal Book of Lamech, mentioned once in a Greek list

face to indicate that many American scholars have played roles, large and small, in the interpretation of this major Aramaic work from Qumran. In the years immediately following its initial publication, no American other than Fitzmyer appears to have made broad contributions to the study of the *Apocryphon*. In fact, before 1971, when Fitzmyer published his second edition, fewer than a handful of articles had been penned by North American scholars on the *Apocryphon*. It is therefore probably most useful to divide scholarship on the *Apocryphon* into work that was done before the publication of the full textual material in the early 1990s and work that was done subsequently.<sup>10</sup>

In attempts to characterize its genre that were very typical of early scholarship on the *Apocryphon*, both Manfred Lehmann and Gerald Kuiper considered its relationship to the later rabbinic literature, represented by the targumim and midrashim.<sup>11</sup> In the long run, such approaches to generic classification did not prove successful because it gradually became clearer that the *Apocryphon* had to be located within its own time frame, the Second Temple era, and compared to works, like *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch*, deriving from that period and not from the rabbinic era.

Quite naturally, before the “full” publication of the *Apocryphon*, a good deal of the scholarship on it was the product of research by scholars who were working in Second Temple literature more broadly. James VanderKam, whose work on *Jubilees* culminated with his production of the standard critical edition of its Ethiopic text,<sup>12</sup> published a number of articles on the

---

of apocryphal books.” Cf. further William F. Albright’s editorial comments there, pp. 9-10, n. 4.

<sup>10</sup> The textual material not published by Avigad and Yadin was edited by Jonas C. Greenfield and Elisha Qimron, “The Genesis Apocryphon Col. XII,” in Takamitsu Muraoka, ed., *Studies in Qumran Aramaic* (AbrNSup 3; Leuven: Peeters, 1992), 70-77; and Matthew Morgenstern, Elisha Qimron, and Daniel Sivan, “The Hitherto Unpublished Columns of the Genesis Apocryphon,” *AbrN* 33 (1995): 30-54.

<sup>11</sup> Manfred R. Lehmann, “1Q Genesis Apocryphon in the Light of the Targumim and Midrashim,” *RevQ* 1 (1958-1959): 249-63; Gerald J. Kuiper, “A Study of the Relationship between ‘A Genesis Apocryphon’ and the Pentateuchal Targumim in Genesis 14<sub>1-12</sub>,” in Matthew Black and Georg Fohrer, eds., *In memoriam Paul Kahle* (BZAW 103; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1968), 149-61. Lehmann (1922-1997) was not a professional academician, but a Swedish-born Jewish-American businessman with deep interest in Jewish scholarship. In the course of his life he published many articles on Jewish themes, including several others on Qumran.

<sup>12</sup> James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text* (CSCO 510-511; Scriptores Aethiopici 87-88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989). VanderKam (1946-) did his doctoral work under Frank Cross at Harvard on the *Book of Jubilees*, and has been a leading figure in American scholarship on the Dead Sea Scrolls and the life and thought of the Second Temple era more generally. He has also trained many students at the University of Notre Dame who have gone on to produce significant scholarship on the scrolls.

related *Apocryphon*, including studies of its biblical *Vorlage*<sup>13</sup> and of the poetry of the description of Sarai's beauty in column XX.<sup>14</sup> An essay on the ancient versions of the birth of Noah, centering on *1 Enoch* 106-107 and *Genesis Apocryphon* II-V, and discussing the use of etymologies in those stories, followed.<sup>15</sup> Shortly after the publication of column XII by Greenfield and Qimron, VanderKam pointed out the significance of Shem's having the same number of sons and daughters in the *Apocryphon* so that they could marry within the pure family and not have to resort to intermarriage with the families of either Japhet or Ham.<sup>16</sup>

Craig Evans endeavored to locate the *Genesis Apocryphon* among the other Second Temple works which had been classified as "rewritten Bible," a term introduced by Geza Vermes in 1961 as a rubric for a number of Jewish works of late antiquity.<sup>17</sup> Although limited, in retrospect, by not having the fullest textual material from the *Apocryphon* available to him, Evans presented a brief but useful survey of the various genres to which the *Apocryphon* had been assigned to that point, as well as a discussion of the "rewritten Bible" type with the reasons for including the *Apocryphon* in it.

James Miller, also writing before the publication of the full text of the *Apocryphon*, approached the text as a narrative.<sup>18</sup> He observed that the *Book of Tobit* exhibits the pattern of beginning its narrative in the first person and then, in chapter 3, shifting to the third person. He suggests (again, working only from the earlier published material) that the *Genesis Apocryphon*

<sup>13</sup> James C. VanderKam, "The Textual Affinities of the Biblical Citations in the Genesis Apocryphon," *JBL* 97 (1978): 45-55. On p. 47 he notes that "the two [*Jubilees* and the *Apocryphon*] presuppose virtually identical biblical Vorlagen in addition to their many other similarities."

<sup>14</sup> James C. VanderKam, "The Poetry of 1QApGen, XX, 2-8a," *RevQ* 10 (1978-1981): 57-66.

<sup>15</sup> James C. VanderKam, "The Birth of Noah," in Zdzislaw J. Kapera, ed., *Intertestamental Essays in Honour of Józef Tadeusz Milik* (Qumranica Mogilanensia 6; Krakow: Enigma, 1992), 213-31. VanderKam's earlier essay, "The Righteousness of Noah," in George W. E. Nickelsburg and John J. Collins, eds., *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1980), 13-32, belongs to the same series of studies, but does not deal at length with the *Apocryphon*.

<sup>16</sup> James C. VanderKam, "The Granddaughters and Grandsons of Noah," *RevQ* 16 (1994): 456-61.

<sup>17</sup> Craig E. Evans, "The Genesis Apocryphon and the Rewritten Bible," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 153-65; Geza Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (2nd ed.; StPB 4; Leiden: Brill, 1973), 95. For recent discussions of the appropriate employment of this term, see Moshe J. Bernstein, "'Rewritten Bible': A Generic Category Which Has Outlived Its Usefulness?" *Textus* 22 (2005): 169-96, and the books by Falk and White Crawford cited below n. 33.

<sup>18</sup> James E. Miller, "The Redaction of Tobit and the Genesis Apocryphon," *JSP* 8 (1991): 53-61.

follows the same model, with the narrative being first person until column XXI, 33 and then shifting to third person. Although his argument for “intertextuality between Tobit and the *Apocryphon*” has not attracted adherents, he may have succeeded in directing attention to the way in which the *Apocryphon* tells its story, which had heretofore been neglected.

Only occasionally did scholars turn their attention to the very fragmentary remains of any columns other than II and XIX-XXII, which survive substantially. John Reeves discussed the relationship of Noah’s offerings after the flood that are described in column X of the *Apocryphon* to those found in *Jubilees* 6:2-3, and suggested that the verb *ואקטרת* does not refer to the offering of incense as it had been translated by Fitzmyer’s second edition, but to the offering of fat.<sup>19</sup> The fuller publication of the text of column X indicated that Reeves was partially correct (being misled only by not having X, 14 before him where the burning of the fat is mentioned explicitly), and that what was burned was indeed fat and not incense. Reeves pointed out that the sequence of the offering indicated a possible connection of the *Apocryphon* with Qumran sectarian understanding of sacrificial ritual.<sup>20</sup>

Focused contributions were occasionally made to the study of the *Apocryphon* in those early decades by scholars whose primary interests lay elsewhere. Joshua Finkel, primarily a Semitist, presented an argument for the author of the *Apocryphon*’s having been familiar with the Book of Esther.<sup>21</sup> In light of the well-known absence of any fragment of Esther from the caves at Qumran, this seemingly minor point may have ramifications for the question of whether the *Apocryphon* was composed at Qumran. Ancient historian Shaye Cohen showed very interesting parallels between the description of Sarai’s beauty in the *Apocryphon* and a Hellenistic epigram

<sup>19</sup> John C. Reeves, “What Does Noah Offer in 1QApGen X, 15,” *RevQ* 12 (1986): 415-19. Fitzmyer’s third edition, in light of Morgenstern, Qimron and Sivan’s publication, adjusts the translation.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. *Jubilees* 6:2 and 7:3-4, 11QTemple XXIII, 11ff., and Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983), 1:146-8.

<sup>21</sup> Joshua Finkel, “The Author of the Genesis Apocryphon Knew the Book of Esther,” in Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin, eds., *Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls: In Memory of E.L. Sukenik* (Jerusalem: Heikhal Ha-Sefer, 1961), 163-82 (Hebrew). Although many of Finkel’s arguments are highly open to question, his remarks (178-80) on possible linguistic connections between the *Apocryphon* and the book of Esther are worthy of serious consideration. More recently, see Shemaryahu Talmon, “Was the Book of Esther Known at Qumran?” *DSD* 2 (1995): 249-67 (with many more dubious, and some attractive, suggested connections), and the suggestive note of Jonathan Ben-Dov, “A Presumed Citation of Esther 3:7 in 4QD<sup>b</sup>,” *DSD* 6 (1999): 282-4, to which we can add that the same phrase (מיומן ליום ומחודש) appears in the deeply enigmatic 4Q306 i 2.



in praise of one Flora.<sup>22</sup> It demonstrated that, in this one aspect, the literary traditions of the *Apocryphon* may not have been limited to those of the Semitic-speaking world.

Although it might have been expected that the newly published material from the *Genesis Apocryphon* would have immediately attracted renewed and concentrated scholarly interest in the 1990s with its decipherment and publication, such was not the case. Americans Michael Wise and Bruce Zuckerman put together the pieces of 1Q20 and identified them as columns 0 and I of the *Apocryphon*,<sup>23</sup> but it was still the long-published material which remained the focus of attention. Two articles relating to Abram's dream in column XXI of the *Apocryphon* were published within a couple of years of each other.<sup>24</sup> Luijken Gevartz suggested that the function of the dream in the narrative is not merely, as has been pointed out by others, to resolve the issue of Abram's apparent amoral behavior, but also to underline his status as a possessor of divinely inspired wisdom. Bloch's much more narrow contribution discussed the gender aspect of the pairing of cedar and palm as found in Song of Songs and in Abram's dream in the *Apocryphon*.

As the last decade of the twentieth century advanced, so did interest in the *Apocryphon* in North America. Richard Steiner, a Semitist who had published a brief but significant note dealing in part with the *Apocryphon* in 1991,<sup>25</sup> provided an important analysis of the words מלי נוח, "book of the words of Noah," that are found toward the end of column V of the *Apocryphon*.<sup>26</sup> Establishing the meaning of the phrase with great care, he showed that it indicated a shift in sources on the part of the *Apocryphon*,

<sup>22</sup> Shaye J. D. Cohen, "The Beauty of Flora and the Beauty of Sarai," *Helios* 8 (1981): 41-53. The article is unfortunately marred by a number of typographical errors.

<sup>23</sup> These fragments had been published in Dominique Barthélemy and Józef T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD I; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 86-87, under the name "Apocalypse de Lamech," and identified as deriving from the scroll of the *Apocryphon*, which had not been published yet. Wise and Zuckerman presented their work at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Kansas City in 1991. The terminology "column 0" derives from the fact that the reconstruction of column I from the fragments of 1Q20 indicated the presence of material to the right of that column. See Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*, 5 and 115-16.

<sup>24</sup> Marianne Luijken Gevartz, "Abram's Dream in the Genesis Apocryphon: Its Motifs and Their Function," *Maarav* 8 (1992): 229-43 and Ariel A. Bloch, "The Cedar and the Palm Tree: A Paired Male-Female Symbol in Hebrew and Aramaic," in Ziony Zevit et al., eds., *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphical and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 13-17.

<sup>25</sup> Richard C. Steiner, "The Mountains of Ararat, Mount Lubar and הַר הַקָּדִים," *JJS* 42 (1991): 247-9.

<sup>26</sup> Richard C. Steiner, "The Heading of the 'Book of the Words of Noah' on a Fragment of the Genesis Apocryphon: New Light on a 'Lost' Work," *DSD* 2 (1995): 66-71.



an observation which has been foundational to all further structural and source critical work on the text.

Moshe Bernstein has studied a variety of aspects in the *Apocryphon* in a series of articles beginning in 1996.<sup>27</sup> He has examined those aspects of the *Apocryphon* which make it part of the larger mosaic of early Jewish biblical interpretation, as well as specific features and phenomena within the text. Thus he has analyzed the exegetical techniques of the *Apocryphon* in both narrow and broad focus, its relationship to the biblical narrative, the unique problems in determining its genre, and its relationship (or lack thereof) to the later Aramaic targumim. Bernstein's view is that the fact that the *Apocryphon* is composite, made up of works which belong to different genres, makes it particularly difficult to fit it into a generic pigeonhole. Despite,

---

<sup>27</sup> Bernstein's work touching upon the *Apocryphon* includes: "Re-Arrangement, Anticipation and Harmonization as Exegetical Features in the Genesis Apocryphon," *DSD* 3 (1996): 37-57; "Pentateuchal Interpretation at Qumran," in Flint and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years*, 1:128-59; "Noah and the Flood at Qumran," in Eugene C. Ulrich and Donald W. Parry, eds., *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: New Texts, Reformulated Issues and Technological Innovations* (STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 199-231; "Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls: Categories and Functions," in Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon, eds., *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Second International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature, 12-14 January, 1997* (STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 1-26; "The Contours of Genesis Interpretation at Qumran: Contents, Contexts and Nomenclature," in James L. Kugel, ed., *Studies in Ancient Midrash* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Center for Jewish Studies/Harvard University Press, 2001), 57-85; "From the Watchers to the Flood: Story and Exegesis in the Early Columns of the Genesis Apocryphon," in Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant and Ruth Clements, eds., *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran, Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran, 15-17 January, 2002* (STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 39-63; "Genesis Apocryphon," *New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2007), 2:538-9 [with Esther Eshel]; "Divine Titles and Epithets and the Sources of the Genesis Apocryphon," *JBL* 128 (2009): 291-310; "The Genre(s) of the Genesis Apocryphon," in Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stöckl Ben Ezra, eds., *Aramaica Qumranica: The Aix-en-Provence Colloquium on the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 94; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 317-43; "The Genesis Apocryphon: Compositional and Interpretive Perspectives," in Matthias Henze, ed., *Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 157-79; "The Genesis Apocryphon and the Aramaic Targumim Revisited: A View from Both Perspectives," in Armin Lange, Emanuel Tov and Matthias Weigold, eds., in association with Bennie H. Reynolds III, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures* (VTSup 140/I-II; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 2:651-71. Bernstein (1946-) came to his interests in Qumran studies and early Jewish biblical interpretation (especially the Aramaic targumim) by a somewhat circuitous route. Virtually "home-schooled" in Aramaic from an early age by his father, Michael Bernstein, who taught Semitic languages at Yeshiva University, he holds a doctorate in Classical Languages from Fordham University and rabbinic ordination from Yeshiva University, where he also pursued further graduate work in biblical studies and is now Professor of Bible.

however, his claim that it clearly derives from diverse sources, he has argued that it still possesses a unity that is probably the product of its final composer/redactor.<sup>28</sup> Most recently, he has suggested approaching the *Apocryphon* not only as a work of “rewritten Bible” or biblical interpretation, but as a literary entity in its own right in order to explain certain features of the text that appear problematic if we focus only on its relationship to Genesis.<sup>29</sup>

George Nickelsburg’s interests in the Enochic corpus and in Second Temple literature more broadly led him to discuss the *Genesis Apocryphon* in several contexts.<sup>30</sup> In an article published in 1998, he discussed the narrative of the *Apocryphon*, focusing on a significant feature common to both segments of the *Apocryphon*, “patriarchs who worry about their wives.”<sup>31</sup> The study actually goes well beyond the terms of its title, and touches upon the relationship of the *Apocryphon* to the Enochic corpus, its literary genre, and the importance of psychology and erotic themes in it.<sup>32</sup>

Daniel Falk and Sidnie White Crawford have each devoted significant space to the *Apocryphon* in their recent books on rewriting the Bible in the

<sup>28</sup> Moshe J. Bernstein, “Is the Genesis Apocryphon a Unity? What Sort of Unity Were You Looking For?” *Aramaic Studies* 8 (2010): 107-34.

<sup>29</sup> In a paper, entitled “Narrator and Narrative in the Genesis Apocryphon,” delivered at the World Congress of Jewish Studies in Jerusalem in August 2009.

<sup>30</sup> In addition to the article on the *Apocryphon* discussed immediately below, Nickelsburg’s magisterial work, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001) refers to the *Apocryphon* wherever it is relevant, and his *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (2d ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 172-7 and 387-9, treats the *Apocryphon* in some detail (as it does the other major Aramaic works from Qumran). Nickelsburg (1934-) received his Th.D. at Harvard (later published as *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* [HTS; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972]). An ordained Lutheran minister who spent his academic career at the School of Religion, University of Iowa, Nickelsburg has published broadly on Second Temple Judaism and early Christianity, especially the Apocrypha and pseudepigraphic and apocalyptic literature.

<sup>31</sup> George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Patriarchs Who Worry About Their Wives: A Haggadic Tendency in the Genesis Apocryphon,” in Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon, eds., *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 May, 1996* (STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 137-58.

<sup>32</sup> Eileen M. Schuller, a Canadian scholar of the Dead Sea Scrolls, makes this point about the broad range of the article in her sympathetic and judicious critique that accompanies the republication of this essay in Jacob Neusner and Alan J. Avery-Peck, eds., *George W.E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning* (JSJSup 80; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 1:200-12, to which Nickelsburg then offered a rejoinder (1:213-15).

Second Temple period.<sup>33</sup> Falk's discussion of the *Apocryphon*, in fact, takes up more than half of this volume, and represents one of the most thorough endeavors to engage many of the major issues surrounding the *Apocryphon* in detail in a work which is not devoted solely to it. Unlike most other scholars, he sees the *Apocryphon* as fundamentally divided between Noah and Abram cycles,<sup>34</sup> and the lion's share of his presentation is therefore given over to the Noah and Abram "motifs" of the *Apocryphon* (pp. 42-94).

Although White Crawford's book has a title resembling that of Falk's, it is a more genuine survey of twice as many texts which might be said to rewrite scripture, and therefore has less room to give to each one. Nonetheless, it furnishes a good synthesis of the contents of the *Apocryphon* and its relationship to other works which belong loosely to this class of Second Temple literature. White Crawford concludes that the "Apocryphon offers an example of the ongoing vitality of the scribal tradition" and "also illustrates the particular biases of the priestly-levitical/Essene exegetical tradition of which the Qumran community was a part."<sup>35</sup>

In 2007, Daniel Machiela completed a Ph.D. dissertation on *The Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20): A Reevaluation of Its Text, Interpretive Character, and Relationship to the Book of Jubilees*.<sup>36</sup> It contains the most recent attempt to reconstruct the text on the basis of all available photographs, as well as a detailed study of the story of the division of the earth among Noah's sons in columns XVI-XVII. Although many of his new readings are debatable, there is no question that Machiela's efforts have enhanced our knowledge of the text of the *Apocryphon* by uncovering readings which had remained hidden until now.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Daniel K. Falk, *Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures Among the Dead Sea Scrolls* (CQS 8; LSTS 63; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 26-106; Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting the Bible in the Second Temple Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008).

<sup>34</sup> Falk, *Parabiblical Texts*, 30. Most other scholars see the portion of the *Apocryphon* before the words "book of the words of Noah" in column V as belonging to an Enoch or Lamech section.

<sup>35</sup> White Crawford, *Rewriting the Bible*, 127.

<sup>36</sup> Written under the supervision of VanderKam at the University of Notre Dame. Published under the title *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13-17* (STDJ 79; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

<sup>37</sup> We have not seen Edward Chandler's Ph.D. dissertation (Catholic University of America [2001] produced under the direction of Douglas M. Gropp) on "Word Order in Qumran Aramaic." (Thanks to Edward Cook for drawing our attention to this unpublished work.)

*Targum of Job (11Q10 [11QtgJob])*

The second long Aramaic text preserved at Qumran is the *Targum of Job*, which was published in its entirety in 1971.<sup>38</sup> Within North America, the language of the text proved to be a more popular subject than its content. The *editio princeps* was reviewed thoroughly by Stephen Kaufman, who focused in particular on linguistic issues: he drew attention to the implications of the text's language for the dating of the *Targum* and for Aramaic dialectology more generally.<sup>39</sup> Kaufman argued that the Aramaic of the text was an "artificial, literary Aramaic," which knew no geographical borders, although it was inevitably "colored by the local dialect."<sup>40</sup>

Fitzmyer then contributed a lengthy article in which he discussed various aspects of the text;<sup>41</sup> regarding the language, he took issue with Kaufman's conclusion, pointing out that there is no other evidence for such a trans-regional literary dialect.<sup>42</sup> Fitzmyer also noted the presence of a relatively large number of Persian loanwords (פתגם "word, thing," דחשת "desert," נוך "spear, javelin," חרתך "thorn," דת "law, religion"), but minimized the significance of this observation.<sup>43</sup> In a related point, he drew attention to some of the features which Muraoka later used to argue for the eastern provenance of the text, including the use of חזא "to see" instead of the supposedly Palestinian form חמא. But whereas Muraoka upheld the dialectological distinctions and drew conclusions regarding the text's provenance from these observations, Fitzmyer apparently assumed the text's provenance, and

<sup>38</sup> Jan van der Ploeg and Adam van der Woude, with the collaboration of Bastiaan Jongeling, *Le Targum de Job de la grotte XI de Qumrân* (Leiden: Brill, 1971).

<sup>39</sup> Stephen A. Kaufman, "The Job Targum from Qumran," *JAOS* 93 (1973): 317-27. Among the most prominent American Aramaists, Kaufman (1945-) studied Semitics at Yale and the Hebrew University, and has long taught at Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati. He has not published narrowly on the Qumran Aramaic texts, but has often discussed them in more general linguistic and other contexts. His intensive involvement in Qumran studies can be perceived not only in the comments on Qumran texts sprinkled throughout his more general writings (e.g., "On Vowel Reduction in Aramaic," *JAOS* 104 [1984]: 90, 91-92), but also in reviews such as that of *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche* in *JAOS* 116 (1996): 549-50.

<sup>40</sup> Kaufman, "The Job Targum," 325. This issue will be further discussed below, in the section on the Aramaic language.

<sup>41</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Some Observations on the Targum of Job from Qumran Cave 11," *CBQ* 36 (1974): 503-24, revised edition published as "The Targum of Job from Qumran Cave XI," in *WACAE*, 161-82, from which citations below come.

<sup>42</sup> Fitzmyer, "The Targum of Job," 166. We will return to this subject below and nn. 181-3.

<sup>43</sup> Fitzmyer, "The Targum of Job," 166-7.

therefore called into question the oft-repeated dialectological claim that *תּוֹמָא* is Palestinian: “Is it really?”<sup>44</sup>

Fitzmyer was also interested in the terminology used by the *Targum of Job* for the light it could shed on New Testament usage. For example, he found the forerunner of the absolute use of κύριος in the attestation of *מְרָא* in *Targum of Job* XXIV, 6-7 to render *שׁוּדִי*.<sup>45</sup> He paid special attention to the two uses of the noun *מְרָא* in the text, since later targumic *מְרָא* (מְרָא מְרָא), which serves as a “buffer” between God and humans, has often been compared to the use of λόγος in the Gospel of John. He concludes that there is no such use of *מְרָא* in the *Targum of Job*, and that therefore this text “puts the burden of proof on those who would maintain an early date for the buffer or personified usage of *מְרָא* in the discussion of the Johannine λόγος.”

As mentioned above, Fitzmyer has returned recently to a topic he broached earlier, studying the use of Aramaic *פֶּרֶךְ* – important for understanding the Aramaic background of Peter’s name (John 1:42).<sup>46</sup> This lexeme appears in the *Targum of Job* twice (as well as in other Qumran Aramaic texts), and the contexts demonstrate that it can refer to a large rock or rocky cliff, and not only a small round stone, contrary to the assertions of other New Testament scholars who had focused on later Aramaic texts to prove the opposite. This is an instructive example of Fitzmyer’s methodologically sound principle of employing contemporary Aramaic texts for the elucidation of New Testament texts, rather than later Aramaic, as others have done.

When Michael Sokoloff’s edition of the text was published in 1974,<sup>47</sup> it was reviewed by Stanislav Segert, who was then a recent addition to the cadre of Aramaists working in North America; he had moved from Czechoslovakia to the University of California, Los Angeles, in 1969.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>44</sup> Fitzmyer, “The Targum of Job,” 171.

<sup>45</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “Der semitische Hintergrund des neutestamentlichen Kyriostitels,” in Georg Strecker, ed., *Jesus Christus in Historie und Theologie: Neutestamentliche Festschrift für Hans Conzelmann zum 60. Geburtstag* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1975), 267-98 = “The Semitic Background of the New Testament Kyrios-Title,” *WACAE*, 115-42 (124). See also “Qumran Aramaic and the New Testament,” 87-90.

<sup>46</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “The Meaning of the Aramaic Noun *כּפּא/כּיפּא* in the First Century” (above, n. 6).

<sup>47</sup> Michael Sokoloff, *The Targum to Job from Qumran Cave XI* (Bar-Ilan Studies in Near Eastern Languages and Culture; Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 1974). Sokoloff, although American-born, made *aliyah* early in his life and belongs fully to the Israeli school of Aramaists. For his contributions, see the chapter by Steven Fassberg in this volume.

<sup>48</sup> Segert’s review appeared in *JAOS* 98 (1978): 145-6. Born in Prague, then Czechoslovakia, Segert (1921-2005) began his studies at the Protestant Theological Faculty of Charles

Segert had discussed the Qumran Aramaic texts as early as 1965, when he argued that the Aramaic texts in particular betrayed no sign of sectarianism, and were instead representative of more general Judaism of the late Second Temple period.<sup>49</sup>

Other North American Aramaists also turned their attention to this text. Anthony York at Cornell and Bruce Zuckerman at Yale wrote doctoral theses on it.<sup>50</sup> Zuckerman provides important critical comments regarding the *editio princeps*,<sup>51</sup> including comments on their over-reliance on photographs instead of visual inspection of the scroll itself (perhaps ironic in light of his own later and fundamental contributions to the use of photography in the study of ancient texts). His own project was to study the process of translation reflected in the *Targum*, and, although he provides a very thorough treatment of everything within the first 15 columns, he refrains from providing any type of synthesis.<sup>52</sup> Zuckerman later co-published an

---

University in 1939, but completed them illegally in underground courses after the Nazis shut down all universities that year. In 1943 he was ordained by the Evangelical Church of Czech Brethren, and after the war rejoined the University, earning a doctorate in Semitic and Classical philology and philosophy. He taught in Czechoslovakia until 1969, when the government reacted to the Soviet invasion of the previous year by instituting a series of repressions. Segert then left for the United States, where he became a professor at the University of California. He was a wide-ranging and versatile Semitist, publishing grammars of Ugaritic, Old Aramaic, and Phoenician and Punic, and teaching and writing articles about both Aramaic and Hebrew. He began publishing on the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1951 ("A Discovery of Hebrew Manuscripts Near the Dead Sea," *ArOr* 19 [1951]: 610-11) and continued to touch upon them in his scholarship for more than four decades. Prominent among his students who work on Qumran is Edward Cook (1952-) of the Catholic University of America.

<sup>49</sup> Stanislav Segert, "Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu einigen aramäischen Texten von Qumran," *ArOr* 33 (1965): 190-206, especially in the concluding section.

<sup>50</sup> Anthony D. York, "A Philological and Textual Analysis of the Qumran Job Targum (11QTgJob)" (Ph.D. diss., Cornell University, 1973); Bruce E. Zuckerman, "The Process of Translation in 11QTgJob: A Preliminary Study" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1980). York also published two other studies on the text: "זרע רומאה" as an Indication of the Date of 11QTgJob?" *JBL* 93 (1974): 445-6 and "11 Q tg Job xxi, 4-5 (Job 32, 13)," *RevQ* 9 (1977-1978): 127-9.

<sup>51</sup> Zuckerman, "The Process of Translation," 14-16. Zuckerman's contributions to Dead Sea Scrolls research go well beyond his published articles on the texts. He is responsible for many of the enhanced photographs that other scholars in the field have used in the course of preparing their editions and other studies. See, e.g., "Bringing the Dead Sea Scrolls Back to Life: A New Evaluation of the Photographic and Electronic Imaging of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 3 (1996): 178-207. Zuckerman is Professor in the School of Religion at the University of Southern California; he also directs the USC Archaeological Research Collection and the West Semitic Research and InscriptiFact Projects.

<sup>52</sup> Zuckerman, "The Process of Translation," 39-42, on the lack of synthetic discussion. See also his "Two Examples of Editorial Modification in 11QTgJob," in Gary A. Tuttle, ed., *Biblical and Near Eastern Studies: Essays in Honor of William Sanford LaSor* (Grand Rapids:



additional fragment of the text (identifying it as “column VIIa”) that was discovered while he was photographing Scrolls at the Shrine of the Book.<sup>53</sup>

As part of a broad survey of Aramaic literature in late antiquity, Ben-Zion Wacholder discussed this text as a targum, reporting that “philologists who have examined these texts agree that the Qumran manuscripts are representative of what may be called a genuine targum.” He adds that this just might be the targum of Job said to have been condemned by Rabban Gamaliel I or II (*t. Šabb.* 13:2).<sup>54</sup>

Two University of Chicago alumni have published on this targum. One discussion of the text is by Michael Wise,<sup>55</sup> who uses Sokoloff’s edition as an example of the futility of mechanical linguistic dating, and perhaps of linguistic dating altogether.<sup>56</sup> Michael Wechsler published two articles on

Eerdmans, 1978), 267-75; “The Date of 11Q Targum Job: A Palaeographic Consideration of Its Vorlage,” *JSP* 1 (1987): 57-78.

<sup>53</sup> Zuckerman and Stephen Reed, “A Fragment of an Unstudied Column of 11QtgJob: A Preliminary Report,” *CAL Newsletter* 10 (1993): 1-7.

<sup>54</sup> Ben-Zion Wacholder, “The Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature (500-164 BCE): A Classification of Pre-Qumranic Texts,” in Lawrence H. Schiffman, ed., *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (JSPSup 8; JSOT/ASOR Monograph 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 265. Wacholder (1924-2011), after studying in pre-World War II *yeshivot* in his native Poland and surviving the Holocaust there, received his undergraduate training and rabbinic ordination at Yeshiva University and his Ph.D. at University of California. For many years he was Professor of Talmud and Rabbinics at Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati. In addition to his many publications on the Dead Sea Scrolls, including *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (MHUC 8; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983), he published broadly on ancient chronography and the Hellenistic Jewish historians.

<sup>55</sup> Wise wrote his doctorate on the *Temple Scroll* at the University of Chicago (1988) under Norman Golb; it was later published as *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (SAOC 49; Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990). His book, *The First Messiah: Investigating the Savior before Jesus* (San Francisco: HarperSan-Francisco, 1999) presented a controversial theory of a suffering messiah in the first century BCE. The book he published with Robert Eisenman, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered: The First Complete Translation and Interpretation of 50 Key Documents Withheld for Over 35 Years* (Shaftesbury: Element, 1992) was likewise the subject of much debate, both for some of its interpretations and for the ethical questions that were raised regarding the publication of some of the texts in it. The latter issues were discussed publicly and heatedly at a conference held at the New York Academy of Sciences in 1993. An edited transcript of the debate can be found in Michael O. Wise et al., *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 455-97. For further discussion of the incident, see James C. VanderKam and Peter Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus and Christianity* (New York: HarperCollins, 2002), 394-7 (“A Controversial New Book and the Ethics of Publication”).

<sup>56</sup> Michael O. Wise, “Accidents and Accidence: A Scribal View of Linguistic Dating of the Aramaic Scrolls from Qumran,” in Muraoka, *Studies in Qumran Aramaic*, 124-67, reprinted in *Thunder in Gemini and Other Essays on the History, Language and Literature*

the text, the second of which was a lengthy and painstakingly detailed study demonstrating that there is no genetic relationship between the Qumran *Targum of Job* and the later Peshitta translation of the book, despite some stylistic similarities.<sup>57</sup>

John Poirier contributed a recent study of the *Targum of Job*, investigating its place within Palestinian Judaism, surveying views regarding the need for such a work and discussing the origins of the practice of targum in Palestinian synagogues.<sup>58</sup> Poirier suggests that in fact targum in general was not prevalent among first-century Jews, and that the *Targum of Job* is exceptional in its existence. By way of explanation, he offers the suggestion (supported by other facts) that the Qumran group venerated the book of Job, and it was for this book alone that a targum was utilized. Moshe Bernstein has also recently discussed the biblical interpretation latent in the *Targum* as part of a broad study of interpretive texts at Qumran.<sup>59</sup>

### *Other texts*

Besides these two long texts, numerous other texts within the Aramaic Qumran corpus have attracted attention from the western side of the Atlantic. We shall begin our discussion with studies devoted to the “Danielic” literature (4Q242-4Q246), and then turn to pseudepigraphic texts associated with Enoch, Levi, Qohat, and Amram. Following this the Tobit texts will be surveyed, then the fragments loosely associated with the book of Esther, and finally other isolated Aramaic texts.

### *Prayer of Nabonidus: 4Q242 (4QPrNab ar)*

When Józef Milik published 4Q242 in 1956, labeling it “*Prière de Nabonide*,” and arguing that it provided insight into the pre-history of the

---

*of Second Temple Palestine* (JSPSup 15; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994); see especially pages 105-11 with the detailed notes; see also below, n. 184.

<sup>57</sup> Michael G. Wechsler, “Who Can Restore It? An Alternative Reading of 11QTgJob XXV, 5 (AD 34:29),” *RevQ* 20 (2001): 117-19; “Shared Reflections of Early Jewish Exegetical/Targumic Tradition in the Peshitta Text of Job and the Targum from Qumran (11QTgJob),” *Le Muséon* 115 (2002): 77-128. Wechsler, like Wise, was a student of Norman Golb, although his Ph.D. dissertation was not in the area of Qumran studies.

<sup>58</sup> John C. Poirier, “The Linguistic Situation in Jewish Palestine in Late Antiquity,” *JGRChJ* 4 (2007): 55-134 (102-10).

<sup>59</sup> Moshe J. Bernstein, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and Jewish Biblical Interpretation in Antiquity: A Multi-Generic Perspective,” in Lawrence H. Schiffman and Shani L. (Berrin) Tzoref, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls at 60: Scholarly Contributions of New York University Faculty and Alumni* (STDJ 89; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 55-90 (64-69).



biblical book of Daniel,<sup>60</sup> the significance of the text was immediately acknowledged. Since 1882 it had been known that Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon before the Persian rise to power, had spent a decade in Teima, for reasons, which still remain somewhat mysterious, involving his veneration of the moon god Sin. It had been suspected that this historical episode lay behind the story in Daniel 4, in which Nebuchadnezzar was struck by madness by God as punishment for his hubris and (as had been foretold by Daniel), spent “seven times” in the wilderness.<sup>61</sup> As Daniel had further prophesied, he was allowed to return only when he recognized the unique power of the God of Israel. 4Q242 appeared to go part of the way towards bridging the gap between the historical story of Nabonidus and the Danielic story of Nebuchadnezzar. It furnished a story about Nabonidus (נבניד) who was struck by שחנה “disease” in Teman, and cured only when a Jewish diviner (גזר) told him to recognize God’s power.

Even within the preserved section, only the right half of each column is preserved, and, as a result, there was much need for reconstruction. The initial discussion was by David Noel Freedman.<sup>62</sup> He assumed that the text was written by someone at Qumran in the second century BCE, and, since the text presupposed knowledge of Babylonian history not transmitted through the Bible, he concluded that the sect must have included “later migrants from Babylonia.” In current thinking, the fact that the text was found at Qumran does not, of course, immediately yield the conclusion that it was written there, and the further hypothesis of Babylonian immigrants in the sect is therefore unnecessary. Of more lasting importance was his perception that the Masoretic Text of Daniel 4 represented a re-worked version of the story partially preserved in 4Q242.

The text itself was later re-edited by Frank Cross,<sup>63</sup> who emphasized the

<sup>60</sup> Józef T. Milik, “‘Prière de Nabonide’ et autre écrits d’un cycle de Daniel,” *RB* 63 (1956): 407-15.

<sup>61</sup> Sidney Smith, *Babylonian Historical Texts Relating to the Capture and Downfall of Babylon* (London: Methuen & Co., 1924), 35-36.

<sup>62</sup> David N. Freedman, “The Prayer of Nabonidus,” *BASOR* 145 (1957): 31-32.

<sup>63</sup> Frank M. Cross, “Fragments of the Prayer of Nabonidus,” *IEJ* 34 (1984): 260-64. Cross (1921-), an original member of the international editorial team of the Dead Sea Scrolls, was Hancock Professor of Hebrew and Other Oriental Languages in the Department of Near East Languages and Civilizations at Harvard University from 1958-1992, and has continued his active scholarly career as Professor Emeritus. In addition to his classic *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, first published in 1958 and now in its third edition (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), he was responsible for *Qumran Cave 4.XII, 1-2 Samuel* (DJD XVII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005). He wrote his doctorate (actually two doctorates, both co-written with David Noel Freedman) under William Albright at Johns Hopkins, and has published very influential works on the Deuteronomistic History, epigraphy and the development of the Jewish scripts (and especially that of the Qumran scrolls), early biblical poetry

material aspects of the text and their importance for a proper reconstruction. He argued that earlier efforts had ignored the constraints that the proper arrangement of the fragments placed on the spaces available for reconstructions. According to his placement of the fragments, there was far less room than had originally been proposed by Milik. Cross's reconstructions were criticized by García Martínez,<sup>64</sup> but John Collins in his DJD edition concludes that "Cross' placement of the fragments should be preferred, but the alternative is not impossible."<sup>65</sup>

The position that 4Q242 precedes Daniel has been the dominant view, in North America as elsewhere, since the text's initial publication. It has been challenged, however, by Andrew Steinman, who argued that the relationship was more likely to be the other way around, and that 4Q242 drew on the book of Daniel.<sup>66</sup> The key argument is his adducing data which, to his mind, show that the author of 4Q242 was familiar not only with Daniel 4, but with all of Daniel 2-5, including the reference to the diviner (גזר) and the phrase אלהי כספא ודהבא. Steinman's own suggestion is that the author of 4Q242 sought to fill the literary lacuna between Daniel 4 (Nebuchadnezzar) and Daniel 5 (the Persians), but this requires a knowledge and sense of history which is probably out of place. More plausible is the synthesis offered by Wacholder, according to whom this work "precedes the canonical version of Daniel 4 in the development of the tradition." Wacholder further suggests that the text dates from a period when the Babylonian events were still fresh in the author's memory,<sup>67</sup> thus placing it, apparently, in the fourth or third century. The fullest analysis was offered by Matthias Henze,

---

and early Israelite religion, in addition to Qumran studies. See also Hershel Shanks, *Frank Moore Cross: Conversations with a Bible Scholar* (Washington: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1994).

<sup>64</sup> Florentino García Martínez, "The Prayer of Nabonidus: A New Synthesis," *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 116-36.

<sup>65</sup> John J. Collins, "4Q242," in George J. Brooke et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD XXII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 84; cf. also Peter W. Flint, "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran," in John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint, eds., with the assistance of Camron VanEpps, *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (VTSup 83; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 2:333. Collins (1946-), currently Professor of Old Testament at Yale, was a student of Cross at Harvard and is one of the most significant and prolific scholars in the area of Second Temple Judaism, especially in the field of apocalyptic. Flint, a student of Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam at the University of Notre Dame, is Professor of Religious Studies and Co-Director of the Dead Sea Scrolls Institute at Trinity Western University in British Columbia. He has contributed significantly to the study of the biblical texts at Qumran, especially Isaiah and Psalms.

<sup>66</sup> Andrew Steinman, "The Chicken and the Egg: A New Proposal for the Relationship between the Prayer of Nabonidus and the Book of Daniel," *RevQ* 20 (2002): 557-70.

<sup>67</sup> Wacholder, "The Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature," (above, n. 54), 269.

who convincingly argued that Daniel 4 cannot be directly dependent on the Prayer of Nabonidus, but that each represents a different crystallization of a fluid body of traditions.<sup>68</sup>

An important contribution to the study of the intellectual background and purpose of the text was made by Susan Ackerman, who investigated why Jews began telling stories about Mesopotamian monarchs and their illnesses in the first place. She observes that Nabonidus was famously a devotee of the moon god Sin, who was believed to be responsible for skin diseases. The claim that Nabonidus would be struck with *שחנה באישא* (l. 2), then, could be seen as a two-stage polemic. In the first stage, Nabonidus' detractors (of whom there were many) may have mocked the king devoted to Sin by claiming that he was actually struck by a disease controlled by the god he so devotedly venerated. In the second stage, this argument was adopted by monotheistic Jews, who turned the polemic into a claim for the power of their God.<sup>69</sup>

*Other 'Danielic' texts: 4Q243-4Q245 (4QpsDan<sup>a-c</sup> ar)*

4Q243-4Q245 (4QpsDan<sup>a-c</sup> ar) were published by Milik in the same article as 4Q242.<sup>70</sup> It became clear to the later editors of the texts, Peter Flint and John Collins, that while 4Q243-4Q244 belonged to the same text (and even partially overlapped), 4Q245 was distinct, although related.<sup>71</sup> Daniel's name appears in both, however, indicating some sort of relationship to the biblical book or to the traditions that lie behind it. Flint's survey of this literature has led him to the conclusion that these texts "present evidence

<sup>68</sup> Matthias Henze, *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar: The Ancient Near Eastern Origins and Early History of Interpretation of Daniel 4* (JSJSup 61; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 51-73. Henze, a native of Germany, received his doctorate (of which this book is a revised version) at Harvard; he has taught at Rice University since 1997.

<sup>69</sup> Susan Ackerman, "The Prayer of Nabonidus, Elijah on Mount Carmel, and the Development of Monotheism in Israel," in William G. Dever and J. Edward Wright, eds., *The Echoes of Many Texts: Reflections on Jewish and Christian Traditions: Essays in Honor of Lou H. Silberman* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 54-60.

<sup>70</sup> These are the "autres écrits d'un cycle de Daniel" in Milik, "Prière de Nabonide."

<sup>71</sup> John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint, eds., "243-245. 4Qpseudo-Daniel<sup>a-c</sup> ar," in George J. Brooke et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD XXII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 95-164; Peter W. Flint, "4QPseudo-Daniel ar<sup>c</sup> (4Q245) and the Restoration of the Priesthood," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 137-50; "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran", 338. See also his concise survey and discussion in "Prayer of Nabonidus (4Q242) and Pseudo-Daniel (4Q243-245)," in Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter, eds., *Dictionary of New Testament Background* (Downers Grove: Inter Varsity Press, 2000), 822-4.

of a Daniel cycle, or at least a rich tradition, in which a faithful Jew, who has received God's power or inspiration performs wonders."<sup>72</sup>

Milik suggested a number of restorations in 4Q243-4Q244, which brought the text even closer to the biblical book of Daniel, restoring, e.g., מלכותא קדומיתא in 4Q243 16 4, and taking it as a reference to a four-kingdom scheme of history. This reading and others were rejected by Flint and Collins (who restore instead מלכותא קדוניתא), however, and they arrive at the more cautious conclusion that 4Q243-4Q244 "is at least acquainted with the tradition that Daniel was active at the Babylonian court...but adopts a different path, by having Daniel expound the full sweep of Israelite history."<sup>73</sup> The preserved parts of Daniel's speech in this text begin with a reference to Enoch, and continue through Noah, Egypt, Nebuchadnezzar, and Balakhros, before turning to an eschatological time.

4Q245 also surveys Israelite history, focusing on a list of high priests (beginning with Levi) and then a list of kings (beginning, apparently, with David). The first list in particular is interesting for who is included: Flint and Collins found it noteworthy that the Hasmoneans Jonathan and Simon were included among the high priests, apparently without negative comment despite the alleged antagonism between the Qumran group and the Hasmoneans.<sup>74</sup>

Michael Wise recently re-edited this text utilizing the theoretically precise methods of material reconstruction developed by Hartmut Stegemann, and was able to reconstruct most of the text despite its fragmentary state by relying on parallels to its genre (a list of high priests) and on historical data from other Second Temple sources. His most important restoration was the name of Judah Maccabeus within the list of high priests. This reading provides early evidence for Judah's high priesthood, in agreement with Josephus' first statement on this issue (e.g., *Ant.* 12.414) and in opposition to 1 Maccabees and Josephus' own later statements to the contrary (*Ant.* 20.237-238). Wise argues that Judah most likely functioned as a high priest, but was certainly not recognized as such by the Seleucids; the question of whether or not Judah was a high priest is therefore a debate that

<sup>72</sup> Peter W. Flint, "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran," in Craig A. Evans and Peter W. Flint, eds., *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 59.

<sup>73</sup> Peter W. Flint, "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran," 340; Collins and Flint, "4Q243-244," DJD XXII, 136.

<sup>74</sup> Flint and Collins, "4Q245," DJD XXII, 157-8; Flint, "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran," 355-6.

goes back to his own contemporaries, and need not be resolved by modern scholars.<sup>75</sup>

#### 4Q246 (4QapocrDan ar)

4Q246 has attracted much attention in North America, both scholarly and popular, since it was first discussed in a lecture at Harvard by Milik in 1972. The text which attracted the most attention was the line ברה די אל יתאמר/ובר עליון יקרונה, “he will be called son of God/god, and be declared son of the Most High.” Both Fitzmyer and Cross formed their interpretations of the text at that point. Fitzmyer immediately published an article on the text based on the lecture,<sup>76</sup> and returned to the text in earnest after 1992, when it was both featured in Eisenman and Wise’s *Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* and edited formally by Puech.<sup>77</sup> Although Cross did not publish on it for more than two decades, he has since written two articles regarding this text.<sup>78</sup> Following its official publication the text attracted the sustained attention of the younger American scholars John Collins and Edward Cook, as well.<sup>79</sup>

Fitzmyer emphasized that the titles בְּרָהּ דִּי אֱלֹהִים and בֶּר עֲלִיוֹן “are not applied to anyone who is called messiah.” Although he preferred an apocalyptic interpretation of the text, the titles themselves referred to real humans: “[they] applied to the son of some enthroned king, possibly an heir to the throne of David.”<sup>80</sup> Fitzmyer saw the Qumran text as providing one missing link in the chain from the messianic and royal imagery of the Hebrew Bible

<sup>75</sup> Michael O. Wise, “4Q245 (PsDan<sup>c</sup> Ar) and the High Priesthood of Judas Macabaeus,” *DSD* 12 (2005): 313-62.

<sup>76</sup> Fitzmyer, “Qumran Aramaic and the New Testament”; note pages 92-93 in *WACAE*.

<sup>77</sup> Eisenman and Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, 68-70; Émile Puech, “Fragment d’une Apocalypse en araméen (4Q246 = pseudo-Dan) et le ‘Royaume de Dieu,’” *RB* 99 (1992): 98-131. For Fitzmyer’s work, see “4Q246: The ‘Son of God’ Document from Qumran,” *Bib* 74 (1993): 153-74; “The Aramaic ‘Son of God’ Text from Qumran Cave 4,” in Wise, *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 163-78; “The Palestinian Background of ‘Son of God’ as a Title for Jesus,” in Tord Fornberg and David Hellholm, eds., assisted by Christer D. Hellholm, *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in their Textual and Situational Contexts: Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman* (Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995), 567-77.

<sup>78</sup> Frank M. Cross, “Notes on the Doctrine of the Two Messiahs at Qumran and the Extracanonical Daniel Apocalypse (4Q246),” in Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks, eds., *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995* (STDJ 20; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 1-13; “The Structure of the Apocalypse of ‘Son of God’ (4Q246),” in Paul, et al., *Emanuel*, 151-8.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Edward M. Cook, “4Q246,” *BBR* 5 (1995): 43-66; John J. Collins, “The Background of the ‘Son of God’ Text,” *BBR* 7 (1997): 51-62.

<sup>80</sup> Fitzmyer, “Qumran Aramaic and the New Testament” (above, n. 4), 93.

to that used with regard to Jesus in the New Testament.<sup>81</sup> And ever the philologist, Fitzmyer also stressed the importance of the attestation of 𐤀𐤁, sometimes thought to be an exclusively Hebrew word, in an undoubtedly Aramaic text.<sup>82</sup> This had implications for the New Testament, as well, since Matthew (27:46) quotes Jesus as saying 𐀀𐀁 𐀀𐀁 𐀀𐀁 𐀀𐀁 𐀀𐀁 𐀀𐀁 𐀀𐀁, and there was now no obstacle to taking this as Aramaic.<sup>83</sup>

Cook's article offered two contributions to the study of the text. First, his edition is superior to those published earlier, based on careful readings, close attention to line lengths (a point which had been ignored in some earlier treatments, resulting in impossible reconstructions), and good grammatical reasoning. His second contribution was a discussion of the text's intellectual heritage: he connected it to Akkadian prophecies foretelling kings who would vastly improve life. Collins responded to Cook's study, and, although he accepted Cook's corrections regarding the text itself,<sup>84</sup> Collins took issue with the proposed background. He argued that the text fit in quite well with Hellenistic- and Roman-era texts such as Daniel and the Gospel of Luke.

One of the central issues debated was the value of the expressions 𐤁𐤓𐤁 𐤁𐤓𐤁 "son of God/god." In Cook's reconstruction, the son of God "would be Antiochus IV Epiphanes, and his father would be Antiochus III the Great, a supposition that fits our textual reconstruction."<sup>85</sup> The point of the text, of course, was not to glorify Antiochus IV, but the opposite: it was a Jewish criticism of the divine pretensions of foreign kings.<sup>86</sup> Collins rightly criticized some of the details of the historical reconstruction offered

<sup>81</sup> See also Fitzmyer's "addendum" to his article on "Qumran Aramaic and the New Testament", 102-7 on the "implications of the 4Q 'Son of God' text."

<sup>82</sup> Cross, "The Structure of the Apocalypse of 'Son of God' (4Q246)," 157-8, n. 20, argues that the use of Hebrew titles indicates that the figure described is a king of Israel; his analysis and Fitzmyer's are mutually exclusive. We should note that 𐤀𐤁 indeed occurs quite rarely in the Aramaic texts from Qumran according to the data in Martin G. Abegg, James E. Bowley and Edward M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance. Volume One: The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2003), 2:782b-783a, s.v. 𐤀𐤁. These volumes, containing concordances to both the Hebrew and Aramaic texts, are an indispensable North American-produced tool for the study of the Scrolls, and especially for study of the Hebrew and Aramaic languages at Qumran.

<sup>83</sup> Abegg, Bowley and Cook, *Concordance*, 2:782b-783a, s.v. 𐤀𐤁.

<sup>84</sup> There are relatively few criticisms of Cook's readings and translations in Collins's study.

<sup>85</sup> Cook, "4Q246," 64.

<sup>86</sup> Cook, "4Q246," 64-66. It is worth noting that Israeli scholar David Flusser also presented a reading of the text ("The Hubris of the Antichrist in a Fragment from Qumran," *Immanuel* 10 [1983]: 31-37; repr. in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* [Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988] 207-13) that viewed the central figure negatively, even though his approach and Cook's diverge.

by Cook, noting that “Antiochus Epiphanes was not called ‘the Great’ and Antiochus III was never king of both Syria and Egypt” (as Cook had read in column ii).<sup>87</sup> The crux for Collins was that “the one who is called ‘son of God’ is accepted as a positive figure in this text,” and furthermore that it has a “messianic connotation.”<sup>88</sup>

When Cross eventually wrote about the text, his first article<sup>89</sup> contained an important argument regarding one of the phrases in the text: he argued that מלך אתור ומצריין is to be translated as “the king of Assyria and of Egypt” (4Q246 i 6), which he claimed is a reference to the two dynasties of the Ptolemies and the Seleucids.<sup>90</sup> Cross also wrote that his view since 1972—when he heard Milik’s lecture at Harvard—was that the son of God is a messianic figure.

In Cross’s second study, he provided a discussion of the structure of the text, including a transcription and translation, with commentary.<sup>91</sup> Cross apparently worked without recourse to Cook’s work; this is particularly unfortunate since there are points of disagreement which could have been further clarified had Cross referred to Cook’s earlier study. For example, the reading ושנוך at the end of i 2 (which Cross regards as “certain” [155 n. 9]) is emphatically rejected on grammatical grounds by Cook (50). Similarly, Cook argued well that אתה in i 2 cannot be the 2d per. masc. sg. independent pronoun (which is אנתה in Qumran Aramaic), but is rather the participle אָתָה (49); Cross takes אתה to mean “you” without comment.<sup>92</sup>

<sup>87</sup> Collins, “The Background,” 57. See below, n. 90.

<sup>88</sup> Collins, “The Background,” 59, 60.

<sup>89</sup> Cross, “Notes on the Doctrine of the Two Messiahs at Qumran.”

<sup>90</sup> The syntactic question is whether the phrase מלך אתור ומצריין requires that there be a single king reigning over both countries; it is relatively easy to show that it does not, and similar constructions appear at least rarely in Biblical Hebrew (e.g., Judg 7:25 [רֹאשׁ-עַרְבַּי] and 2 Sam 19:6 [וְיָצֵא נָפֶשׁ בְּיָדוֹ וּבְיָדוֹ]), and in Qumran Hebrew, e.g., 1QM III, 13-14 [וְיָצֵא נָפֶשׁ בְּיָדוֹ וּבְיָדוֹ], and in the comments of Martin G. Abegg, “The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in Flint and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years*, 1:334-35. This was observed by John J. Collins, “Patterns of Eschatology at Qumran,” in Baruch Halpern and Jon D. Levenson, eds., *Traditions in Transformation: Turning Points in Biblical Faith, Festschrift Honoring Frank Moore Cross* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1981), 354 n. 8, in discussing the phrase מְשִׁיחַ אַהֲרֹן וְיִשְׂרָאֵל in the *Damascus Document*, which he says (following van der Woude) is to be translated “the messiah of Aaron and the one of Israel.” It was Cross who developed this point regarding 4Q246, and observed that מלך אתור ומצריין can refer to two different kings.

<sup>91</sup> Cross, “The Structure of the Apocalypse of ‘Son of God’ (4Q246).”

<sup>92</sup> Even with regard to the readings, reference to Cook’s study would have benefited Cross: he reads בקשוט in ii 6 (as did Collins), rather than בקשט, which Cook pointed out was the correct reading (46). It would appear that Collins had had some access to Cross’s unpublished work, but this is unclear. Cook’s translation is also preferable—both philologically and literarily—to Cross’s.



It is worth noting that despite some points of interest relevant specifically for Jewish texts, and the ostensibly non-denominational nature of academic research, all the American scholars who have published on 4Q246 are Christian, and the nature of the figure called the “son of God”—whether positive or negative—has been the most furiously debated issue. At stake, to some degree, is the question of what Jesus meant when he called himself a son of God. If he was simply following a convention inherited from earlier figures, the expression in its NT context reveals less than it does if it is unprecedented.

*Enoch: 1QEnGiants ar (1Q23-1Q24); 2QEnGiants ar (2Q26); 4QEn ar (4Q201-4Q212); 4QEnGiants ar (4Q530-4Q533); 6QpapGiants ar (6Q8)*

The publication of the Aramaic *1 Enoch* fragments (4Q201-4Q212) and Milik’s synthetic analysis in *The Books of Enoch*<sup>93</sup> quickly established “a new era in Enochic studies.”<sup>94</sup> Two years later, Michael Knibb’s edition of the Ethiopic text in light of the Aramaic texts from Qumran provided another major contribution to the textual study of *Enoch*.<sup>95</sup> James VanderKam and George Nickelsburg, in particular, shouldered the burden of continuing this work in North America.<sup>96</sup> They have undertaken the task of producing a full commentary on *1 Enoch* for the Hermeneia series, in the context of which they deal, of course, with the Aramaic materials from Qumran. Nickelsburg’s work on chapters 1-36 and 81-82 has appeared already,<sup>97</sup> and

<sup>93</sup> Józef T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976).

<sup>94</sup> So James C. VanderKam in his review of Milik (*JAOS* 100 [1980]: 362). Many of Milik’s theories have been rather harshly criticized; see, for example, the discussion in James C. VanderKam, “Some Major Issues in the Contemporary Study of 1 Enoch: Reflections on J. T. Milik’s *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (1976),” *Maarav* 3 (1982): 85-97.

<sup>95</sup> Michael A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (in consultation with Edward Ullendorff; Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press and Oxford University Press, 1978). See the review by VanderKam in *JAOS* 101 (1981): 412-14.

<sup>96</sup> VanderKam collaborated with Matthew Black on *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes* (with an appendix on the ‘Astronomical’ chapters [72-82] by Otto Neugebauer; SVTP 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985). This was reviewed rather negatively by Nickelsburg in *JBL* 107 (1988): 342-4.

<sup>97</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary*. The commentary is very heavy on textual discussions, taking into account the Aramaic, Greek, and Ethiopic versions. Much of the discussion regarding the book has focused on some of the broader literary theories propounded by Nickelsburg, including his argument that the original form of the work was a testament, that the *Animal “Vision”* is not apocalyptic, and that chapters 81-82 originally belonged together with 1-36. See especially Neusner and Avery-Peck, *George W. E. Nickelsburg in Per-*



a translation of the entire book based on their respective work has been published, as well.<sup>98</sup> VanderKam has also published a survey of Enoch-related literature more broadly, including a survey of the appearances he makes elsewhere in Qumran literature.<sup>99</sup>

The most important contribution the Aramaic texts themselves have made to the study of Enoch is with regard to the dating of the book's component parts. Various theories have been propounded, beginning with Milik's intricate and widely-criticized hypotheses;<sup>100</sup> an excellent survey of the evidence and the literature has been penned by García Martínez.<sup>101</sup> The hypothesis that attracted the most negative attention was probably Milik's hypothesis regarding the *Book of Parables* (37-71): based in large part on the fact that no fragments of this section were found at Qumran (and do not survive in Greek either), Milik argued that they were a much later Christian composition. This has been roundly rejected.<sup>102</sup>

At a more basic level, however, Milik demonstrated that the second century BCE Aramaic texts were already composite, and that the earliest Enochic traditions, therefore, went back as far as the third century BCE at the latest. In light of this finding, a debate has ensued on whether there was such a thing as "Enochic Judaism," in which Enoch was seen as independent from, and to some extent as a competitor of, Moses. This position has been rejected in North America by the prominent scholar of early Christianity

---

*spective*, 2:365-423, with contributions by Patrick Tiller, John Collins, James VanderKam, David Suter, and Ithamar Gruenwald, and a response by Nickelsburg.

<sup>98</sup> George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004).

<sup>99</sup> James C. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Studies on the Personalities of the Old Testament; Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995), esp. 121-9 on other texts from Qumran. His earlier publication, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984) touches occasionally on the Aramaic texts as well. A fuller discussion of this literature is provided in VanderKam's contribution to this volume.

<sup>100</sup> See the appreciative but skeptical reaction of Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Implications of the New Enoch Literature from Qumran," *TS* 38 (1973): 332-45 (esp. the summary of Milik's views on "the development of Enochic literature" on 337-41 and Fitzmyer's analysis on 341-4).

<sup>101</sup> García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 45-96.

<sup>102</sup> The question of date and provenance is of particular importance because the title "son of man" appears in this section, but not elsewhere in *Enoch*. For discussion of the consensus against Milik, see James H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament: Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 88-90, and cf. VanderKam's conclusion, "[Milik's] view has not carried the day. Rather, the contemporary debate has turned around two options: the Similitudes were composed in the first century B.C.E. or the first (possibly the beginning of the second) century C.E." (*Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 132).

Ed Sanders, but promoted by George Nickelsburg and recently supported by John Collins.<sup>103</sup>

With regard to the language of the Aramaic fragments, the discussion has been more muted. American expatriate Michael Sokoloff contributed the most important study of the language of the Enoch texts, and nothing similar has appeared in his former home continent.<sup>104</sup> On the lexical side, Baruch Levine drew attention to some of the vocabulary (דגל, סרך, and מסרת) in the texts related to astronomical themes.<sup>105</sup> Stanislav Segert wrote an important study of the Aramaic in the texts in a 1992 volume in honor of Milik.<sup>106</sup> He put the language in its Aramaic context, comparing it extensively to the Aramaic text in Demotic script (Papyrus Amherst 63) that had been partially published by Richard Steiner and Charles Nims in the 1980s as well as to other Aramaic literature of roughly contemporaneous origin, such as the book of Daniel. He drew attention, for example, to the verb דגה “to shine,” found in Aramaic *Enoch* and in Papyrus Amherst 63 to refer specifically to the sun’s first light in the morning.<sup>107</sup> More generally, he showed the broad Aramaic (and even broader Northwest Semitic) literary tradition to which the Enoch texts belonged.

There have been a limited number of studies focused on the details of Milik’s textual readings and reconstructions, especially by scholars interested in the relationship between the different versions that have come down from antiquity. Ephraim Isaac, who did not use the Aramaic texts in his own translation,<sup>108</sup> has argued that the readings of the Aramaic could be improved by better use of the Ethiopic evidence.<sup>109</sup> Erik Larson has shown

<sup>103</sup> Ed P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 346-62; George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Enochic Wisdom: An Alternative to the Mosaic Torah?” in Jodi Magness and Seymour J. Gitin, eds., *Hesed ve-Emet: Studies in Honor of Ernest S. Frerichs* (BJS 320; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 123-32; *1 Enoch*, 50-56; John J. Collins, “How Distinctive was Enochic Judaism?” *Meghillot* 5-6 (2008): \*17-\*34.

<sup>104</sup> Michael Sokoloff, “Notes on the Aramaic Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 4,” *Maarav* 1 (1978-1979): 197-224.

<sup>105</sup> Baruch A. Levine, “From the Aramaic Enoch Fragments: The Semantics of Cosmography,” *JJS* 33 (1982): 311-26.

<sup>106</sup> Stanislav Segert, “Parallelistic Structures in the Aramaic Enoch Fragments,” in Kaperá, *Intertestamental Essays in Honour of Józef Tadeusz Milik*, 187-203.

<sup>107</sup> Segert, “Parallelistic Structures,” 192-3.

<sup>108</sup> Ephraim Isaac, “1 Enoch: A New Translation and Introduction,” in James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 1:5-89.

<sup>109</sup> Ephraim Isaac, “The oldest Ethiopic Manuscript (K-9) of the Book of Enoch and Recent Studies of the Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4,” in David M. Golomb, ed., with the assistance of Susan T. Hollis, “*Working with No Data*”: *Semitic and Egyptian Studies Presented to Thomas O. Lambdin* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987), 195-207; “Textual

(contra Milik), on the basis of close comparison between the Aramaic and Greek versions of Enoch, that there is no evidence of multiple recensions of the book(s) of Enoch within the Aramaic fragments.<sup>110</sup> Finally, in the realm of intellectual history, Dorothy Peters has argued that within the Aramaic texts of *Enoch*, we may discern a certain wariness about the character of Noah and a concomitant idealization of Enoch. She speculates that this may have been because of perceived potential connections between Noah and Mesopotamian flood heroes and giants,<sup>111</sup> an idea which relates to some earlier hypotheses raised by John Reeves, as well.<sup>112</sup>

*Aramaic Levi Document (ALD: 1Q21; 4Q213-4Q214b)*

Whereas Enoch had been fully known, and the contribution of the Aramaic texts from Qumran consisted of the first fragments to survive in its original language, the *Aramaic Levi Document*<sup>113</sup> was known only in a fragmentary state before the Qumran finds. It was partially known since the end of the nineteenth century, when pieces were discovered in the Cairo Geniza and published by Pass and Arendzen, and Charles and Cowley.<sup>114</sup> The substan-

---

Problems in 4QEnoch,” in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years*, 426-33. Milik’s undervaluation of the Ethiopic version was also the subject of some of the early reviews; cf., e.g., Edward Ullendorff and Michael Knibb in *BSOAS* 40 (1977): 601-2.

<sup>110</sup> Erik Larson, “The Relation Between the Greek and Aramaic Texts of Enoch,” in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years*, 434-44. Larson wrote his Ph.D. thesis at New York University on “Translating Enoch: From Aramaic into Greek” under Lawrence Schiffman.

<sup>111</sup> Dorothy M. Peters, “The Tension between Enoch and Noah in the Aramaic Enoch Texts at Qumran,” *Hen* 29 (2007): 11-29; *Noah Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conversations and Controversies of Antiquity* (SBLEJL 26; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 29-61.

<sup>112</sup> John C. Reeves, “Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants?” *JBL* 112 (1993): 110-15.

<sup>113</sup> The text was formerly known as the “Aramaic Testament of Levi,” because of its apparent relationship to the later Greek *Testament of Levi*, one of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* in the so-called Pseudepigrapha. As has now been pointed out by many, however, the Aramaic text shows no sign of actually having been a testament. Robert A. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi* (SBLEJL 9; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), the revision of his dissertation at the University of Notre Dame under VanderKam, called the text simply “Aramaic Levi.” The name *Aramaic Levi Document* was employed by others, especially Greenfield and Stone, and we shall follow that nomenclature, abbreviating it as ALD. For the DJD edition, see Jonas C. Greenfield and Michael E. Stone, “Aramaic Levi Document,” in George Brooke et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD XXII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 1-72; for a thorough commentary, see Jonas C. Greenfield, Michael E. Stone and Esther Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary* (SVTP 19; Leiden: Brill, 2004).

<sup>114</sup> H. L. Pass and J. Arendzen, “Fragment of an Aramaic Text of the Testament of Levi,” *JQR* (O.S.) 12 (1900): 651-61; R. H. Charles and A. Cowley, “An Early Source of

tial sections discovered at Qumran have allowed a relatively long, if still fragmentary, text to be pieced together.<sup>115</sup> The most substantial contribution to this endeavor on the western shores of the Atlantic was chapters 2-3 in Robert Kugler's monograph on the development of the traditions about Levi in Second Temple times. Utilizing the fragments from the Geniza and Qumran (as well as the Greek text from Mount Athos, which was shown by Charles a century ago to preserve elements paralleled only in the Aramaic texts<sup>116</sup>), Kugler was able to synthesize a running text and describe its structure and contents.<sup>117</sup>

Kugler's most important methodological contribution was to emphasize that it was improper to reconstruct ALD on the basis of the later *Testament of Levi*: since the *Testament* had used ALD as a source for its own reworking, it could provide no evidence for the macrostructure of the earlier text. Some of Kugler's detailed results were also noteworthy. He argued that there was in fact only one vision in the text, rather than two or more as understood by others.<sup>118</sup> He placed the Shechem incident prior to the prayer of Levi on the basis of the first line in 4Q213 (preserved more fully in the Greek Mount Athos text), which described Levi as washing himself in pure water before praying. Kugler reasonably understood this to be a means of purification after the violence of Genesis 34. More recently, however, Kugler has argued that the medieval texts (from the Cairo Geniza and the Mount Athos monastery) may not be direct descendants of the Qumran text, after all. Instead, he suggests that an earlier Levi text had been subtly modified by the Qumran community to produce the text found there.<sup>119</sup> He points out that this suggestion would have broad implications regarding not merely the authorship of this text, but also the Qumran community and the nature of the library found there.

---

the Testaments of the Patriarchs," *JQR* (O.S.) 19 (1907): 566-83. More recently, see the full discussion in Émile Puech, "Le 'Testament de Lévi' en araméen de la Geniza du Caire," *RevQ* 20 (2002): 511-56.

<sup>115</sup> For a history of the relevant publications, see Greenfield, Stone and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 1-6; Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 25-27.

<sup>116</sup> R. H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908), 245-56.

<sup>117</sup> Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 34-59; see also his detailed analysis on pp. 61-138.

<sup>118</sup> This has been subjected to criticism by James Kugel, "How Old is the *Aramaic Levi Document*?" *DSD* 14 (2007): 291-312.

<sup>119</sup> Robert A. Kugler, "Whose Scripture? Whose Community? Reflections on the Dead Sea Scrolls Then and Now, By Way of Aramaic Levi," *DSD* 15 (2008): 5-23. Kugler had argued earlier that, although he could not prove the case, there are "tantalizing hints" within ALD which support Milik's suggestion that the text was Samaritan in origin ("Some Further Evidence for the Samaritan Provenance of Aramaic Levi [1QTestLevi; 4QTestLevi]," *RevQ* 17 [1996]: 351-8).

One of the more thoroughly debated issues regarding ALD is that of its relationship with *Jubilees*. James L. Kugel argued that ALD utilized *Jubilees* directly. In Kugel's reconstruction, furthermore, ALD utilized two hypothetical sources which he names "Levi's Apocalypse" and "Levi's Priestly Initiation," and *Jubilees* itself also made use of "Levi's Priestly Initiation" (although it did not know of "Levi's Apocalypse").<sup>120</sup> Kugler, on the other hand, claimed that *Jubilees* was dependent on ALD.<sup>121</sup> James VanderKam found neither position compelling, and adopted the view that ALD was earlier, but that the two works were not genetically related and drew independently on common traditions.<sup>122</sup> Kugel has recently returned to this topic, arguing cogently that (a) ALD, although very likely based on an earlier "Levi" text, could only have been written after the Hasmonean rise to power, since it refers to Levi as the forebear of the monarchy; (b) *Jubilees* was almost certainly written earlier than this; (c) on internal grounds, it appears that ALD draws on *Jubilees* directly.<sup>123</sup> It appears that this issue has not yet been settled.

*Tobit* (4Q196-4Q200 [4QpapTob<sup>a</sup> ar; 4QTob<sup>b-d</sup> ar; 4QTob<sup>e</sup>])

Fragments of five manuscripts of Tobit were found at Qumran, four Aramaic (4Q196-4Q199) and one Hebrew (4Q200), and they were all eventually assigned to Fitzmyer for publication. He published them in DJD XIX, and wrote a comprehensive article discussing the fragments as a corpus,<sup>124</sup> as well as a retrospective essay exploring the ways in which the Qumran texts of Tobit affected the modern understanding of the book.<sup>125</sup> This work

<sup>120</sup> James Kugel, "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings," *HTR* 86 (1993): 1-64. American trained, Kugel (1945-) was Starr Professor of Hebrew Literature at Harvard University 1982-2003, and has been Professor of Bible at Bar Ilan University in Israel since 1991. His work on early biblical interpretation includes *The Bible As It Was* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997) and *Traditions of the Bible* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998). He also published an earlier article on ALD, "The Story of Dinah in the *Testament of Levi*," *HTR* 85 (1992): 1-34.

<sup>121</sup> Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 146-55.

<sup>122</sup> James C. VanderKam, "Isaac's Blessing of Levi and his Descendants in Jubilees 31," in Ulrich and Parry, *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 511-19.

<sup>123</sup> Kugel, "How Old Is the Aramaic Levi Document?"

<sup>124</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Preliminary Publication of pap4QTob<sup>a</sup> ar, Fragment 2," *Bib* 75 (1994): 220-24; "The Aramaic and Hebrew Fragments of Tobit from Qumran Cave 4," *CBQ* 57 (1995): 655-75; "196-200. 4QpapTobit<sup>a</sup> ar, 4QTobit<sup>b-d</sup> ar, and 4QTobit<sup>e</sup>," in Magen Broshi et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XIX; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 1-76.

<sup>125</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Significance of the Hebrew and Aramaic Texts of Tobit from Qumran for the Study of Tobit," in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years*, 418-25.

then led to a commentary on the book of Tobit that took into consideration all of its ancient versions.<sup>126</sup> Fitzmyer's publication of the texts also allowed others to incorporate them into their discussions of Tobit, and the first commentary to do so was that in the Anchor Bible series by Carey A. Moore, published in 1996.<sup>127</sup> Moore shared his own perceptions of how the Qumran texts altered the study of Tobit in an earlier article, as well.<sup>128</sup>

One of the key questions that Moore hoped the discovery of these fragments would resolve was the original language of the book of Tobit.<sup>129</sup> Indeed, since their publication a consensus has developed that the book was originally composed in Semitic,<sup>130</sup> but precisely which language has provoked further discussion. Michael Wise (as well as Klaus Beyer) argued that the book was originally written in Hebrew, and thence translated into Aramaic.<sup>131</sup> This was disputed by Edward Cook, who dispensed with Wise's arguments in a convincing fashion, as well as by Fitzmyer.<sup>132</sup> Cook and Fitzmyer both argued that the book was originally composed in Aramaic, and that in this case the Hebrew was a translation. The fact that an Aramaic work would be translated into Hebrew in late antiquity may be sociolinguistically significant.

Cook also used the Aramaic and the Greek versions for a methodologically careful study, in which he examined the two side-by-side, looking for evidence of mistranslations.<sup>133</sup> This is an important issue for New Testament scholarship, because ever since Charles Cutler Torrey there has been a view that difficult passages in the Gospels can be explained on the assumption that the Greek is a mistranslation of an Aramaic original.<sup>134</sup> Cook's

<sup>126</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Tobit* (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003).

<sup>127</sup> Carey A. Moore, *Tobit* (AB 40A; New York: Doubleday, 1996). Moore, who taught at Gettysburg College, received his Ph.D. at Johns Hopkins University, for his dissertation on "The Greek Text of Esther."

<sup>128</sup> Carey A. Moore, "Scholarly Issues in the Book of Tobit Before Qumran and After: An Assessment," *JSP* 5 (1989): 65-81.

<sup>129</sup> For further discussion of this issue, see Richard A. Spencer, "The Book of Tobit in Recent Research," *CurBS* 7 (1999): 171-2.

<sup>130</sup> For dissenting views, see Spencer's discussion (Spencer, "The Book of Tobit," 171-2).

<sup>131</sup> Michael O. Wise, "A Note on 4Q196 (PapTob Ar<sup>a</sup>) and Tobit I 22," *VT* 43 (1993): 566-70.

<sup>132</sup> Edward Cook, "Our Translated Tobit," in Kevin J. Cathcart and Michael Maher, eds., *Targumic and Cognate Studies: Essays in Honour of Martin McNamara* (JSOTSup 230; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 153-62; Fitzmyer, "Hebrew and Aramaic Texts of Tobit from Qumran," 420-23.

<sup>133</sup> Cook, "Our Translated Tobit."

<sup>134</sup> Charles C. Torrey, *Our Translated Gospels: Some of the Evidence* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1936).

article on “our translated Tobit” therefore belongs to the “empirical models” genre of biblical scholarship.<sup>135</sup> His comparison showed that there was little evidence for the Greek translator misunderstanding the Aramaic original, and that therefore it was unlikely that the translator of the Gospels committed very many blunders, either.

Nickelsburg examined Tobit in search of the origins of the story.<sup>136</sup> He suggested five different types of sources utilized by the author: the Hebrew Bible, folklore, ‘tales of persecuted courtiers’ (citing Ahiqar as an example), Homer’s *Odyssey* (specifically the Telemachus cycle), and Enochic literature. He then speculated about the process of the book’s composition, which of course requires solid philological knowledge, a thorough understanding of the intellectual and cultural currents of the time, and a healthy imagination—a combination at which North American scholars seem to excel.

#### 4Q550

When Józef Milik in 1992 announced the publication of the fragments of 4Q550, which he named *Proto-Esther*,<sup>137</sup> there was swift reaction in North American circles, on two major fronts. First, it was argued by many that the six fragments which Milik saw as one text actually derived from at least two different texts (fragment f was the one most easily severed). Second, the relationship between these fragments and the biblical book of Esther was questioned repeatedly.

Sidnie White Crawford dealt with the second issue first. Instead of assuming that 4Q550 was a direct forerunner to the Masoretic Text of Esther, she proposed a different, more complex, model of literary relationship.

---

<sup>135</sup> Compare the similar methodology utilized by Stephen A. Kaufman, “Dating the Language of the Palestinian Targums and Their Use in the Study of First Century CE Texts,” in Derek R. G. Beattie and Martin J. McNamara, eds., *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 118-41, in which Kaufman used the Qumran and medieval versions of *Tobit* as empirical models to investigate how such texts were linguistically updated throughout the centuries. More generally, compare the work of Jeffrey H. Tigay, “The Evolution of the Pentateuchal Narratives in the Light of the Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic,” in Jeffrey H. Tigay, ed., *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 21-52, as well as the other essays in that volume and Tigay’s earlier book on the Gilgamesh Epic. Another essay of Kaufman’s (“The Temple Scroll and Higher Criticism,” *HUCA* 53 [1983]: 29-43) utilizes Qumran materials as the empirical evidence to test theories regarding biblical texts.

<sup>136</sup> George W. E. Nickelsburg, “The Search for Tobit’s Mixed Ancestry: A Historical and Hermeneutical Odyssey,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 339-49.

<sup>137</sup> Józef T. Milik, “Les modèles araméens du livre d’Esther dans la grotte 4 de Qumrân,” *RevQ* 15 (1991-1992): 321-409.



Building on the earlier work regarding the redaction history of Esther by David Clines and Michael Fox in particular, White Crawford argued that 4Q550 could be one of several sets of tales which developed out of the material from which the pre-Masoretic Text of Esther was also drawn.<sup>138</sup> In particular, 4Q550 would have been part of a cycle of stories which she named “Tales of the Persian Court,” which served as a source for “Proto-Esther,” which itself served as a source both for the Masoretic Text of Esther and the version of Esther translated in the Alpha Text.<sup>139</sup>

The theory of a collection of stories related to the Persian court, and specifically to courtiers within it, was revisited by White Crawford in a later study.<sup>140</sup> Accepting the separation of 4Q550f from the remaining fragments, she proposed assigning 4Q550a-e to a more general category of “royal courtier tales.” To this group she assigned stories such as the Joseph story in Genesis 37-50 and Ahiqar, and avers that the genre “may be” pre-Exilic. With such a wide range of stories, however, it becomes unclear what the benefit of such a definition is. Kristin De Troyer (briefly at Claremont, now at St. Andrews) also discussed 4Q550 in the context of Persian court tales, and suggested refining the category further, naming it “Tales of the court of Darius I.”<sup>141</sup> This faces obvious difficulties if Esther is supposed to be related somehow to this genre.

John Collins and Deborah Green rejected Milik’s thesis more strongly. They argued that the prevailing notion seemed to be that all texts found at Qumran had to be identified as either sectarian or somehow biblically related, but that methodologically this was simply a fallacy.<sup>142</sup> Relying further on the fact that fragment f was unrelated to fragments a-e, they concluded

<sup>138</sup> Sidnie White Crawford, “Has ‘Esther’ Been Found at Qumran? 4QProto-Esther and the ‘Esther’ Corpus,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 307-25.

<sup>139</sup> The relationship between the Greek Alpha Text and the Masoretic Text of Esther was the subject of the contributions of Clines and Fox; they both argued that the Alpha Text was translated from a pre-Masoretic Text version of the book. See David J. A. Clines, *The Esther Scroll: The Story of the Story* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), and Michael V. Fox, *The Redaction of the Books of Esther: On Reading Composite Texts* (SBLMS 40; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991).

<sup>140</sup> Sidnie White Crawford, “4QTales of the Persian Court (4Q550a-e) and Its Relation to Biblical Royal Courtier Tales, Especially Esther, Daniel and Joseph,” in Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov, eds., *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (London: British Library, 2002), 121-37.

<sup>141</sup> Kristin De Troyer, “Once More, the So-called Esther Fragments of Cave 4,” *RevQ* 19 (2000): 401-22.

<sup>142</sup> John J. Collins and Deborah A. Green, “The Tales from the Persian Court (4Q550a-e),” in Bernd Kollmann, Wolfgang Reinbold, and Annette Steudel, eds., *Antikes Judentum und frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 49.



that the parallels between 4Q550a-e and biblical Esther were “of limited significance.”<sup>143</sup> Instead, this text and others from Qumran should be seen as part of what was apparently a large body of Aramaic literature that existed in antiquity and is now mostly lost.

Finally, Wechsler argued for an even more radical reevaluation, arguing that half of the 4Q550 texts had nothing to do with the Esther materials at all, and that the other half were written after the Masoretic Text of Esther, and presupposed that story.<sup>144</sup> He divided the six fragments into three texts, and provided an edition and commentary for two of them: he labeled the first (consisting of fragments a-c) “4QEsther Prequel,” and the second (fragments d and e) “4QEzra-Nehemiah Sequel.”

Matters currently seem to be in a state of flux. Very important methodologically is the point made by Collins and Green that not all Qumran texts which are not sectarian need to somehow be related to the Bible. It seems difficult nonetheless to resist the temptation to see in these texts some connection to the Esther story and other Persian-era Jewish literature. Kaufman, for one, still believes that the fragments of 4Q550 are relevant (if only indirectly) to the questions of the *origins* of the Masoretic Text of Esther.<sup>145</sup>

### *Minor Texts*

Finally, we turn to some of the Aramaic texts that have not engendered extended discussion, but to whose study North American scholars have made important contributions. Edward Cook wrote an important article on the “Testament of Kohath,” which included an edition that improved on Puech’s, a commentary focused primarily on philological and linguistic matters but including also aspects of intellectual history the text raised, and a discussion of the implications of the text’s language for linguistic dating more generally.<sup>146</sup>

Michael Wise has published a number of long textual studies on relatively orphaned texts. His study of 4Q318, an “Aramaic brontologion,” provided an edition of the text, with long discussions of possible restorations, and an analysis of the zodiac traditions utilized in the text in light

<sup>143</sup> Collins and Green, “Tales.”

<sup>144</sup> Michael G. Wechsler, “Two Para-Biblical Novellae from Qumran Cave 4: A Reevaluation of 4Q550,” *DSD* 7 (2000): 130-72.

<sup>145</sup> Stephen A. Kaufman, “Recent Contributions of Aramaic Studies to Biblical Hebrew Philology and the Exegesis of the Hebrew Bible,” in André Lemaire, ed., *Congress Volume: Basel, 2001* (VTSup 92; Boston: Brill, 2002), 49.

<sup>146</sup> Edward M. Cook, “Remarks on the Testament of Kohath from Qumran Cave 4,” *JJS* 44 (1993): 205-19.

of Mesopotamian and especially Hellenistic astrological thought.<sup>147</sup> He co-authored with Douglas Penney a study of 4Q560, which they deciphered as a magical incantation that reflected Greco-Roman magical beliefs. The authors showed through detailed analysis of the Aramaic text, however, that 4Q560 reveals the debt owed by Aramaic culture (especially in the realm of magic) to Mesopotamian forebears. Based on the material aspects of the text, they argued that it was a “recipe book” for a “Jewish magician,” who could consult it when in need of a spell for a particular occasion.<sup>148</sup>

Another of Wise’s studies dealt with 4Q559, a chronographic text. After providing a full edition of the text with extensive restoration and philological argumentation, Wise dealt at length with three of the problems with which, in his view, the text dealt: the length of the Israelites’ sojourn in Egypt, the chronology of events during the Israelites’ stay in the desert, and the chronology of the period of the Judges. In order to situate the text properly within its intellectual context, Wise’s article consists of wide-ranging discussions of ancient approaches to these problems, taking into account the full range of early biblical interpretation.<sup>149</sup>

Interestingly, and probably not coincidentally, both Cook and Wise have argued on the basis of these “minor” texts that the regnant views of linguistic typologies, in which texts can be dated based on tabulating dialectal features in them, are without basis.<sup>150</sup> Wise also questioned the stranglehold which Cross’s paleographic work had on the question of dating texts, calling it “a tautological absurdity,”<sup>151</sup> a position that he has continued to hold. It would seem that intensive involvement with texts other than the major ones that everyone studies has allowed these scholars a broader perspective on the variety of Aramaic language and literature found at Qumran. This brings us to the question of the Hebrew and Aramaic languages more generally.

<sup>147</sup> Wise, *Thunder in Gemini*, 13-50.

<sup>148</sup> Douglas L. Penney and Michael O. Wise, “By the Power of Beelzebub: An Aramaic Incantation Formula from Qumran (4Q560),” *JBL* 113 (1994): 627-50. See also Wise and Penney, “4Q560 (Exorcism ar),” in Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader: Part 6: Additional Genres and Unclassified Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 226-7.

<sup>149</sup> Michael O. Wise, “To Know the Times and the Seasons: A Study of the Aramaic Chronograph 4Q559,” *JSP* 15 (1997): 3-51.

<sup>150</sup> Compare Cook, “Remarks on the Testament of Kohath,” 216-19, and Wise, “Accidents and Accidence,” 151.

<sup>151</sup> Eisenman and Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, 12-13.

*Hebrew and Aramaic Languages**Hebrew Language 1: Grammar and Lexicography*

Studies of the Hebrew of the Qumran texts can be divided into two categories: grammatical studies and sociolinguistic studies. In the first area, the North American contribution has been notably small. Some early lexicographical work focused, understandably, on words which held particular significance for understanding the larger themes in the Scrolls. For example, Isaac Rabinowitz studied the word פֶּשֶׁר.<sup>152</sup> On the grammatical side, Mark Smith analyzed some issues in verbal syntax as part of his larger diachronic project.<sup>153</sup>

One measure of recent activity is to survey the contents of the three published volumes of the symposium series on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and related literature initiated in Leiden in 1995 by Takamitsu Muraoka.<sup>154</sup> In the first two volumes, of the 27 articles all together, two were by a single scholar working in North America, Mark Smith. In the third volume, of the 20 essays, 3 were by North American scholars: Smith was joined by William Schniedewind, who wrote a sociolinguistically oriented essay (see below), and James Kugel, who studied a question in intellectual history through the analysis of some key terms. In total, then, 5 out of 47 articles (just over 10%) of the articles were by North Americans; 3 out of the 5 were by one individual.

Fortunately for the state of North American scholarship, Smith's contributions are noteworthy for their thoroughness. The methodology can be exemplified by his contribution to the *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages* volume, in which he studied the use of the "predicative participle" in pre-mishnaic Hebrew; was the participle used as a verb in Hebrew earlier than the Mish-

<sup>152</sup> Isaac Rabinowitz, "Peshar, pittaron': Its Biblical Meaning and Its Significance in the Qumran Literature," *RevQ* 8 (1973): 219-32.

<sup>153</sup> Mark S. Smith, "Converted and Unconverted Perfect and Imperfect Forms in the Literature of Qumran," *BASOR* 284 (1991): 1-16 and "The Waw-Consecutive at Qumran," *ZAH* 4 (1991): 161-4. Smith (1956-) holds masters degrees in theology from both the Catholic University of America and the Harvard Divinity School, and a Ph.D. from Yale. Currently Professor of Bible and Ancient Near Eastern Studies at New York University, his research interests range from Ugaritic texts to Hebrew philology to the development of Israelite religion, in addition to Qumran studies.

<sup>154</sup> Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde, eds., *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (STDJ 26; Leiden: Brill, 1997); *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages* (STDJ 33; Leiden: Brill, 1999); *Diggers at the Well* (STDJ 36; Leiden: Brill, 2000).

nah?<sup>155</sup> Utilizing the corpora of Biblical Hebrew and Qumran Hebrew, he was able to show that it clearly was, and that even in pre-Exilic Hebrew the participle appeared as a verb *in direct discourse*. Here and in his other studies, Smith shows a propensity to crunch large amounts of data and to integrate them into a cohesive picture, taking into account both diachronic change and nuanced synchronic variation. In other studies, Smith has applied similar methodology to the question of the *waw* consecutive verbal forms<sup>156</sup> and the use of the infinitive absolute as a verbal form.<sup>157</sup>

Martin Abegg wrote an overview of the Hebrew language at Qumran in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years*. The article dealt exclusively with morphology (including morphosyntactic issues such as the use of the *waw* consecutive forms and infinitives), and was oriented towards teachers of Biblical Hebrew, to enable them to integrate Qumran Hebrew data into their lectures.<sup>158</sup> For this reason, he often refers to Qimron's slim grammar for further details. Details in the grammar and lexicography of Qumran Hebrew have been studied by North American scholars Paul-Eugène Dion and Michael O'Connor.<sup>159</sup>

### *Hebrew Language 2: Sociolinguistics*

In the area of the sociolinguistics of Qumran, Americans have contributed a characteristic emphasis on cultural theory and interdisciplinary sophistication to address the question of the origins and social background of the dialect of Hebrew within the Qumran texts. Among Israeli scholars this topic has been debated regularly, the question being whether Qumran Hebrew

<sup>155</sup> Mark S. Smith, "Grammatically Speaking: The Participle as a Main Verb of Clauses (Predicative Participle) in Direct Discourse and Narrative in Pre-Mishnaic Hebrew," in Muraoka and Elwolde, *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages*, 278-332.

<sup>156</sup> Mark S. Smith, *The Origins and Development of the Waw-Consecutive: Northwest Semitic Evidence from Ugarit to Qumran* (HSS 39; Atlanta: Scholars Press 1991), 35-63; see the summary in Abegg, "The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls," 1:337-8.

<sup>157</sup> Mark S. Smith, "The Infinitive Absolute as Predicative Verb in Ben Sira and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey," in Muraoka and Elwolde, *Diggers at the Well*, 256-67.

<sup>158</sup> Abegg, "The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls," 1.325-58. Abegg (1950-) is Ben Zion Wacholder Professor of Dead Sea Scroll studies at Trinity Western University, holder of a chair named for his Ph.D. *Doktorvater* at Hebrew Union College where he wrote his dissertation on the *War Scroll* from Qumran Caves 1 and 4. He is co-director of the Dead Sea Scrolls Institute at Trinity Western, and has been a major contributor to Qumran scholarship since the 1990s.

<sup>159</sup> Paul-Eugène Dion, "The Hebrew Particle ׀ in the Paraenetic Part of the 'Damasus Document'," *RevQ* 39 (1977): 197-212; Michael P. O'Connor, "Biblical Hebrew Lexicography: ׀ 'children, dependents' in Biblical and Qumranic Hebrew," *JNSL* 25 (1999): 25-40.

was a spoken dialect or a literary artifact.<sup>160</sup> Americans asked a different question: in a society that is at best bilingual, and probably predominantly Aramaic-speaking,<sup>161</sup> why write in Hebrew at all?<sup>162</sup>

William Schniedewind and Steven Weitzman both argued that there were ideological considerations involved.<sup>163</sup> Schniedewind argued (following an earlier suggestion of Chaim Rabin) that the power of Hebrew at Qumran was its use as an “anti-language,” a conscious rejection of the “modern” dialect known to us as Mishnaic Hebrew, and a conscious attempt to recapture the past. Schniedewind’s strength (here and elsewhere) is his use of theoretical models, appropriately applied to the ancient data, to arrive at new insights.<sup>164</sup> Weitzman pointed out that this needed to be buttressed with textual evidence from Qumran itself, so he studied two texts (4Q464 and *Jubilees*) known to have been read at Qumran, which offer statements about the value of Hebrew. Based on those passages, Weitzman was able to suggest that the use of Hebrew by the Qumran community was “one way in which it affirmed its identity as a transcendent community, a symbolic gesture of its eternally valid status in a world of competing ideologies and languages.”<sup>165</sup>

Taken together, the contributions of Schniedewind and Weitzman provide a compelling combination of theory and data, and demonstrate the

<sup>160</sup> See the views of Morag, Qimron, Blau, Hurvitz, and Fassberg, discussed in Fassberg’s chapter in this volume.

<sup>161</sup> Evidence for this came early, from Kutscher’s study of the *Great Isaiah Scroll* (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>), which he convincingly showed to be suffused with Aramaisms: E. Yechezkel Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1 Q Isa)* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1959) (Hebrew); also published under the same title in STDJ 6-6a (Leiden: Brill, 1974-1979); see also the article by Weitzman cited in n. 163 below.

<sup>162</sup> Stanislav Segert, “Die Sprachenfragen in der Qumrangemeinschaft,” in Hans Bardtke, ed., *Qumrān-Probleme: Vorträge* (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft 42; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963), 315-29, had earlier observed that in terms of content, the Aramaic texts seemed to not be polemically sectarian as the Hebrew texts are, which suggests that they are non-Qumran texts. Since it is unlikely that the Qumran group would be acquiring and studying rivals’ compositions, this probably indicates that the texts antedate the major settlement at Qumran.

<sup>163</sup> Steven Weitzman, “Why did the Qumran Community Write in Hebrew?” *JAOS* 119 (1999): 35-45; William Schniedewind, “Qumran Hebrew as an Antilanguage,” *JBL* 118 (1999): 235-52; “Linguistic Ideology in Qumran Hebrew,” in Muraoka and Elwolde, *Diggers at the Well*, 245-55; “Prolegomena for the Sociolinguistics of Classical Hebrew,” *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 5 (2004-2005). Cited 24 January 2011 online: [http://www.arts.ualberta.ca/JHS/Articles/article\\_36.htm](http://www.arts.ualberta.ca/JHS/Articles/article_36.htm).

<sup>164</sup> It should be noted that there are some implausible details in Schniedewind’s arguments, which do not on their own affect the theoretical perspective. For example, is it really possible that the Qumran scribes reconstructed the forms אַבְרָהָם etc. using historical linguistic methodology, as is claimed on p. 245 of Schniedewind’s *JBL* article?

<sup>165</sup> Weitzman, “Why Write in Hebrew?” 45.

ideological value of the Hebrew language at Qumran. The latest North American entrant into the field, Gary Rendsburg, writes that he has been converted to their position.<sup>166</sup>

*Aramaic Language 1: Grammar and Lexicography*

The study of the Aramaic of Qumran has not been a particularly popular field in North America, although it is possible that this is merely an example of the status of Semitics in America more generally. We have referred above to the contributions of Joseph Fitzmyer via the grammatical appendix to his successive editions of the *Genesis Apocryphon* and other writings. Another leading American Aramaist, Stephen Kaufman, has been an active participant in the field, although his publications devoted exclusively to Qumran have been limited.<sup>167</sup> His influence is especially felt in the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project, which he heads and which covers all Aramaic texts from the earliest through Late Jewish Literary Aramaic.<sup>168</sup>

Edward Cook provided an overview of the grammar of Qumran Aramaic.<sup>169</sup> It is a historically oriented discussion, and deals primarily with morphological questions; in the last two pages he discusses briefly some aspects of the Qumran Aramaic verbal system. In his study of the *Aramaic Testament of Kohath*, Cook offers an important note regarding the *qutl* nouns in Qumran Aramaic. Whereas Muraoka had argued that they were realized \**qútal* in this dialect,<sup>170</sup> Cook was able to show on the basis of the spelling קישוטי(א) that Kutscher had been correct in positing a realization \**qutul* (or \**qotol*);<sup>171</sup> Cook further pointed out that the same conclusion

<sup>166</sup> Gary A. Rendsburg, "Language at Qumran (With a Trial Cut [1QS])," in Schiffman and Tzoref, *The Dead Sea Scrolls at 60: Scholarly Contributions by New York University Faculty and Alumni*, 217-46; we thank Gary Rendsburg for sharing a pre-publication draft of his article with us.

<sup>167</sup> See above, n. 39.

<sup>168</sup> For a recent survey of the project, see Stephen A. Kaufman, "The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project and Twenty-First Century Aramaic Lexicography: Status and Prospects," in Holger Gzella and Margaretha L. Folmer, eds., *Aramaic in Its Historical and Linguistic Setting* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2008), 353-71. The *Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon* (CAL) contains within its lexicon (now in outline form) a complete treatment of the Qumran Aramaic vocabulary, and within its database all the Qumran Aramaic texts with lexical tagging, amounting to a complete text edition.

<sup>169</sup> Edward M. Cook, "The Aramaic of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Flint and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years*, 1:359-78.

<sup>170</sup> Takamitsu Muraoka, "Segolate Nouns in Biblical and Other Aramaic Dialects," *JAOS* 96 (1976): 231-2.

<sup>171</sup> E. Yechezkel Kutscher, "The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I," *Or* 38 (1970): 181; Cook, "Remarks on the Testament of Kohath," 208-9.

ought to have been reached on the basis of the alternate spelling קשוט, קושט, קשט and קשט in the Enoch texts. The same article contains a full grammatical analysis of the language of that text.

There have been few other contributions by North American scholars in this area.<sup>172</sup>

### *Aramaic Language 2: Dialectology*

Study of the diachronic development of the Aramaic dialects was of course reinvigorated and thoroughly revised by the data available in the Qumran texts. Fitzmyer brought these questions to the fore early on, and in the first edition of his commentary on the *Genesis Apocryphon* he penned what must be one of the most influential footnotes within Aramaic studies, laying out a new diachronic taxonomy of the Aramaic dialects.<sup>173</sup> (He later wrote with pride that no less an Aramaist than Yechezkel Kutscher adopted his classification.<sup>174</sup>)

Other scholars focused on the synchronic analysis of the various Aramaic dialects subsumed under Fitzmyer's new "Middle Aramaic" category. Early in Daniel Boyarin's academic career,<sup>175</sup> he made contributions to the study of Aramaic, including an important article on the Middle Aramaic dialects.<sup>176</sup> Boyarin argued that a *Stammbaum* model of language divergence

<sup>172</sup> Max Rogland, "A Note on Performative Utterances in Qumran Aramaic," *RevQ* 19 (2000): 277-80; Charles Meehan, "Some Semantic and Morpho-Syntactic Observations on Genesis Apocryphon 22:30-32," in Martin F. J. Baasten and Willem Th. van Peursen, eds., *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (OLA 118; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 341-7.

<sup>173</sup> Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I*, 19-20, n. 60. This idea was later expanded into "The Phases of the Aramaic Language," in Fitzmyer, *WACAE*, 57-84.

<sup>174</sup> Fitzmyer, "The Aramaic Levi Document," in Ulrich and Parry, *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 459, n. 30, referring to Kutscher's article, "Aramaic," in Thomas A. Sebeok, ed., *Current Trends in Linguistics* (The Hague: Mouton, 1970), 6:347-8.

<sup>175</sup> Boyarin (1946-) was trained as an Aramaist, writing a M.A. thesis on the verb in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic (at Columbia) and his Ph.D. on the tractate *Nazir* of the Babylonian Talmud (at the Jewish Theological Seminary), and early in his career published a number of important studies of particular dialects of Middle and Late Aramaic (notably the Aramaic of the Bavli, a field to which he continues to contribute occasionally). One of his early publications was "Aramaic Notes I: Column 36 of 11QrtgJob," *JANES* 6 (1974): 29-33. He has since written important books on rabbinic midrash, sexuality in rabbinic culture, early Christianity, martyrdom, and gender studies.

<sup>176</sup> Daniel Boyarin, "An Inquiry into the Formation of the Middle Aramaic Dialects," in Yoël Arbeitman and Allan R. Bomhard, eds., *Bono Homini Donum: Essays in Historical Linguistics in Memory of J. Alexander Kerns* (Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science. Series 4, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, vol. 16, pt. 1-2; Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1982), 613-49.



and development could not account for the Middle Aramaic dialects, and that waves of influence were necessary.<sup>177</sup> A decade later, Edward M. Cook elaborated further on this point, arguing for a dialect continuum stretching from Palestine through Persia, rather than sharply bifurcated dialects; Cook drew important (although not, in our opinion, conclusive) conclusions from these arguments regarding the origins of the “official” Targumim Onqelos and Jonathan.<sup>178</sup>

Semitist Randall Garr has also contributed to the study of Qumran Aramaic. In a thorough study of prenasalization (\*CC > nC) throughout the dialects of Aramaic, Garr showed that the data from Qumran Aramaic were generally consistent with what one would expect from a late variety of Imperial Aramaic. In one example, a *pa'el* verb is affected (הַנְּבִלִי [4QEnGiants<sup>d</sup> 2 9]), and in the *Targum of Job* there may be a semantic distinction between -אִפּ “nose” and -אִנַּפּ “face.” Otherwise, the sound change is inconsistently represented orthographically, and biforms such as מִדַּע and מִנְדַּע appear, and Qumran Aramaic is seen to reflect a still-incipient stage of the development of prenasalization.<sup>179</sup> This is a valuable contribution to the issue of the place of Qumran Aramaic within the Aramaic dialects, although it may yet be refined in light of recent studies pointing to dialectological variation within the Qumran Aramaic corpus.<sup>180</sup> The question of prenasalization might be studied with an eye toward discerning differences between various Qumran texts.

As mentioned above, a debate ensued upon the publication of the *Targum of Job*. Kaufman argued that the text was composed in an “artificial, literary Aramaic” which transcended all geographical borders (although it may be “colored by the local dialect”),<sup>181</sup> but Fitzmyer rejected this claim,

<sup>177</sup> There is an interesting parallel between this argument and Boyarin’s later work on early Judaism and Christianity. In both he rejects the assumptions of tree structures, wherein there is a point of divergence after which the various branches of the family tree are independent and autonomous, and instead argues that even after divergence, the “branches” (whether religious groups or dialects) continue to affect each other deeply.

<sup>178</sup> Edward M. Cook, “Qumran Aramaic and Aramaic Dialectology,” in Muraoka, *Studies in Qumran Aramaic*, 1-21; “A New Perspective on the Language of Onqelos and Jonathan,” in Beattie and McNamara, *The Aramaic Bible*, 142-56. For his current position, see “The Problem of the Dialect of Onkelos,” in Edward M. Cook, *A Glossary of Targum Onkelos According to Alexander Sperber’s Edition* (SAIS 6; Leiden: Brill, 2008), xi-xiv.

<sup>179</sup> W. Randall Garr, “Prenasalization in Aramaic,” in Cynthia L. Miller, ed., *Studies in Semitic and Afroasiatic Linguistics Presented to Gene B. Gragg* (SAOC 60; Chicago: University of Chicago Oriental Institute, 2007), 81-109 (93-94).

<sup>180</sup> For one example, see Aaron Koller, “Four Dimensions of Linguistic Variation: Aramaic Dialects in and Around Qumran,” in Lange, Tov and Weigold, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context*, 1:199-213.

<sup>181</sup> Kaufman, “The Job Targum,” 325.



arguing that there was no direct evidence for such a trans-regional literary dialect.<sup>182</sup> Kaufman's view, however, is currently the more widely held one; it was propounded (prior to the publication of the *Targum of Job*) also by Jonas Greenfield and now bolstered with detailed morphological argumentation by Steven Fassberg (both Americans who moved to Israel).<sup>183</sup>

Finally, as discussed above, Cook and Wise, as well as Wacholder, have questioned the dates assigned to the Aramaic texts from Qumran on the basis of language alone. Wise's article "Accidents and Accidence," which originally appeared in the same volume as Cook's discussion of the Aramaic dialects, is a wholesale attack on the notion of linguistic dating of individual texts, focusing in particular on the discussion of the *Targum of Job* found in Sokoloff's edition.<sup>184</sup> Here and throughout Wise's publications are sprinkled many linguistic notes on the Aramaic of Qumran, as well. Wacholder, in the context of arguing for an earlier date than is usually presumed for much of the Aramaic literature found at Qumran, also rejected the mechanical dating of texts by language: "There is a paucity of texts from which to posit a straight line of development from the Imperial Aramaic of the fifth century BCE to the Daniel Aramaic of the Maccabean crisis."<sup>185</sup>

### *Languages in Roman Palestine*

Finally, the languages of Qumran, both Hebrew and Aramaic have furnished valuable data over the last six decades for the still-open question of the social relationship among the languages spoken in Roman Palestine. Among American scholars, this has been dealt with most prominently by

<sup>182</sup> Fitzmyer, "Targum of Job," 166.

<sup>183</sup> Jonas C. Greenfield, "Standard Literary Aramaic," in André Caquot and David Cohen, eds., *Actes du premier congrès de linguistique sémitique et chamito-sémitique, Paris, 16-19 juillet 1969* (The Hague: Mouton, 1974), 281-9; reprinted in Jonas C. Greenfield, *Al Kanfei Yonah: Collected Studies of Jonas C. Greenfield on Semitic Philology* (ed. Shalom M. Paul et al.; Jerusalem and Leiden: Magnes and Brill, 2001), 111-20; Steven E. Fassberg, "Salient Features of the Verbal System in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls," in Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, eds., *Aramaica Qumranica: The Aix-en-Provence Colloquium on the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 94; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 65-81 (we thank Prof. Fassberg for sharing a copy of this paper with us in advance of its publication). Fitzmyer subsequently discussed Greenfield's Standard Literary Aramaic ("The Aramaic Levi Document", 460-62), agreeing that it existed, but claiming that it was more limited, although he provided little justification for this view.

<sup>184</sup> Michael O. Wise, "Accidents and Accidence," 124-67.

<sup>185</sup> Wacholder, "The Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature," 259.

Fitzmyer,<sup>186</sup> but the survey of Jerome Lund, the computer-based analysis by Donald Parry, and the recent thorough and perceptive discussion by John Poirier should also be mentioned.<sup>187</sup>

Poirier's especially thorough study has argued, following an argument made by ancient historian Seth Schwartz, that Hebrew had been far eclipsed by Aramaic as a spoken language by Roman times.<sup>188</sup> As is well known, the theory that Hebrew had died out during the Second Temple period in Eretz Yisrael was disputed by scholars such as Moses Segal in the early part of the twentieth century.<sup>189</sup> The discovery of the Qumran materials, and especially the Bar Kokhba letters, led to a new consensus that in fact Hebrew was a spoken language until mishnaic times, and this view has been defended strongly especially by Israeli scholars.<sup>190</sup> More recently, doubts have been raised regarding this view (especially by some American Jewish scholars<sup>191</sup>), and it is evident that the consensus view is in need of re-evaluation. The data available, such as the use of Hebrew by Bar Kokhba and at Qumran, or the use of Aramaic in synagogue inscriptions and legal texts, is nearly always ideologically marked, and finding unmarked data that would reflect the naturally living language is not simple. There is internal linguistic evidence from Mishnaic Hebrew to deal with, as well, but it seems clear that a thorough re-evaluation of the question is needed, and the Qumran material will have to play a major role in it.

<sup>186</sup> Cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Languages of Palestine in the First Century A.D.," *CBQ* 32 (1970): 501-31 (= *WACAE*, 29-56). See also his brief article, "Aramaic," in Schiffman and VanderKam, *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:48-50.

<sup>187</sup> Jerome A. Lund, "The Language of Jesus," *Mishkan* 17.2-18.1 (1992-1993): 139-55; Donald W. Parry, "Linguistic Profile of the Nonbiblical Qumran Texts: A Multidimensional Approach," in García Martínez, Steudel, and Tigchelaar, *From 4QMMT to Resurrection*, 217-41; John C. Poirier, "The Linguistic Situation in Jewish Palestine in Late Antiquity."

<sup>188</sup> Seth Schwartz, "Language, Power and Identity in Ancient Palestine," *Past & Present* 148 (1995): 3-47; "Hebrew and Imperialism in Roman Palestine," in Carol Bakhos, ed., *Ancient Judaism in Its Hellenistic Context* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 53-83.

<sup>189</sup> Moses H. Segal, "Mishnaic Hebrew and its Relation to Biblical Hebrew and to Aramaic," *JQR* 20 (1908): 647-737; *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927), 1-20.

<sup>190</sup> See the appendix to Richard C. Steiner, "A Colloquialism in Jer. 5:13 from the Ancestor of Mishnaic Hebrew," *JSS* 37 (1992): 21-26.

<sup>191</sup> See especially the work of Schwartz, and also David M. Goodblatt, *Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 49-70.



## THE SCROLLS AND CHRISTIANITY IN AMERICAN SCHOLARSHIP

JOHN J. COLLINS

In April 1948, William Albright, in one of the earliest published comments on the newly discovered Scrolls, wrote: "It is easy to surmise that the new discovery will revolutionize intertestamental studies, and that it will soon antiquate all present handbooks on the background of the New Testament and on the textual criticism and interpretation of the Old Testament."<sup>1</sup> All of this would prove true. This essay will focus on the aspect of Albright's prediction that deals with the New Testament, and the background of early Christianity.

### *The 1950s*

It was a Frenchman, André Dupont-Sommer, who first argued for far-reaching analogies between the Scrolls and the New Testament. "Everything in the Jewish New Covenant," he wrote, "heralds and prepares the way for the Christian New Covenant. The Galilean Master, as He is presented to us in the writings of the New Testament, appears in many respects as an astonishing reincarnation of the Teacher of Righteousness."<sup>2</sup> The Teacher, like Jesus, was the Messiah. He had been condemned and put to death, but he would return as the supreme judge. In the meantime, he too left a "church," supervised by an overseer or "bishop," whose essential rite was the sacred meal. Few scholars saw the similarities between Jesus and the Teacher as being as extensive as did Dupont-Sommer: for example, the evidence that the Teacher was condemned and put to death, or that he was expected to come again, is extremely dubious. But he raised issues that would reverberate through scholarship on the Scrolls, especially in North America, for decades to come.

---

<sup>1</sup> William F. Albright, "Notes from the President's Desk," *BASOR* 110 (1948): 2-3.

<sup>2</sup> André Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey* (trans. E. Margaret Rowley; Oxford: Blackwell, 1952), 99-100, translated from his *Aperçus préliminaires*.

An early, scholarly, response to Dupont-Sommer was published by William Brownlee, who had been present at the American Schools of Oriental Research in Jerusalem when scrolls were brought there by the Syrian Metropolitan, Mar Samuel, in 1948.<sup>3</sup> Brownlee acknowledged that “a careful study of the texts” showed “the tenuousness (if not impossibility) of the constructions that he (Dupont-Sommer) had placed upon them,” but he added “Yet Professor Dupont-Sommer often has an uncanny knack for being ultimately right (or nearly so), even when his views are initially based on the wrong texts!”<sup>4</sup> He concluded: “Just as the Servant of the Lord of Second Isaiah is the most important single background element for the understanding and interpretation of the New Testament, so it is likely to prove for the Qumran Scrolls.”<sup>5</sup> Brownlee also opined with reference to John the Baptist: “In view of John’s thorough acquaintance with Essene thought, it is not at all improbable that he spent his childhood in the wilderness, being brought up by the Essenes.”<sup>6</sup> In all, he concluded, “the messianic motifs of the Qumran Community are combined, modified, and adapted in the New Testament portrayal of Jesus the Christ.”<sup>7</sup>

Dupont-Sommer’s claims were endorsed and popularized in a much less critical manner by the literary critic Edmund Wilson, in a best-selling book, which originated in articles in the *New Yorker* magazine, even though he was aware that the position of the French scholar was overstated.<sup>8</sup> “If,” he wrote, “we look now at Jesus in the perspective supplied by the scrolls, we can trace a new continuity and, at last, get some sense of the drama that culminated in Christianity ... The monastery [of Qumran] ... is, perhaps, more than Bethlehem or Nazareth, the cradle of Christianity.”<sup>9</sup> Wilson suggested that the scholars working on the Scrolls were “somewhat inhibited

---

<sup>3</sup> William H. Brownlee, “The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls,” *BASOR* 132 (December 1953): 8-15; “The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls II,” 135 (October 1954): 33-38; “Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament,” *NTS* 3 (1956-1957): 12-30. William Brownlee (1917-1983) was a junior fellow at the American Schools of Oriental Research in Jerusalem when cave 1 was discovered. He later became Professor of Religion at Claremont Graduate School and Director of its Dead Sea Scrolls project.

<sup>4</sup> Brownlee, “The Servant of the Lord,” 9.

<sup>5</sup> Brownlee, “The Servant of the Lord II,” 33.

<sup>6</sup> William H. Brownlee, “John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls,” *Int* 9 (1955): 73.

<sup>7</sup> Brownlee, “Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament,” 12.

<sup>8</sup> Edmund Wilson, *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955).

<sup>9</sup> Edmund Wilson, *The Dead Sea Scrolls, 1947-1969* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969), 98.

in dealing with such questions by their various religious commitments.”<sup>10</sup> The fire of this controversy was fanned by a radio broadcast in England by John Allegro, a member of the Qumran documents editorial team, who contended that “Dupont-Sommer was more right than he knew.”<sup>11</sup> Thus was born the conspiracy theory, according to which the editorial team, led by a French Catholic priest (Roland de Vaux) withheld or suppressed material that might be damaging to Christianity. This theory never gained wide currency in North America, but it was aired periodically until the full corpus of the Scrolls was finally published in the 1990s.

The publications of Wilson, in North America, and Allegro, in England, contributed to what has been called the “Qumran fever” which developed in the mid-1950s when the major Scrolls from Qumran had been published. Much of the interest in the Scrolls in North America arose from the possibility that they might shed light on Jesus and the early Church. (This remains true of popular American interest in the Scrolls today). The Scrolls were, after all, the only texts from the land of Israel from around the turn of the era that had been preserved in their original languages, and they clearly derived from a sectarian movement which entertained messianic beliefs. The major American scholars working on the Scrolls in this period were all Christian, and their interests naturally gravitated to the affinities of the Scrolls with Christianity. Moreover, there was relatively little halachic material, representative of the aspects of Judaism from which Christianity is furthest removed, in the Scrolls from cave 1. It was inevitable then that scholarly interest would focus to a great degree on the affinities of the Scrolls with Christianity, and also that these affinities would be somewhat exaggerated.

Nonetheless, sober accounts of the relevance of the Scrolls for the New Testament were published in the mid- to late 50s by some of the most authoritative Christian scholars in the field. In 1958 Krister Stendahl, a Swedish scholar then at Harvard, attempted to set the record straight by publishing a collection of essays culled from international New Testament scholarship.<sup>12</sup> In Stendahl’s view: “the issue between the Essenes and the early Christians was not one of ‘originality,’ but a searching question about who were the legitimate heirs to the prophetic promises and who could pro-

<sup>10</sup> Wilson, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 99.

<sup>11</sup> Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1991), 46.

<sup>12</sup> Krister Stendahl, *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (New York: Harper, 1957), reprinted with a new introduction by James H. Charlesworth (New York: Crossroad, 1992).

duce the most striking arguments for fulfillment.”<sup>13</sup> The volume included essays by three American scholars, Brownlee on John the Baptist, Raymond Brown on the Gospel of John and Joseph Fitzmyer on the Ebionites.

The most authoritative treatments of the Scrolls by American scholars in the 1950s were those of Millar Burrows of Yale and Frank Cross of Harvard. Burrows had been Director of the American Schools of Oriental Research in Jerusalem in 1948, and had published the first photographs and transcriptions of the *Manual of Discipline* (= the *Community Rule*), *Peshet Habakkuk* and the *Great Isaiah Scroll*.<sup>14</sup> Cross, who was a member of the international team appointed to edit the Scrolls, taught first at McCormick Theological Seminary in Chicago and then became Hancock Professor of Hebrew and Oriental Languages at Harvard in 1957.

Burrows produced the first comprehensive survey of the Scrolls in 1955, and published an expanded account three years later.<sup>15</sup> In the first book, he devoted a chapter to “Contributions to the Study of Judaism and Christianity.”<sup>16</sup> In his view, “Direct influence of the Qumran sect on the early church may turn out to be less probable than parallel developments in the same general direction.”<sup>17</sup> He was skeptical of attempts to associate Jesus or John the Baptist with Qumran: “if John the Baptist had ever been an Essene, he must have withdrawn from the sect and entered upon an independent prophetic ministry. This is not impossible, but the connection is not so close as to make it seem very probable.”<sup>18</sup> He granted that there were parallels between the teaching of Jesus and the Scrolls, but found the differences even more striking. In conclusion, he confessed: “after studying the Dead Sea Scrolls for seven years, I do not find my understanding of the

---

<sup>13</sup> Stendahl, *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, 6.

<sup>14</sup> Millar Burrows, with the assistance of John C. Trever and William H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*: I. *The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary*; II. *The Manual of Discipline* (New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950-1951).

<sup>15</sup> Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1955); *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1958). Millar Burrows (1889-1980) was a Presbyterian minister, who received a Ph.D. from Yale in 1925. He was Winkley Professor of Biblical Theology at Yale from 1934 to 1950, and chair of the Department of Near Eastern Languages from 1950 until his retirement in 1958. He was director of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem in 1947-1948 when the first Dead Sea Scrolls were discovered, but was away on a trip to Baghdad. He issued the first press release about the discovery in April 1948. He authored *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (1955) and *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (1958).

<sup>16</sup> Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 326-45.

<sup>17</sup> Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 328.

<sup>18</sup> Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 329.

New Testament substantially affected.”<sup>19</sup> In his second book he reiterated these positions, and emphasized the “basic contrasts” between Jesus and the Scrolls, especially with regard to ritual purity.<sup>20</sup>

### *Frank Cross*

Even more influential was the work of Frank Cross. Cross maintained that “the Essenes prove to be the bearers, and in no small part the producers of the apocalyptic tradition of Judaism,”<sup>21</sup> an overstatement, perhaps. His assumption was that works such as *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees* and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* should be regarded as either “Essene” or “proto-Essene.” (Some of it was commonly attributed to the Hasidim, whom Cross regarded as the parent movement of the Essenes). “In some sense,” he wrote, “the primitive Church is the continuation of this communal and apocalyptic tradition.”<sup>22</sup> Like the Essenes, the early Church was distinctive in its consciousness of living already in the end of days. The “eschatological existence” of the early Church, then, its communal life in anticipation of the kingdom, was not a uniquely Christian phenomenon, but had an antecedent in the communities of the Essenes. Both were “apocalyptic communities.”

It is in the context of this common eschatological consciousness that the various analogies between the Scrolls and the New Testament must be seen. Nowhere were these more evident than in the Johannine literature, in such phrases as “the spirit of truth and deceit” (1 John 4:6), “sons of light” (John 12:36) or “eternal life” (passim). The affinities of the Johannine literature with the Scrolls had already been noted by Albright,<sup>23</sup> and elaborated by Raymond Brown.<sup>24</sup> For Albright and his students (including

<sup>19</sup> Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 343.

<sup>20</sup> Burrows, *More Light*, 39-132.

<sup>21</sup> Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3d ed., 144. All citations in this article are from the third edition. The first edition was published in 1958. Frank Moore Cross (1921-) received his Ph.D. in Semitic languages from Johns Hopkins in 1950. He became a member of the international team entrusted with publishing the Scrolls in 1953. He served as Hancock Professor of Hebrew and Other Oriental Languages at Harvard from 1958-1992. Cross was one of the most influential scholars of Hebrew Bible and ancient Israel of the 20th century. His 1957 Haskell lectures, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (1958, 3d ed. 1995) remains a classic of the field.

<sup>22</sup> Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3d ed., 145.

<sup>23</sup> William F. Albright, “Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of St. John,” in Winton Davies and David Daube, eds., *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954), 153-71.

<sup>24</sup> Raymond E. Brown, “The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles,” *CBQ* 17 (1955): 403-19, 559-74.



Cross and Brown) these parallels served to refute the approach of Rudolf Bultmann, which read the New Testament primarily in a Hellenistic context. "These Essene parallels to John and the Johannine Epistles will come as a surprise only to those students of John who have attempted to read John as a work under strong Greek influence," wrote Cross.<sup>25</sup> While he noted that there is no equivalent of the Logos in the Scrolls, and granted that the Gospel had an elaborate literary history he concluded: "the point is that John preserves authentic historical material which first took form in an Aramaic or Hebrew milieu where Essene currents still ran strong."<sup>26</sup> Cross was not an especially conservative Christian, although this conclusion, like the positions of the Albright school in general, was attractive to Christians of a conservative bent. More important for Cross was the continuity between early Christianity and Judaism, which was questioned and sometimes denied in German and German-inspired scholarship. Nonetheless, the emphasis on the Semitic background of the Johannine literature seems no less one-sided than the alternative Hellenistic approach.<sup>27</sup>

Among the "common eschatological motifs," Cross naturally noted the developed messianic expectations of the Scrolls. He noted, however, that "Nowhere at Qumran, at least so far, is there a hint of 'highest' New Testament Christology: the pre-existence of the Messiah, the Second Adam, the Son of Man."<sup>28</sup> (In the third edition of the book, however, Cross affirmed that the title "Son of God" is applied to the messiah in 4Q246, which had not yet come to light at the time of the first edition). Neither was the messiah a heavenly savior. (11QMelchizedeq, which complicates this discussion, was not yet published either). Nonetheless, the emphasis was on the continuity between the "developed apocalyptic messianism" in the Scrolls and in the New Testament, rather than on the different characters of the messiah of Israel and of Jesus of Nazareth. In sharp contrast to Dupont-Sommer, and even to William Brownlee, Cross found no evidence of a suffering messiah in the Scrolls. He also noted that the designation "Righteous Teacher" is neither prophetic nor messianic, although it may be priestly. The Teacher was neither the eschatological prophet nor a messiah. Neither was he expected to return from the dead. Analogies with the New Testament are carefully limited here. Also, while he noted analogies

<sup>25</sup> Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3d ed., 155.

<sup>26</sup> Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3d ed., 156.

<sup>27</sup> A sampling of scholarship on the relevance of the Scrolls for the Johannine literature can be found in James H. Charlesworth, ed., *John and Qumran* (London: Chapman, 1972; repr. New York: Crossroad, 1990). About half the contributions are by American scholars.

<sup>28</sup> Charlesworth, *John and Qumran*, 159.

between John the Baptist and the eschatological prophet, he refrained from suggesting that John had ever been an Essene: "it seems methodologically dubious to argue on the basis of John's desert life that he was at one time associated with the desert community at Qumran."<sup>29</sup>

Finally, Cross turned to matters of organizational structure.<sup>30</sup> He acknowledged from the outset that there is no counterpart in the early Church to the dominance of priests at Qumran, but he regarded the enigmatic "twelve men and three priests" mentioned in *Community Rule* (1QS VIII, 1) as analogous to the twelve apostles. The office of inspector, *mebaqqer* or *paqid*, was thought to parallel the Christian *episkopos*, or bishop.

The boldest analogies drawn by Cross concerned "the central 'sacraments' of the Essene community," baptism and the communal meal. The "baptism of the Essenes," is held to be "like that of John:" "on repentance of sins into the eschatological community of God."<sup>31</sup> He acknowledged that the Essenes practiced daily washings that have no parallel in Christianity (although he noted that daily ritual washing persisted among the Ebionites, a Jewish Christian sect).<sup>32</sup> Whether in fact initiatory baptism in the Yahad was at all comparable to Christian baptism is open to question. Cross argued that the communal meal of the Essenes must be understood as a liturgical anticipation of the messianic banquet, and as such provides a closer parallel to the Christian Eucharist than the Passover meal.<sup>33</sup> Here again Christian practice is taken as the heuristic key to the significance of what is described in the Scrolls, and the analogy is open to question.

But while Cross may have viewed the Scrolls through Christian lenses in some cases, his treatment is distinguished by its sobriety, when compared with the proposals of Dupont-Sommer or Allegro, or even with those of the more moderate Brownlee. The analogies were grounded in the similar eschatological consciousness of the two groups, and in most cases did not require direct Essene influence on early Christianity.

<sup>29</sup> Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3d ed., 148.

<sup>30</sup> Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3d ed., 165. This subject had already been treated by Sherman E. Johnson, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of Acts," *ZAW* 66 (1954): 106-20.

<sup>31</sup> Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 168.

<sup>32</sup> Following Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Qumran Scrolls, the Ebionites and their Literature," *TS* 16 (1955): 335-72; repr. in Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Semitic Background of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 435-80.

<sup>33</sup> Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3d ed., 169.

*The 1960's, 1970's and 1980s*

After the initial "Qumran fever" of the late 1950s, the question of the relevance of the Scrolls for early Christianity became much less controversial. The following decades were enlivened only by occasional new disclosures and theories.

*Joseph Fitzmyer*

Cross, like Albright, was primarily a scholar of the Hebrew Bible and its Semitic context. When he took up his position at Harvard he increasingly devoted his energies to early Israel and its Canaanite heritage.<sup>34</sup> His interest in the New Testament was incidental. Among Albright's students, the two who would emerge as leading New Testament scholars were Raymond Brown and Joseph Fitzmyer, both of whom helped compile the card concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls in the late 1950s. Brown did not remain active in Scrolls scholarship, but Fitzmyer produced a steady stream of first-rate articles over a period of fifty years.<sup>35</sup> These very often focus on passages in the Scrolls that are relevant to issues in New Testament scholarship, ranging from divorce to messianism to the presence of angels in the cultic assembly. His work has always been marked by philological rigor. Somewhat surprisingly, he entertains the idea that John the Baptist was a member of the Qumran community as "a plausible hypothesis," granted that "one can neither prove nor disprove it."<sup>36</sup> (John would, of course, have left the community before his career as described in the Gospels). Fitzmyer even speculates that "after the death of his elderly parents, he may have been adopted by the Essenes."<sup>37</sup> Further, he claims that "John's baptism acquires a likely explanation as a development of the ritual washings of the Essenes."<sup>38</sup> He acknowledges that baptism in the Scrolls "was not a washing that does away with sin," as that of John apparently does, but thinks that

---

<sup>34</sup> See Cross's classic book, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973).

<sup>35</sup> Many of these are collected in Joseph A. Fitzmyer's book *The Semitic Background of the New Testament*, which combines two earlier collections, *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London: Chapman, 1971) and *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979). See also his more recent collection, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).

<sup>36</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Responses to 101 Questions on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Paulist Press, 1992), 106.

<sup>37</sup> Fitzmyer, *Responses*, 107.

<sup>38</sup> Fitzmyer, *Responses*.

John's baptism may have developed from that of the Essenes nonetheless. The attempt to associate John the Baptist with Qumran has been a hardy perennial, and we shall meet it again in the most recent phase of Scrolls scholarship.

Fitzmyer's most controversial work has been related to an Aramaic text, 4Q246, known as "the Aramaic Apocalypse," or "the Son of God text." This text was announced to the world by Józef Milik in a lecture at Harvard in December 1972, but Milik never published the text. Fitzmyer, however, obtained a copy of Milik's handout and published an extract from the text in 1974, maintaining that it was "in the public domain."<sup>39</sup> Official publication of the full text did not follow until 1992, when it was edited by Émile Puech.<sup>40</sup> Fitzmyer's action is interesting in light of later controversies about the publication of the Scroll, and dramatizes the ethical issue: did the scholar who failed to publish a text or the one who published it without authorization have the moral high ground?

Fitzmyer's interpretation of this text has proven to be a subject of enduring controversy. The text refers to a figure who will be called "son of God" and "son of the Most High," in an eschatological context. Milik had argued that the reference was to a Syrian king, perhaps Alexander Balas. Fitzmyer, more plausibly, argued that the reference was to a Jewish king, "possibly an heir to the Davidic throne."<sup>41</sup> But he insisted that this figure was not a "messiah," since the word משיח is not used: "I consider this apocalyptic text to speak of a coming Jewish ruler, perhaps a member of the Hasmonean dynasty, who [will] be a successor to the Davidic throne, but who is not envisaged as a Messiah."<sup>42</sup> Many scholars, including the present author, would argue that a Jewish king, heir to the Davidic throne, in an eschatological context, is by definition a messiah.<sup>43</sup> Fitzmyer actually concedes this point in his most recent discussion of the subject, but he still insists that 4Q246

<sup>39</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament," *NTS* 20 (1974): 382-407 (391-4); reprinted in a slightly revised form in *A Wandering Aramean*, 85-113 (92-93). The text had been acquired by the Palestine Archaeological Museum in 1958.

<sup>40</sup> Émile Puech, "Fragment d'une Apocalypse en Araméen (4Q246 = pseudo-Dan<sup>d</sup>), et le 'Royaume de Dieu,'" *RB* 99 (1992): 98-131.

<sup>41</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Qumran Aramaic and the New Testament," in *A Wandering Aramean*, 106.

<sup>42</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "4Q246: The 'Son of God' Document from Qumran," *Bib* 74 (1993): 173-4.

<sup>43</sup> John J. Collins, "Jesus, Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in James H. Charlesworth, Hermann Lichtenberger and Gerbern S. Oegema, eds., *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 110.

does not constitute evidence for a messianic use of the title “Son of God.”<sup>44</sup> At issue is the originality of the Christian proclamation of Jesus as Son of God: “The double predication of ‘Son of God’ and ‘Messiah’ for one individual is still first attested in Christian usage.”<sup>45</sup> Also at issue is whether the title “Son of God” as originally applied to Jesus was simply a messianic title or something more. According to Fitzmyer, the proclamation of the angel Gabriel to Mary in the Gospel of Luke should be understood as a two-stage announcement: “he is not only the Davidic Messiah, he is also God’s son.”<sup>46</sup> If the text from Qumran uses “Son of God” as a messianic title, this distinction is undercut. Fitzmyer, then, finds himself in the unusual position of defending Wilhelm Bousset, who denied that the title “Son of God” was related to Jewish messianism,<sup>47</sup> although the thrust of his life’s work has been to argue against the tradition of German scholarship represented by Bousset, by affirming the Semitic context of early Christianity.

### *Morton Smith*

Another minor but noteworthy controversy erupted in the late 1980s, concerning the interpretation of a very fragmentary Hebrew text, fragment 11 of 4Q491, that had been published as part of the *War Scroll* by Maurice Baillet in 1982.<sup>48</sup> Parallel fragments in the *Hodayot* would later come to light, that would put the relation of this text to the *War Scroll* into question.<sup>49</sup> In this text an unknown speaker refers to

“... a mighty throne in the congregation of the gods. None of the ancient kings shall sit on it, and their nobles [shall] not [There are no]ne comp[arable

<sup>44</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The One Who Is to Come* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 106-07: “I agree with Collins ... that a future ‘successor to the Davidic throne’ in an apocalyptic or eschatological context is by definition a Davidic messiah.”

<sup>45</sup> Fitzmyer, *The One Who Is to Come*, 107.

<sup>46</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX* (AB 28; Garden City: Doubleday, 1981), 339.

<sup>47</sup> Wilhelm Bousset, *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1970; German original, 1913), 207.

<sup>48</sup> Maurice Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4, III (4Q482-4Q520)* (DJD VII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 12-68.

<sup>49</sup> The fullest edition is that of Michael O. Wise, “מי כמורי באלים: A Study of 4Q491c, 4Q471b, 4Q427 7 and 1QH<sup>a</sup> 25:35-26:10,” *DSD* 7 (2000): 173-219. For a useful synopsis of 4Q471b, 4Q427 7 and 4Q491 11, with minimal reconstruction, see Devorah Dimant, “A Synoptic Comparison of Parallel Sections in 4Q427 7, 4Q491 11 and 4Q471B,” *JQR* 85 (1994): 157-61. The relation to the *War Scroll* is still defended by Florentino García Martínez, “Old Texts and Modern Mirages: The ‘I’ of Two Qumran Hymns,” in Florentino García Martínez, *Qumranica Minora I: Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism* (STDJ 63; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 105-25 (114-18).

to me in] my glory, no one shall be exalted besides me ... For I have sat on a [thron]e in the heavens, and there is no one ... I am reckoned with the gods and my abode is in the holy congregation.”

(4Q491 11 i 12-14 )

Baillet had proposed that the speaker was an angel, and had dubbed the composition “the Canticle of Michael.” At a conference at New York University in 1985, Morton Smith, of Columbia University, dismissed that suggestion with scorn: “Michael would scarcely have compared himself to such small-fry. He had been created an archangel and doubtless took his throne in the heavens for granted. This parvenu not only boasts of this, but in doing so makes clear that he was not originally at home in the heavens.”<sup>50</sup> The speaker must be human. Smith thought immediately of the author of the *Hodayot*, but acknowledged that the claims in this fragment are more bold and explicit than any made there. In the end, he refrained from proposing an identification. Others would subsequently propose the Teacher of Righteousness,<sup>51</sup> some other teacher,<sup>52</sup> or an eschatological figure.<sup>53</sup> More important than the specific identification for Smith, however, was the evidence for “speculation on deification by ascent towards or into the heavens, speculation which may have gone along with some practices that produced extraordinary experiences understood as encounters with gods or angels.”<sup>54</sup> Smith had already suggested that Jesus had engaged in such practices, in his controversial book, *Clement of Alexandria and the Secret Gospel of Mark*,<sup>55</sup> and suggested that “such material may not have been a later intrusion into the teaching and practice of Jesus, but an original part of them.” He concluded: “I am therefore happy to find so clear and complete an example of it in the Dead Sea documents, approximately sixty years before Jesus’s time. I do not, however, think that this theme in Jesus’s teaching and practice is to be explained by the influence of the cave 4 Milhamah or

<sup>50</sup> Morton Smith, “Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM<sup>a</sup>,” in Lawrence H. Schiffman, ed., *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (JSPSup 8; JSOT/ASOR monograph series 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press), 181-8. The quotation is from 186.

<sup>51</sup> Martin G. Abegg, “Who Ascended to Heaven? 4Q491, 4Q427, and the Teacher of Righteousness,” in Craig A. Evans and Peter W. Flint, eds., *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 61-73 (64-70).

<sup>52</sup> John J. Collins, “A Throne in the Heavens: Apotheosis in Pre-Christian Judaism”, in John J. Collins and Michael Fishbane, eds., *Death, Ecstasy, and Otherworldly Journeys* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995), 43-48.

<sup>53</sup> John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 136-53.

<sup>54</sup> Smith, “Ascent to the Heavens,” 188.

<sup>55</sup> Morton Smith, *Clement of Alexandria and the Secret Gospel of Mark* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973).

of any other texts of the Dead Sea circles. Rather, those documents and the Gospels are different mushrooms of the same ring, connected not directly, but by the ramified root system of popular piety from which they independently arose.”<sup>56</sup> He made the supposed parallel with Jesus more explicit in a follow-up piece: “Two Ascended to Heaven – Jesus and the Author of 4Q491.”<sup>57</sup>

Smith’s interpretation of the fragment from 4Q491 has remained controversial. Not all scholars have been convinced that it constitutes evidence for a practice of ascent to heaven in pre-Christian Judaism, although that interpretation has recently received a weighty endorsement from Philip Alexander.<sup>58</sup> It has made no impression on New Testament scholars, however. Smith’s claim that Jesus practiced ascent to heaven is closely bound up with the *Secret Gospel of Mark*, which he published, and whose authenticity is doubted by many scholars. So, while the fragment of 4Q491 is of great interest for the early history of Jewish mysticism, its relevance to Jesus and early Christianity remains unclear. It is conceivable that it is a claim made on behalf of the Teacher after his death. If that were so, it would provide an interesting parallel to Christian belief in the heavenly enthronement of Jesus. But this possible parallel remains very uncertain.

### *1991 to the Present*

The early 1990s saw a revolution in the study of the Scrolls, which led to the reorganization of the editorial team and the rapid publication of all the Scrolls in the following years. Here we are only concerned with one aspect of that revolution: the new claims that were made regarding the relation between the Scrolls and early Christianity. These came to the fore most dramatically in a volume published in 1992 by Robert Eisenman and Michael Wise: *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*,<sup>59</sup> which was translated into German

<sup>56</sup> Smith, “Ascent to the Heavens,” 188.

<sup>57</sup> Morton Smith, “Two Ascended to Heaven: Jesus and the Author of 4Q491” in James H. Charlesworth, ed., *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 290-301.

<sup>58</sup> Philip S. Alexander, *The Mystical Texts: Companion to the Qumran Scrolls* (London: T&T Clark International, 2006), 90.

<sup>59</sup> Robert H. Eisenman and Michael O. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (Rockport: Element, 1992). Robert Eisenman received a Ph.D. from Columbia in Middle East Languages and Cultures in 1971. He achieved notoriety as co-editor, with Michael Wise, of an unauthorized publication of several fragmentary texts in the above-mentioned volume, and for his theory that the Teacher of Righteousness was James, the Brother of Jesus. Michael Owen Wise (1954-) received his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, where he studied with Norman Golb. He wrote a highly regarded dissertation on the *Temple Scroll*,



with the title *Jesus und die Urchristen*. Eisenman had obtained microfilm of the Scrolls from the Huntington Museum, and he enlisted Wise and a team of graduate students from the University of Chicago to transcribe and translate them. The publication ignited a firestorm of controversy about the publication rights. But the content of the book was also controversial.

### *Eisenman and Wise*

In part, the controversy arose from Eisenman's introduction to the volume, which expressed his own view of the Scrolls, to which Wise and his collaborators did not subscribe. Eisenman contended that the Scrolls provide "nothing less than a picture of the movement from which Christianity sprang in Palestine," or rather "a picture of what Christianity actually was in Palestine."<sup>60</sup> Eisenman acknowledged that this picture is "virtually the opposite of the Christianity with which he or she is familiar," but he claimed it was transformed when Christianity spread to the Gentile world. Both stages of Christianity "used the same vocabulary, the same scriptural passages as proof texts, similar conceptual contexts; but the one can be characterized as the mirror reversal of the other. While the Palestinian one was zealot, nationalistic, engaged, xenophobic, and apocalyptic; the overseas one was cosmopolitan, antinomian, pacifistic – in a word 'Paulinized'. Equally we can refer to the first as Jamesian."<sup>61</sup> Eisenman had been propounding his theory of the "Jamesian" origin of the Scrolls for a decade before *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* appeared,<sup>62</sup> and would continue to do so in the following years,<sup>63</sup> arguing that the Teacher of Righteousness was none other than James, the brother of Jesus. He has had no impact on scholarship, either on the Scrolls or on early Christianity, as his interpretive framework is radically different from that shared by other scholars.

*The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* contained some 50 texts, several of which had messianic or apocalyptic overtones. Although the "Son of God" text had been known for 20 years, it now generated headlines in newspapers

---

but achieved notoriety by co-editing, with Robert Eisenman, the above-mentioned editions. Denied tenure at Chicago, he went on to become professor at Northwestern College in St. Paul, Minnesota, and to author several important studies relating to the early history of the sect.

<sup>60</sup> Eisenman and Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, 10.

<sup>61</sup> Eisenman and Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*.

<sup>62</sup> Robert H. Eisenman, *Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran: A New Hypothesis of Qumran Origins* (Leiden: Brill, 1983).

<sup>63</sup> Robert H. Eisenman, *James, the Brother of Jesus: The Key to Unlocking the Secrets of Early Christianity and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1997).



from Los Angeles to London, announcing that a pre-Christian “Son of God” had been discovered among the Dead Sea Scrolls. Some other texts also seemed to anticipate the Gospels. Also publicized in the newspapers were claims that a Hebrew fragment (4Q285) spoke of a “dying messiah:” “they will put to death the Prince of the Congregation, the Bran[ch of David].”<sup>64</sup> The claim was attributed to Eisenman and Wise. If it were true, it would be the first evidence of a “dying messiah” before the time of Jesus. Subsequent analysis, however, showed that this interpretation was unlikely. The passage could be translated “the Prince of the Congregation, the Branch of David, will kill him,” with reference to the “king of the Kittim.”<sup>65</sup> Wise and Eisenman were more tentative in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, but they still defended their original interpretation as possible.<sup>66</sup>

The first text featured in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* was 4Q521, which begins “heaven and earth will obey his messiah.” Wise published a semi-popular study of this text with James Tabor in *Biblical Archeology Review*.<sup>67</sup> The text contains a remarkable parallel to “the works of the messiah” in Matt 11:2-5 and Luke 7:22: “for he will heal the wounded, give life to the dead and preach good news to the poor.” (Compare Matt 11: “Go and tell John what you hear and see: the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, and the poor have good news brought to them”). Wise and Tabor argued that the messiah is the subject of these verbs. In fact, the antecedent is God, but since God does not normally preach good news, the work of a herald, it is quite likely that God acts through a messianic agent. The present author has argued at length that the reference here is not to a royal messiah but to a prophetic messiah of the type of Elijah.<sup>68</sup>

If this is correct, this text may indeed throw light on the question how Jesus came to be regarded as a messiah. In the Dead Sea Scrolls, the royal, Davidic messiah is consistently portrayed as a violent warrior, who would liberate Israel by defeating her enemies. Whatever his followers may have expected, Jesus did nothing of the sort. According to the Gospels, he functioned rather as a prophetic figure, who performed miracles of healing, even raising the dead, in the manner of Elijah and Elisha. If such a figure could

<sup>64</sup> The *New York Times*, November 8, 1991; The *Chicago Tribune*, November 11, 1991.

<sup>65</sup> Geza Vermes, “The Oxford Forum for Qumran Research Seminar on the Rule of War from Cave 4 (4Q285),” *JJS* 43 (1992): 85-90.

<sup>66</sup> Eisenman and Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, 24-27.

<sup>67</sup> Michael O. Wise and James D. Tabor, “The Messiah at Qumran,” *BAR* (November/December 1992): 60-65.

<sup>68</sup> John J. Collins, “The Works of the Messiah,” *DSD* 1 (1994): 98-112; *The Scepter and the Star*, 117-23.

be called a “messiah,” or anointed one, it is easier to see how the title might have been conferred on Jesus. Since he preached the coming of the kingdom of God, however, it was inevitable that his followers would suspect that he was the one who would bring it about, and come to identify him also with the royal messiah. Nonetheless, the passage in the New Testament in which Jesus is conformed most closely to the usual picture of the Davidic messiah is found in the Book of Revelation, chapter 19, where he comes from heaven on a white horse, to strike down the nations with the sword of his mouth. This, however, is not the way Jesus behaved in his earthly life, but rather the way some early Christians hoped he would behave at the Second Coming.<sup>69</sup>

### *The “First Messiah”*

Not all discussion of matters relating to Jesus and messianism in recent years has been based on the “new” texts. In 1999 Michael Wise published an entire monograph on the subject.<sup>70</sup> Wise argued that the Teacher of Righteousness was a messianic figure, who modeled himself on the Suffering Servant of Second Isaiah. He based his case on the “Teacher Hymns” in the *Hodayot*. Wise claims that toward the end of the Teacher Hymns the Teacher “came to speak of himself as the Servant of the Lord in concentrated fashion. He made allusion after allusion to the passages of Isaiah that modern scholars designate Servant Songs, and others to portions that might easily be so construed.”<sup>71</sup> While some of the examples might be questioned, Wise’s argument is well grounded, and is closer to the old argument of Brownlee (but with fuller documentation) than to that of Dupont-Sommer.<sup>72</sup> He does not belabor the analogies with the New Testament, although he surely has them in mind. The allusions to Isaiah do not, in my

<sup>69</sup> See further Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 204-10; “Jesus, Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in Charlesworth, Lichtenberger and Oegema, *Qumran-Messianism*, 100-119. John Collins (1946-) received his Ph.D. from Harvard (1972) where he worked with John Strugnell. He taught at Notre Dame, Chicago and Yale (from 2000 as Holmes Professor of Old Testament). He is the author of several books on Second Temple Judaism, including *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997), *The Scepter and the Star* (New York: Doubleday; 1995, 2nd ed., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2010) and *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), editor of *Dead Sea Discoveries* (2003-2007), and co-editor, with Timothy Lim, of *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

<sup>70</sup> Michael O. Wise, *The First Messiah: Investigating the Teacher before Jesus* (San Francisco: Harper, 1999).

<sup>71</sup> Wise, *The First Messiah*, 290.

<sup>72</sup> See the assessment of Wise’s argument in John J. Collins, “A Messiah before Jesus,”

view, require that the Teacher saw himself as a messianic figure, but they support the view that he saw himself either as analogous to Isaiah's Servant or as the fulfillment of the Servant prophecies.

### *John the Baptist*

James Charlesworth has recently reopened the question of the Essene affiliation of John the Baptist.<sup>73</sup> Charlesworth grants that the Baptist cannot have been a member of the Essenes at the point in his career which is described in the Gospels: "In summary, the Baptizer was not an Essene, but – most likely – he had been almost fully initiated into the Yahad. He apparently refused full initiation and left the Qumran Community because of their rigid predestination and their institutionalized hatred of all the Sons of Darkness." This thesis, claims Charlesworth, "helps us comprehend the Baptizer's choice and interpretation of Scripture, especially Isa 40:3, his location in the wilderness not far from Qumran, his apocalyptic eschatology, and his use of water in preparing for the day of judgment."<sup>74</sup> In this case, however, the argument has not really advanced beyond the time of Brownlee and Burrows. Those who were not convinced by the older arguments of John's association with the Essenes will find no new evidence here to convince them.

### *James VanderKam*

In his popular 1994 book, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, James VanderKam devoted a chapter to "The Scrolls and the New Testament."<sup>75</sup> VanderKam noted that the more controversial attempts linking Jesus or the Baptist to

---

in John J. Collins and Craig A. Evans, eds., *Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006), 21-23.

<sup>73</sup> James H. Charlesworth, "John the Baptizer and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 1-35. James Charlesworth received his Ph.D. from Duke University, where he worked with John Strugnell. He has been a professor of New Testament Language and Literature at Princeton Seminary. He is the editor of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 2 volumes, and the series *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Tübingen-Louisville: Mohr Siebeck-Westminster John Knox, 1994-2006).

<sup>74</sup> Charlesworth, "John the Baptizer," 35.

<sup>75</sup> VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 159-85; 2d ed., 197-226. James VanderKam (1946-) received his Ph.D. from Harvard, 1976. He is a professor of Hebrew Scriptures at the University of Notre Dame, editor of several volumes in the DJD series, and editor, with Lawrence Schiffman, of the *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), expert on the *Book of Jubilees*.

Qumran, or identifying the movement described in the Scrolls with early Christianity in the case of Eisenman, have never found much support, and he reaffirms the conclusions reached by Burrows and Stendahl in the 1950s. The similarities between John the Baptist and the Qumran sect “amount to something less than an identification.”<sup>76</sup> The eschatological associations of the community meal, especially as described in the “messianic rule,” the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa), “recall elements found in the New Testament treatments of the Lord’s Supper,”<sup>77</sup> but unlike Cross, VanderKam does not speak of “sacraments,” and he notes the argument of Lawrence Schiffman that the Qumran meals were not cultic in character.<sup>78</sup>

In the matter of eschatology, VanderKam writes that “the two communities operated with related messianic faiths. Hence, it is not surprising to learn that both in dependence on the Hebrew scriptures, use some of the same or similar titles for the messiah(s).”<sup>79</sup> He notes that 4Q246 constitutes “an impressive parallel” to the titles used for Jesus in Luke 1:32-35: “Here one cannot simply dismiss the parallel as one title that happens to surface in two texts; on the contrary, the entire contexts have striking similarities: the individual in question will be great, son of God (a title found in the Hebrew Bible), son of the Most High (a new title), and his kingdom will be eternal.”<sup>80</sup> This statement undercuts his preference for the conclusion that the titles in 2Q246 do not refer to a messianic figure, but to an evil figure who does not deserve them. If that were true, the contexts would be entirely different.

VanderKam deals with the texts relevant to the New Testament at greater length in his more recent book, with Peter Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*.<sup>81</sup> In this case, he refrains from adjudicating the identity of the figure in 4Q246, noting only the diversity of scholarly opinion and the indisputable parallels to Luke.<sup>82</sup> 4Q521 is recognized as one of the most important Qumran texts for understanding Jesus and his ministry.<sup>83</sup> He does not dispute the argument of Michael Wise that the Teacher Hymns allude to the Suffering Servant, but he concludes, correctly, that “the scrolls

<sup>76</sup> VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 170; 2d ed., 208.

<sup>77</sup> VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 175; 2d ed., 214.

<sup>78</sup> Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SBLMS 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 53-67.

<sup>79</sup> VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 178; 2d ed., 216.

<sup>80</sup> VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 179; 2d ed., 217.

<sup>81</sup> James C. VanderKam and Peter W. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2002), 330-61.

<sup>82</sup> VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 335.

<sup>83</sup> VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 332.

do not appear to describe the Teacher's suffering as offering atonement for others."<sup>84</sup> His cautious treatment stands in the tradition of Millar Burrows, in contrast to all attempts to sensationalize the Scrolls by exaggerating the affinities with the New Testament.

### *Other Issues*

Not all the parallels noted by scholars between the Scrolls and the New Testament concern messianism or Jesus. VanderKam, for example, cites the parallel to the Beatitudes in 4Q525, the issue of rebuking a fellow member in Matt 18:15-17, and the dispute on the Sabbath in Matt 12:11-12.<sup>85</sup> The *Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* also contains chapters on Acts and the Epistles by VanderKam and on the Book of Revelation by Peter Flint.<sup>86</sup> The papers from the 1998 Princeton symposium include a whole volume on "The Scrolls and Christian Origins,"<sup>87</sup> most, but not all, of which are by American scholars. These include essays on the Synoptic Gospels (Craig Evans, pp 75-96), the Johannine community (Charlesworth, 97-152), Paul and the works of the Law (Charlesworth with James Dunn, 187-202), Hebrews (Harold Attridge, 203-30) and the Book of Revelation (Adela Yarbro Collins on the New Jerusalem, 203-54, and Loren Johns, 255-80). Another volume edited by Flint and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years. A Comprehensive Assessment* (Leiden: Brill, 1999) contains noteworthy, up-to-date reviews of "Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls," by Craig Evans (573-98), "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls," by Joseph Fitzmyer (599-621) and "Qumran and the Book of Revelation" by David Aune (622-48).

Among the issues relating to Paul, we may note the minor controversy over the relevance of 4QMMT as possible background for Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. Dunn and Charlesworth conclude: "The Qumran composition known as 4QMMT preserves both a vocabulary ("works of the Law") and a way of interpreting Torah that obviously helped shape the thought and practices of some early Jews. We should not assume that only the Qumranites knew about the ideas and teachings preserved in 4QMMT, since not only Paul's Galatians but also *halakhot* in rabbinics prove that other Jews knew some of the ideas found in this document."<sup>88</sup> In line with the

<sup>84</sup> VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 343.

<sup>85</sup> VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 336-42.

<sup>86</sup> VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 346-78.

<sup>87</sup> James H. Charlesworth, *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, vol. 3.

<sup>88</sup> James D. G. Dunn and James H. Charlesworth, "Qumran's Some Works of Torah

work of Dunn, Martin Abegg, an American teaching in Canada, affirms a clear terminological connection between 4QMMT and Galatians, but denies the Qumran document implies that people earn their salvation by works.<sup>89</sup> These theses have been controversial in Britain more than in North America. Simon Gathercole, for example, warns that “the polemic context in which the phrase is used in MMT ... cannot be transferred wholesale into the Pauline context,” a point that would seem to be well taken.<sup>90</sup>

None of the issues discussed in this essay is peculiarly American; all have involved international discussion. The most distinctively American interest in the Dead Sea Scrolls, however, is surely the fascination with any light they may shed on Jesus and his messianic claims. From time to time, this fascination has led to sensationalism, as in the two phases of “Qumran fever” in the 1950s and 1990s, but extreme views have never found a wide following, and the most authoritative surveys of the Scrolls have been remarkably sober and balanced.

---

(4Q394-399 [4QMMT]) and Paul’s Galatians,” in James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 201.

<sup>89</sup> Martin G. Abegg, “Paul and James on the Law in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in John J. Collins and Craig A. Evans, eds., *Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 63-74.

<sup>90</sup> Simon Gathercole, *Where is Boasting? Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul’s Response in Romans 1-5* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 96. Compare Nicholas T. Wright, “Paul and Qumran,” *BRev* 14 (1998): 18-54, and the comments of VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 351.



## CANADIAN SCHOLARSHIP ON THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

EILEEN M. SCHULLER

Canadian scholars have been actively involved in the acquisition, publication and study of the Dead Sea Scrolls from as early as 1950 up until the present.<sup>1</sup> Of particular interest and importance was the contribution made by the Faculty of Divinity at McGill University, Montreal, towards the purchasing of fragments from cave 4 from the Bedouin. But this story has been little known, even in Canada;<sup>2</sup> fortunately in recent years two graduate students at McGill, Jacqueline du Toit and Jason Kalman, undertook extensive research that recovered and publicized many details of this fascinating episode.<sup>3</sup> This short article makes no claim to name every person or project that could be mentioned, but it does demonstrate that Canadian scholars have been well represented in almost every aspect of Dead Sea Scrolls research.<sup>4</sup>

The first Canadian involvement in the saga of the discovery was in the summer of 1950 when Fred Winnett from the Department of Near Eastern Studies, University of Toronto, came to Jerusalem to serve as the annual director at the American School in Jerusalem (now the Albright Institute). Some months later, in the spring of 1951, Robert Scott, a United Church

---

<sup>1</sup> This article will include scholars born and working in Canada, those born in Canada who have taught outside Canada, and those born elsewhere who have done their major work in Canada.

<sup>2</sup> The first brief account of the "McGill project" was published as a "personal reflection" by Robert B. Y. Scott, "Whatever Happened to McGill's Dead Sea Scrolls," *ARC* 9 (1981): 55-58; *ARC* is the journal of the Faculty of Religious Studies at McGill and has very limited circulation. To mark the occasion of the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the discovery of the Scrolls, Eileen Schuller made a brief presentation on Canadian involvements at a session of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies in 1988; this was subsequently published as "The Fortieth Anniversary of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Canadian Contribution," *SR* 18 (1989): 61-65.

<sup>3</sup> Jacqueline S. du Toit and Jason Kalman, *Canada's Big Biblical Bargain: How McGill University Bought the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2010). See also their earlier article, "Great Scott! The Dead Sea Scrolls, McGill University and the Canadian Media," *DSD* 12 (2005): 6-23.

<sup>4</sup> An earlier version of this article was given at a symposium sponsored by the Canadian Bible Society and Trinity Western University in October 2007 to celebrate the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the discovery, and will be included in the collection of papers from the conference, *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Sixty Years*, edited by Jean Duhaime, Peter W. Flint and Kyung Baek, *Early Judaism and its Literature Series* (Atlanta: SBL, forthcoming).



clergyman who had served in 1948-1949 as the first Dean of the Faculty of Divinity at McGill University, came to Jerusalem for a short-term study visit. Winnett's field of expertise was linguistics, inscriptions, and Syriac. It is perhaps a salutary corrective to our tendency to think that the Scrolls were the biggest and only news item in Jerusalem in those days to note that in his annual formal report to the American Schools of Oriental Research (ASOR) at the end of his term, Winnett made no mention of anything about the Scrolls or Qumran; in outlining the highlights of his tenure, he discussed only his work on Arabic, Moabite and Thamudic inscriptions and at sites in Transjordan.<sup>5</sup>

We do know that during his year as Director, Winnett was directly involved in one particular incident involving the Scrolls. For over two years (1949-1951), there had been a spate of highly charged polemical articles, both in the popular media and in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, about the authenticity and dating of the Scrolls: were they really ancient documents? Could they not be just medieval copies or modern forgeries? One alleged piece of the puzzle was related to an article that appeared in a Hebrew newspaper written by Toviah Wechsler, a Jewish antiquities dealer.<sup>6</sup> He reported that in the summer/fall of 1947 he had visited the library of St. Mark's Monastery at the invitation of a member of the Syrian community and had been shown two scrolls, a copy of the book of Isaiah and a *Haftarot* scroll.<sup>7</sup> Much fuss ensued about whether this *Haftarot* scroll was subsequently being suppressed or whether it was being confused with an 18<sup>th</sup> century scroll that William Brownlee and John Trever had once seen in the monastery library. Finally, in the spring of 1951, Millar Burrows (acting on behalf of ASOR) asked the American School in Jerusalem to send someone to go to St. Mark's and ascertain whether the library did possess such a *Haftarot* scroll. And so the two Canadians, Winnett and Scott, paid a visit to the monastery on March 21, 1951; they met with the Archbishop and were assured that no *Haftarot* scroll existed among the library's collec-

---

<sup>5</sup> Fred V. Winnett, "Report of the Director of the School in Jerusalem," *BASOR* 124 (1951): 4-7.

<sup>6</sup> Toviah Wechsler, "The Overt *Geniza* and the Hidden *Geniza*," *Haolam* (December 12, 1949): 156-7 (Hebrew).

<sup>7</sup> There is a dispute over the exact date: Toviah Wechsler, "The 'Hidden Geniza,'" *JQR* 41 (1951): 249, gives the date as July 1947; Archbishop Samuel gives the date as the end of September; see Athanasius Yeshue Samuel, *Treasure of Qumran: My Story of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), 197-8; Weston W. Fields puts the visit at the end of September or beginning of October, in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Short History* (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2006), 19. The visit was at the invitation of Stephan Hann of the Transjordanian Department of Antiquities.

tion. Burrows accepted their report and concluded that “the whole matter has received more attention than it deserves.”<sup>8</sup>

In the debates and polemics of these early years regarding authenticity and dating, an important figure was Solomon Birnbaum, who established his own dates for the Qumran manuscripts on paleographic grounds, independently of William Albright and John Trever (as he spiritedly insisted when Paul Kahle tried to group him with Albright and Trever<sup>9</sup>).<sup>10</sup> Birnbaum was an Austrian who had fled to England, but after his retirement he lived in Toronto with his sons from 1970 to 1990; he was active in research and writing in the Toronto academic and Jewish community until his death at the age of 98 (and so he is included here). Canada can also lay claim to Harold Ginsberg who was born in Montreal, although he lived mainly in the United States. Ginsberg wrote a series of early articles on the Scrolls and their authenticity; indeed, late in 1948 he published one of the very first descriptions of the contents of the Hebrew University Scrolls.<sup>11</sup>

Winnett was followed as Director of the American School (an annual position) by William Reed, and then on July 1, 1952 by another Canadian, Douglas Tushingham, who had been teaching at Queen’s Theological College, Kingston. These were exciting days: a second cave had been discovered to the north of cave 1 by Bedouin in February 1952; Milik discovered cave 3 and the *Copper Scroll* in March 1952; and the Bedouin found cave 4 in September 1952. On September 20, some Bedouin showed up at Kando’s shop in Bethlehem and at the École Biblique in Jerusalem with the first batches of fragments from cave 4; by 3:00 pm the Jordanian officials had been notified and arrived at the desert site to discover the Bedouin in the act of removing the fragments.<sup>12</sup>

Tushingham became personally involved in these events over the next weeks. He related in his end-of-the-year annual report that on October 4,

<sup>8</sup> Millar Burrows, “Concerning the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *JQR* 42 (1951): 125.

<sup>9</sup> Solomon A. Birnbaum, *The Qumran (Dead Sea) Scrolls and Palaeography* (BASORSup 13-14; New Haven: ASOR, 1952), 10.

<sup>10</sup> Solomon A. Birnbaum, “The Date of the Habakkuk Cave Scroll,” *JBL* 68 (1949): 161-8; “The Date of the Covenant Scroll,” *PEQ* 81 (1949): 140-47; “How Old are the Cave Manuscripts? A Palaeographical Discussion,” *VT* 1 (1951): 91-109; “Notes on the Internal and Archaeological Evidence Concerning the Cave Scrolls,” *JBL* 70 (1951): 227-32; *The Qumran Scrolls and Palaeography*.

<sup>11</sup> Harold L. Ginsberg, “The Hebrew University Scrolls from the Sectarian Cache,” *BASOR* 112 (1948): 19-23; “The Cave Scrolls and the Jewish Sects,” *Comm* 16 (1953): 77-81; “More Light from the Judaean Caves,” *Comm* 20 (1955): 468-74; “The Cave Scrolls Controversy,” *Mid-Stream* 3 (1957-1958): 58-69.

<sup>12</sup> Much detailed information and chronology of these crucial days has been recovered and discussed by Weston W. Fields in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Short History, Vol. I, 1947-1960* (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

at the traditional tea that was held at the Albright Institute to mark the beginning of the academic year, Roland de Vaux, the director of the École Biblique et Archéologique Française in Jerusalem, took the occasion to tell him that “work had to be begun immediately in a new manuscript cave area.”<sup>13</sup> De Vaux asked Tushingham to undertake a brief expedition, with assistance from Yosef Sa’ad from the Rockefeller Museum. An expedition apparently took place, but Tushingham’s report is brief and cryptic: “The results were not what we had hoped. The Bedu had been there before us.”<sup>14</sup> It is not clear what caves or area Tushingham was being asked to explore nor what was actually done; there is no record in the letters and notes of Harding or de Vaux about this expedition of Tushingham—the one archaeological venture by a Canadian seems to have been a very minor affair indeed!

A more significant involvement is that in these years both Winnett and Tushingham in their capacity as Director of the American School would have represented ASOR on the Board of the Palestine Archaeological Museum. The Museum, particularly in the person of Lankester Harding (who was both Director of the Jordanian Department of Antiquities and Curator of the Museum), had the task of finding the money to purchase the literally thousands of fragments that the Bedouin were bringing in boxes and bags. Harding saw immediately that they must be purchased by the Museum so that they would not be offered for sale piecemeal on the market and scattered among private owners around the world.

The Jordanian government allotted a sum of 15,000 pounds (*circa* \$42,000) and the Museum used its savings, but this was quickly exhausted. Already in the fall of 1952 Harding began appealing to individuals and to institutions around the world (including the Library of Congress and the British Museum) to put up money to purchase fragments. From the very beginning, it was made clear that the fragments themselves would remain in Jordan until they were studied and published and only then would revert to the institution of purchase.

How did Canada become involved? In August 1953 Roland de Vaux made a passionate appeal for funds at the first congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament (IOSOT) in Copenhagen, and Robert Scott was in the audience.<sup>15</sup> On his return to Montreal,

<sup>13</sup> Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1956), 63.

<sup>14</sup> Douglas Tushingham, “Report of the Director of the School in Jerusalem,” *BASOR* 132 (1953): 43.

<sup>15</sup> Scott, “McGill’s Dead Sea Scrolls,” 55-58.

Scott set out to raise money. He put his case to Frank Cyril James, Dean of the Faculty of Divinity, on September 28, 1953 in these words:

This seems a remarkable opportunity for McGill to obtain a collection of documents of the utmost value for Biblical research and for the history of Judaism . . . . The possession of a collection of documents, even in fragmentary condition, from the epoch of the beginnings of normative Judaism and the rise of Christianity, would attract research scholars for many years and put the name of McGill into many scholarly publications.<sup>16</sup>

In November 1953, McGill made an offer to Harding to purchase some scrolls (sight unseen), the first institution in the world to do so. Harding replied immediately on November 27 with a telegram: "Government have [*sic*] agreed to scheme. Please send your contribution earliest possible."<sup>17</sup> Now the money had to be raised! Scott wrote a popular article for the *Montreal Star* that attracted interest from Henry Birks, a well-known Canadian businessman and an elder at Erskine Church (Scott's own church), and his aunt, Mrs. J. Henry (Elizabeth) Birks pledged \$15,000 at the end of January 1954. Payments were made on March 4 and April 8, 1954; in December 1955, the Birks gave an additional \$4,200 to make another purchase.

This was a coup for Canada and especially for McGill. Winnett (who had made some unsuccessful efforts in Toronto to raise money) wrote to Scott, March 9, 1954, congratulating him for obtaining "a sizable chunk of this material for Canada."<sup>18</sup> News of the purchase was made public on May 22, 1954 in the *Montreal Gazette* and the *Montreal Star*, and in the *New York Times* on May 24 (though it was not reported in any of the major Toronto or Ottawa newspapers). Harding wrote: "I must congratulate the University on having acquired what is certainly the finest collection of these unique manuscript fragments outside the original Government collection."<sup>19</sup> Manchester University, the University of Heidelberg, the Vatican Library, McCormick Theological Seminary, and All Soul's Church in New York subsequently made much smaller purchases. In the end, McGill University money was involved in the purchase of approximately one-quarter of the cave 4 materials, both biblical and non-biblical.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Letter #2 in "Annotated Correspondence," in du Toit and Kalman, *Canada's Big Biblical Bargain*, 141-5.

<sup>17</sup> Letter #4 in du Toit and Kalman, *Canada's Big Biblical Bargain*, 147.

<sup>18</sup> Du Toit and Kalman, "Great Scott," 12, n. 22.

<sup>19</sup> The quote is ascribed to Harding by Scott, in the announcement of the purchase in "Acquisition of Dead Sea Scrolls Fragments by McGill University," *BASOR* 135 (1954): 8, and repeated in "The John Henry Birks Collection of Ancient Palestinian Manuscripts," *CJT* 1 (1955): 51-52.

<sup>20</sup> Scott, "The John Henry Birks Collection," 51.

Scott was assured that the fragments would need to remain at the Palestine Museum for about two years; by then they would all be published and the originals could come to Canada.<sup>21</sup>

The purchased scrolls were first seen by someone from McGill University on April 17, 1954 when Wilfred Cantwell Smith (Director of the Islamic Institute) stopped in Jerusalem on his way back from Cairo and was able to examine some pieces. It was not until a year later, in May 1955, that Scott himself went to Jerusalem to identify the “McGill fragments,” which were calculated as 436 pieces from 160 different manuscripts (not including the lot bought in December 1955 with the additional \$4200).<sup>22</sup>

We can only speculate what might have been possible in terms of more direct Canadian involvement in the task of publishing this wealth of cave 4 fragments. In the fall of 1953, Harding offered that McGill could appoint someone to the international team of scholars that was being formed to work on this material (Józef Milik had been working since 1951, Frank Cross came to Jerusalem in the fall of 1953). Harding wrote: “Perhaps you have some one you would like to send to assist in this work? I am trying to bring together an international group of scholars for the purpose,”<sup>23</sup> but no Canadian took up the offer.

Canada had one more chance to acquire additional scrolls. The four scrolls from cave 1 that had come into the possession of Archbishop Samuel had been taken out of Jerusalem in January 1949 and brought to the United States. Initially, Archbishop Samuel made attempts to sell them to various institutions (including Yale University and the Library of Congress), but issues of rights of possession and the fact that photographs were readily accessible meant that there were no buyers. According to the archbishop’s memoirs, it was when he was told that articles were appearing in the newspapers in late May 1954 that a Canadian university had purchased scrolls from Jordan and paid a considerable sum for them that he decided to try once again to sell.<sup>24</sup> He put his own advertisement in the *Wall Street Journal* on June 1, 1954 offering “four Dead Sea Scrolls for sale.” On June 3, his Massachusetts business agent, Charles Manoog, wrote directly to the Principal of McGill; the letter was received June 7 and forwarded to Scott to

<sup>21</sup> Scott, “Acquisition,” 8.

<sup>22</sup> Scott, “McGill’s Dead Sea Scrolls,” 55. A transcription of Scott’s handlist of the fragments purchased by McGill University as of May 1955 is published for the first time by du Toit and Kalman as an appendix in *Canada’s Great Biblical Bargain*, 308-18.

<sup>23</sup> Letter from Harding to Scott, October 3, 1953; Letter #3 in du Toit and Kalman, *Canada’s Great Biblical Bargain*, 146.

<sup>24</sup> Samuel, *Treasure of Qumran*, 197-8.

reply on the Principal's behalf. The answer was negative: "there is little likelihood that McGill University would be in the market for further purchases of this material so soon after the acquisition of the J.H. Birks Collection", and the issue of uncertainty about the archbishop's title to the scrolls was also raised.<sup>25</sup>

In any case, the answer was somewhat moot because within days of the appearance of the newspaper advertisement a deal was already being negotiated between Yigael Yadin (through his agent) and Charles Manoog (acting for the archbishop). When the day of the actual purchase finally came on July 1, Yadin had arranged for Dr. Kutscher from Hebrew University (who happened to be in New York) to view and authenticate the purchase, but at the last minute Kutscher was unavailable. In desperation, Yadin called up Harry Orlinsky, a Canadian, born in Owen Sound and living in New York. In his later years, Orlinsky always delighted in telling the story of how he was just leaving for holidays in Toronto (literally he had come back into the house for one last time to get a suitcase) when he received the phone call; as the anonymous "Mr. Green" he was taken to the bank vault to compare the scrolls that he was shown with the official reproduction in the ASOR volume.<sup>26</sup> There he ascertained that "the scrolls, which formed the subject of the above negotiations, are the authentic 4 DSS referred to and reproduced in the a/m work by Professor Burrows."<sup>27</sup> In addition to this brief moment of adventure, Orlinsky made his own contribution to Scrolls' scholarship with his work on the *Great Isaiah Scroll* (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>), arguing that this manuscript copy was not an important source of early Hebrew variants, but an inferior text. He was also a member of the translation committee for the Revised Standard Version, the first translation to make use of readings from 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>.<sup>28</sup>

Over the next years, the saga of the "McGill fragments" gradually drew to a close as the political situation in Jordan changed. Harding was dismissed on September 30, 1956, in the wake of the Suez crisis and intense anti-British sentiment, and de Vaux lost considerable influence; already in

<sup>25</sup> Letter from Scott to Manoog, June 9, 1954; Letter #25 in *Canada's Great Biblical Bargain*, 172-3.

<sup>26</sup> Harry M. Orlinsky, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Mr. Green," in Harry M. Orlinsky, *Essays in Biblical Culture and Bible Translation* (New York: Ktav, 1974), 245-56. Reprinted as "The Mysterious Mr. Green," *Reform Judaism* (Spring 1992): 46-48.

<sup>27</sup> Letter in Yigael Yadin, *The Message of the Scrolls* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1957), 48.

<sup>28</sup> Orlinsky's contribution to Scrolls' scholarship is described by Jason Kalman, "Optimistic, Even with the Negatives: The Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion and the Dead Sea Scrolls, 1948-1993," *American Jewish Archives* (2009): 1-114.

1956-1957 there were rumors that Jordan would not allow the scrolls to leave the country.<sup>29</sup> Yet negotiations continued between McGill and the Jordanian Department of Antiquities throughout 1959 and on into 1960 regarding the details of insurance, proper shipping, and conservation techniques in preparation for sending the scrolls. Stanley Frost, current Dean of the Faculty of Divinity, was in Jordan in May 1960, and on his return wrote an article in the *Montreal Star* assuring the public that the scrolls would be on display at McGill by the fall of 1960. A formal letter from the Jordanian government came on June 13, 1961, however, informing McGill and other institutions that the scrolls would not leave Jordan: "The reason for this is that these scrolls constitute an indivisible part of the history of Jordan in particular and of the spiritual legacy of all mankind."<sup>30</sup> Though some efforts were made over the next year to have the fragments come to McGill on a long-term loan with the Jordanian government keeping full legal ownership, it soon became clear that that would not happen. The purchase money was returned on April 8, 1963,<sup>31</sup> and the Birks Foundation gave \$5000 of it to McGill for establishing a library collection of printed and photographic materials related to the Scrolls.

But there is a little bit of the Scrolls in Canada. When Scott was in Jerusalem in 1955, he bought from the Bedouin a matchbox containing seventeen fragments and some coins, paying seventeen dinars.<sup>32</sup> When he dutifully handed his purchase over to the Department of Antiquities, they gave him the coins (of no special value) and a small piece of papyrus that seemed to be blank. In 1978 when Scott donated his books and archaeological collection to McGill, this piece was examined more closely and found to be two layers, made up of five pieces, with some remains of letters. These fragments are now in McGill's Redpath Museum; they were publicly exhibited for the first time at the Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, in conjunction with the Scrolls Exhibit there in 2009 and will eventually be published.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>29</sup> For example, in a letter of March 19, 1957 Scott noted that he had received a letter from Professor Rowley at the University of Manchester warning of this possibility; see Letter #76 in du Toit and Kalman, *Canada's Great Biblical Bargain*, 238.

<sup>30</sup> Letter from M. Shingiti, Jordanian Minister of Education and Antiquities; Letter #112 in du Toit and Kalman, *Canada's Great Biblical Bargain*, 291-2.

<sup>31</sup> Apparently de Vaux played an important role behind the scenes in seeing to it that the McGill money was refunded; see Scott, "McGill's Dead Sea Scrolls," 57.

<sup>32</sup> Scott, "McGill's Dead Sea Scrolls," 57.

<sup>33</sup> The fragments are currently being studied by Florentino García Martínez who will publish them. The letters seem similar to those found on materials from Murabba'at and Nahal Hever, but it is not clear how many letters will ever be able to be read with any degree of certainty.



Before the academic/scholarly work on the Scrolls by Canadians is examined, some mention should be made of popular and media interest in the Scrolls in Canada. Kalman and du Toit surveyed the treatment of the Scrolls in the Canadian media and compiled some statistics: e.g., there were fifty-four articles between 1947-1999 in the major Canadian national newspaper, the *Globe and the Mail* (though only thirteen were written by Canadian journalists, the others came from Associated Press, Reuters, the *New York Times*, and the *Times of London*).<sup>34</sup> Scott was the main spokesman from 1953 to 1960 (even after he moved on to Princeton in 1955, he was still the Canadian identified with the Scrolls by the media); particularly influential were a series of talks that Scott gave on CBC radio in August 1955 and published in the same year as *Treasure from the Judaean Caves: The Story of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (United Church Publishing House). His sober and scholarly articles often served to offset a stream of more sensational pieces that propagated the theories of André Dupont-Sommer, John Allegro and Edmund Wilson. In June 1956, Scott gave a lengthy and learned presentation to the Royal Society of Canada on "The Meaning for Biblical Studies of the Qumran Scroll Discoveries."<sup>35</sup> Although Scott noted that the Scrolls provide "new data ... for the understanding of Judaism at the turn of the era," in fact, he supplied very few concrete examples of this aspect of their significance; here, as in most of his presentations, the focus was on the biblical manuscripts and their importance for textual criticism, as well as on texts and themes related to the rise of Christianity and the making of the New Testament. His concluding sentence struck a cautionary note: "But in no case are the consequences of their discovery expected to be revolutionary."<sup>36</sup>

Another publication that had wide popular appeal in Canada came in December 1958 in the *National Geographic Magazine* by Douglas Tushingham, who by this time had moved from Queen's Theological School and become Head of the Division of Art and Archaeology, The Royal Ontario Museum (in 1963 he became chief archaeologist until his retirement in 1979). His article, "The Men Who Hid the Dead Sea Scrolls," raised the issue of whether women and children were part of this community. Tushingham concluded, "The archaeological evidence from the cemeteries proves that wives and even children were present at Qumran, but scholars

---

<sup>34</sup> Du Toit and Kalman, "Great Scott," 8.

<sup>35</sup> *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada* 50.3 (1956), section 2:39.

<sup>36</sup> *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada* 50.3, 48.



doubt that women had access to the inner precincts of the religious centre.”<sup>37</sup>

As noted above, although Scott was particularly interested in the implications of this discovery for Christians, he was aware of the significance of the Scrolls for understanding Judaism, and he had personal contact and good relations with the large Jewish community in Montreal. In November 1955, he was invited by the Canadian Jewish Congress to speak on the Scrolls; unfortunately, no transcript or recording of this talk seems to have survived. In February 1956, Samuel Sandmel, from Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, gave a series of lectures at the major Reform synagogue in Montreal, Temple Emanu-el. As he is quoted in the *Montreal Star*, Sandmel downplayed any link between the Scrolls and the Essenes, and concluded that the Dead Sea Scrolls “change nothing, clarify nothing, and add relatively little to our knowledge of Christianity and Judaism.”<sup>38</sup> The *Montreal Star* contrasted this with an article that had been written by Scott a few months earlier (in the *Weekend* magazine, October 1955) that made many links with Essenes and argued that the Scrolls were “of immense importance.”<sup>39</sup> Over the years, Temple Emanu-El sponsored numerous speakers (both Jewish and Christian) on the Scrolls: in 1961, Norman Golb (at that time at the Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, presently at the University of Chicago), and Christian scholars including Jean Duhaime (Université de Montréal) and Eileen Schuller (McMaster University).

Canadians became involved as academic scholars in the study of the Scrolls already by the late 1950s. Among the first was Willard Oxtoby, an American by birth, who taught mainly in Canada, first at McGill, 1960–1964, and at Trinity College in the University of Toronto, from 1971 until his death in 2003. In 1958–1960, he was at the American School in Jerusalem as a student and worked (along with Raymond Brown, Joseph Fitzmyer, and Javier Teixidor) on making the first handwritten concor-

---

<sup>37</sup> In 1988 (just before his death) I had a conversation with Tushingam in which he recalled that in the artistic drawings that accompanied the article, the artist had portrayed some of the members of the community as women. Frank Cross saw a draft of the article and intervened and said there could not have been women in the community, so they were transformed into men by the addition of beards!

<sup>38</sup> Samuel Sandmel, “Dead Sea Scrolls: Sharp Divergences in Scholarly Views,” *Montreal Star* (February 11, 1956).

<sup>39</sup> Robert B. Y. Scott, “The Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Montreal Star Weekend* (October 15, 1955): 2–4 and 40–42.

dance of the cave 4 manuscripts.<sup>40</sup> As far as can be ascertained, the first graduate level courses in Canada specifically on the Scrolls were offered (not surprisingly) by Scott in the Faculty of Divinity at McGill in 1953-1954 and 1954-1955; no record of the syllabi or the number of students enrolled seems to have survived. By the late 1950s and early 1960s, a number of theses at the masters level were written on Scrolls topics,<sup>41</sup> and in 1962, a doctoral thesis was completed in the Department of Near Eastern Studies, University of Toronto, by John Revell, a 473-page work on "A Structural Analysis of the Grammar of the Manual of Discipline." The first scholarly article appeared in 1964 in the *Canadian Journal of Theology*, by R. E. Osborne, entitled "Did Paul Go to Qumran?" Osborne (who subsequently taught for many years at Carleton University, Ottawa) was working at that time on his Ph.D. in Edinburgh; with characteristic Canadian moderation and caution, he concluded that Paul perhaps knew Essenes in Damascus, but "whether Paul actually did have contact with the men of the Scrolls either at Damascus or at Qumran cannot be determined. It remains an interesting possibility, but beyond that we cannot go."<sup>42</sup>

Throughout the 1970s and 1980s a number of doctoral theses were written by Canadians, some of whose names are familiar as they continued to work on the Scrolls throughout their scholarly careers, while others never wrote again on Qumran but rather moved on to different areas.<sup>43</sup> In the

---

<sup>40</sup> This was a card index, with each word entered on a separate card, that was kept for decades in a large wooden box in the basement of the Rockefeller Museum in the room where the Scrolls were stored. In 1979, all of the cards were photographed, and in 1985 a few print copies were made of these films by Hartmut Stegemann and distributed to selected institutions and individuals.

<sup>41</sup> For example, William Raymond Wood (McMaster Divinity College, 1957), "The Dead Sea Scrolls and their Relevance to the Study of Christian Origins;" Ernest Lloyd Ivany (Pine Hill Divinity School, 1962), "The People of the Covenant in the Qumran Documents and in the Pauline Epistles;" Donald Boyd (McGill, 1962), "The Identification of the Qumran Sect;" Francis Micallef (Regis and St. Mary's, 1965), "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Community of Qumran."

<sup>42</sup> R. E. Osborne, "Did Paul Go to Qumran?" *CJT* 10 (1964): 15-24.

<sup>43</sup> It is very difficult to compile a complete list, and I apologize in advance for people whom I have not discovered, and would appreciate receiving notification so the list can be made more complete:

1971: Paul Garnet (Concordia), "Atonement Ideas in the Qumran Scrolls," published as *Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls* (WUNT 2; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1977); continued to publish occasionally on the Scrolls (most recently, "Cave 4 Parallels to 1QS 5:1-7: Towards A *Serek* Text History," *JSP* 15 [1997]: 67-78; a book review in *DSD* 6 [1999]: 202-05).

1972: Phyllis Smyth (University of St. Andrews), "The Doctrine of the 2 Spirits in the Qumran Literature, with Specific Reference to 1QS 3:13-4:26," went into chaplaincy work.

1974: Lawrence Frizzell (Oxford, under Geza Vermes), "The People of God in the Qumran Sect (Dead Sea Scrolls)," taught at Seton Hall University, New Jersey and worked in

1970s, research on the Dead Sea Scrolls was very much part of the major research project on “Normative Self-Definition” at McMaster University under the direction of Ed Sanders and Ben Meyers (with the assistance of Alan Mendelson), the first large-scale liberal arts project founded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Although McMaster was the center of much of Scrolls study in Canada in these years, at the University of Toronto John Revell regularly taught graduate courses with a focus on the linguistic aspects of the Scrolls, and John Wevers offered seminars on the Scrolls and Text Criticism. In 1985, Geza Vermes visited for a semester at St. Michael’s College, Toronto, and taught a graduate course in which the Scrolls were a significant component.

In the 1980s and 1990s, a number of Canadians became involved for the first time in the actual work of preparing the *editio princeps* of still-unpublished texts—after the missed opportunity in 1953 to appoint a Canadian to the international team! Eileen Schuller (1946-) was given responsibility for editing a series of prayer and psalmic texts for the DJD series: 4Q380 and 4Q381 “Non-Canonical Psalms: a Pseudepigraphic Collection;”<sup>44</sup> 4Q371-4Q373 first designated as “A Joseph Apocryphon” and then renamed “Narrative and Prose Composition,”<sup>45</sup> and 4Q427-4Q432, 4Q433, 4Q433a, 4Q440, the *Hodayot* and *Hodayot-like* texts.<sup>46</sup> After the death of Hartmut Stegemann, she published the reconstruction of the original 1QHodayot<sup>a</sup> scroll that he had made; this edition included many new

---

Jewish-Christian Relations in the Institute of Judaeo-Christian Studies with John Österreicher.

1975: Jean Duhaime (Université de Montréal), “L’instruction sur les deux esprits de la règle de la communauté (1QS 3, 13-14, 26) et ses affinités perses,” ongoing active involvement in Scrolls research.

1975: Benno Przybylski (McMaster), “Meaning and Significance of the Concept of Righteousness with Special Reference to the Use of this Concept in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Tannaic Literature,” published as *Righteousness in Matthew and His World of Thought* (SNTSMS 41; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

1980: Robert Huebsch (McMaster University), “The Understanding and Significance of the Remnant in Qumran Literature.”

1981: Michael Newton (McMaster), “The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul,” published under the same title in SNTSMS 53 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

1985: Wayne McCready (McMaster), “The Use of Jewish Scriptures in Qumran and in Paul as a Means of Self-Definition,” published articles especially on the *Temple Scroll*.

<sup>44</sup> *Qumran Cave 4. VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (DJD XI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

<sup>45</sup> *Wadi Daliyeh II: The Samaria Papyri from Wadi Daliyeh and Qumran Cave 4. XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2* (DJD XXVIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001).

<sup>46</sup> *Qumran Cave 4. XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XXIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999).

readings, and the incorporation of materials preserved in the 4QHodayot manuscripts and 1QHodayot<sup>b</sup>.<sup>47</sup> After Emanuel Tov became editor-in-chief for the publication of the Scrolls in 1991, the still-unpublished material was distributed much more widely; of the 106 individuals listed as contributors to the official Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (DJD) series,<sup>48</sup> in addition to Schuller, there are three others who are native-born Canadians, though now teaching outside the country: Saul Olyan (born in Winnipeg, teaching at Harvard) edited 4Q382 (4Qpap paraKings) in DJD XIII (1994); Timothy Lim (from Vancouver, teaching at the University of Edinburgh) edited some sapiential texts, 4Q303-4Q305 (4QMeditation on Creation A-C) in DJD XX (1997), and halakhic texts, 4Q306 (4QMen of the People Who Err) and 4Q307 (4QText Mentioning the Temple) in DJD XXXVI (2000);<sup>49</sup> Daniel Falk (born in Saskatchewan, now teaching in Eugene, Oregon) edited 4Q392, 4Q393 (4QCommunal Confession) in DJD XXIX (1999).<sup>50</sup>

In addition, a number of “adopted Canadians” have contributed in major ways to the publication of the Scrolls. Peter Flint, from South Africa and currently teaching at Trinity Western University edited the cave 4 Psalms manuscripts with Eugene Ulrich, in DJD XVI (2000);<sup>51</sup> with Eugene Ulrich, he prepared DJD XXXII (2010), a re-edition of the Isaiah manuscripts from Qumran. Sarianna Metso, originally from Finland and currently at

<sup>47</sup> Hartmut Stegemann with Eileen Schuller and Carol Newsom, *Qumran Cave 1.III: 1QHodayot<sup>a</sup> with Incorporation of 4QHodayot<sup>a-f</sup> and 1QHodayot<sup>b</sup>* (DJD XL; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009).

<sup>48</sup> See the list in Emanuel Tov, ed., *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (DJD XXXIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 5-8.

<sup>49</sup> Lim used the Scrolls extensively in his 1991 doctoral thesis from University of Oxford, published as *Holy Scriptures in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997). He has remained active in Scrolls research as an organizer of a number of symposia, and edited two collections of papers, *On Scrolls, Artefacts and Intellectual Property* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), and *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000). He also published *The Pesharim*, (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 3; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), and *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Very Short Introduction* (London: Oxford University Press, 2005).

<sup>50</sup> Falk wrote his thesis at the University of Cambridge, published as *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998); he is very active in Scrolls research and recently published *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 8; Library of Second Temple Texts 63; London: T&T Clark, 2007).

<sup>51</sup> Peter Flint has written extensively on many aspects of both the Masoretic Psalter and various versions of the Psalter found at Qumran, see especially *Psalms at Qumran and the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17; Leiden: Brill, 1993); with James VanderKam he edited the two-volume compendium, *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (Leiden: Brill, 1999).

University of Toronto, edited with Eugene Ulrich 4Q99-4Q100 (4QJob<sup>a,b</sup>), in DJD XVI (2000) in addition to her extensive work on the *Serek* manuscripts.<sup>52</sup> Martin Abegg, currently at Trinity Western University, has prepared concordances for the non-biblical and biblical Scrolls,<sup>53</sup> concordances for Volumes XXXVII and XL of DJD, and the “Concordance of Proper Nouns in the Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran” in DJD XXXIX. In addition to the publication of texts per se, Abegg and Flint (along with Ulrich) edited *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, and (with Florentino García Martínez) an ongoing series of collected essays, *Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature*, designed “to make the best Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship accessible to the scholars, students and the thinking public.”<sup>54</sup>

There are still many other people in Canada or originally from Canada who have not been involved specifically in the publication of texts in DJD volumes but who have been very active in Scrolls research and publication. Names that come to mind immediately include John Kampen, who has written many articles on wisdom literature and the Scrolls and Matthew and edited a number of conferences volumes;<sup>55</sup> Craig Evans, formerly at Trinity Western University (1981-2002) and now at Acadia Divinity School, who in his own writings and in his edited volumes has done much to make the scholarship on the Scrolls accessible to New Testament scholars;<sup>56</sup> and Al Wolters, who taught for many years at Redeemer University College, Ancaster, and found his niche with articles, both technical and popular, on the *Copper Scroll*.<sup>57</sup> From French Canada, the name that immediately comes to mind is Jean Duhaime, who has written extensively on

<sup>52</sup> Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997); *The Serekh Texts* (Library of Second Temple Studies 61; Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 9; London: T&T Clark, 2007).

<sup>53</sup> Martin Abegg, with James Bowley and Edward Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*, vol. 1: *The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran*, vol. 3: *The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 2003, 2010).

<sup>54</sup> Eleven volumes have been published by Eerdmans in the ten years, 1999-2008.

<sup>55</sup> Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez and John Kampen, eds., *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization of Qumran Studies, Cambridge, 1995, Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten* (STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997); Moshe Bernstein and John Kampen, eds., *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

<sup>56</sup> Only a few of his works can be mentioned here: John J. Collins and Craig Evans, eds., *Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic Press, 2006); Peter Flint and Craig Evans, eds., *Eschatology, Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997); Stanley Porter and Craig Evans, eds., *The Scrolls and the Scriptures* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).

<sup>57</sup> In addition to many technical philological articles, *The Copper Scroll: Overview, Text and Translation* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1986).

the *War Scrolls* and the application of social scientific theory to the Qumran Community;<sup>58</sup> Duhaime, with a team of French-Canadian scholars, is charged with preparing the volume on the prophetic materials for the *Bibliothèque de Qumrân* project, under the direction of André Paul and his team in France. In recent years, Canada has been enriched by the addition of Hindy Najman and Judith Newmann to the faculty of the University of Toronto; they have written extensively on biblical interpretation and prayer in the Scrolls, and Najman was an editor of the journal *Dead Sea Discoveries*. Most recently, Daniel Machiela who has worked extensively on the text of the *Genesis Apocryphon*, joined the faculty at McMaster.<sup>59</sup> There are other individuals who have contributed articles and books that deal in depth with Qumran materials (Herbert Basser, Paul Heger have not yet been mentioned); I make no claim to have named everyone, only to have demonstrated the ongoing depth and activity of Scrolls scholarship in Canada.

As the above survey has indicated, graduate work on the Scrolls has been centered at a cluster of universities: in French-speaking Canada at Université de Montréal, in English Canada at McMaster University and more recently at the University of Toronto, and at Trinity Western University, Langley, B.C. In 1995, the latter established the first Canadian academic institute devoted specifically to the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls under the direction of Martin Abegg and Peter Flint, reinforced by the appointment of Peter Flint to a prestigious Canada Research Chair (Tier 1) in November 2004. Out of these schools has come a new generation of Scrolls scholars who have produced doctoral theses and monographs in recent years: Lorenzo DiTommaso, Kenneth Penner, Dorothy Peters, Cecilia Wassen, Jeremy Penner.<sup>60</sup> The occasional thesis is written at other smaller schools, attesting to more widespread interest in Scrolls research on the part of both

---

<sup>58</sup> Jean Duhaime, *The War Texts: 1QM and Related Manuscripts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 6; London: T&T Clark, 2004); the section on the *War Scroll* in James Charlesworth, ed., *Damascus Document, War Scroll and Related Documents* (The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project Vol. 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995); *Les Esséniens de Qumrân: des ésotéristes?* (Paris: Fides, 1990).

<sup>59</sup> Daniel A. Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13-17* (STDJ 79; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

<sup>60</sup> Lorenzo DiTommaso (McMaster University, 2002), *The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text: Content and Contexts* (TSAJ 110; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005); Kenneth Penner (McMaster, 2006), "Verb Form Semantics in Qumran Hebrew Texts;" Dorothy Peters (Trinity Western, University of Manchester, 2007), *Noah Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta/Leiden: SBL Press/Brill, 2008); Cecilia Wassen (McMaster, 2003), *Women in the Damascus Document* (Academia Biblica 21; Atlanta: SBL, 2005); Jeremy Penner (McMaster, 2010), "Patterns of Daily Prayer in Second Temple Judaism."

students and faculty.<sup>61</sup> Moreover, a significant number of smaller schools regularly offer courses at the undergraduate level, sometimes specifically on the Scrolls, more often courses on the Second Temple period in which the Dead Sea Scrolls are treated in considerable depth.<sup>62</sup>

One important venue of scholarly discussion and distribution of knowledge is the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies (CSBS). As far as can be recovered from the CSBS archives, the first public academic talk was given in 1950 when William Taylor, Principal of University College, University of Toronto, presented a paper on “Newly Discovered Biblical Manuscripts;” the talk was to be presented “with Tea” on January 10, but had to be postponed until January 13 when it was finally given “with Tea”! At the annual CSBS meeting in 1953, Parker spoke on “Some Observations on the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Texts of Isaiah,” and Robert Scott commented on “Père de Vaux’s statement concerning excavations at Khirbet Qumran, published in the *Manchester Guardian*.” Papers on the Scrolls were given sporadically from that time on; of special note was the 1956 Presidential Address given by John Wevers on “The Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament;” a special session at the 1987 meeting to mark the fortieth anniversary of the discovery; the Presidential Address in 1995 by Eileen Schuller on “Going on Fifty: Reflections on the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls;” and two sessions organized by Cecilia Wassen in 2007 and 2008 to celebrate the sixtieth anniversary, featuring some twenty-two papers. The French-language society, *L’Association catholiques des études bibliques au Canada* (ACÉBAC) organizes its annual meeting somewhat differently around a major theme, but individual papers on the Scrolls have been given regularly over the years, especially by Jean Duhaime. In addition, Canadian scholars have been active in the Qumran Section of the Society of Biblical Literature, supplying three co-chairs over the last decade: John Kampen, Eileen Schuller, and Martin Abegg. There has been similar involvement in the International Society of Qumran Studies, with regular attendance and papers by Canadians, and Daniel Falk and Eileen Schuller shared in the co-editing

---

<sup>61</sup> For instance, masters-level theses have been written recently at University of Regina and Memorial, and a doctoral thesis in 2001 at Concordia University, by Maria Mamfredis, “A Nation of Priests: The World-View of the Temple Scroll and its Application to the Way of Life Prescribed in the Sectarian Scrolls from Qumran.”

<sup>62</sup> A random survey of university and college websites found such courses being offered at Briercrest College, Briercrest, Saskatchewan; Emmanuel Bible College, Kitchener; Ambrose University College, Calgary; Taylor University College, Edmonton; Providence College, Otterburne, Manitoba; Huron University College, London; York University, Toronto; Tyndale Seminary, Toronto.



of the proceedings from the Oslo Meeting of 1998.<sup>63</sup> A major landmark in Canadian scholarship was the hosting of an international academic conference in Toronto in November 2009, in conjunction with an exhibit of the Scrolls (see below), on the theme “The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts” and the publication of the papers in a conference volume.<sup>64</sup>

Finally, some mention should be made of what has proven to be a major avenue in Canada for the promotion and dissemination of information about the Scrolls to the general public: public exhibits of the Scrolls themselves. In addition to occasional displays of one or two scrolls, there have been three major exhibits: a travelling exhibit arranged by the Government of Jordan and various other agencies that came to the Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, in fall 1965; an Israel Antiquities Authority exhibit in Montreal and at the Museum of Civilizations, Ottawa/Hull, in June 2003–April 2004; and most recently an Israel Antiquities Authority exhibit at the Royal Ontario Museum in the fall of 2009, curated by a Canadian scholar, Lisa Levitt Kohn. These exhibits have offered unique opportunities to bring together people from Christian, Jewish and secular backgrounds both for the exhibits and for public lectures, and have served to highlight and explain to the general Canadian public the importance and contribution of the Scrolls as religious, historical and cultural artifacts.

---

<sup>63</sup> Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez and Eileen M. Schuller, *Sapiential, Liturgical & Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet* (STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000).

<sup>64</sup> Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman and Eileen Schuller, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts* (STDJ 92; Leiden: Brill, 2010).





# DEAD SEA SCROLLS SCHOLARSHIP IN ISRAEL



## ISRAELI SCHOLARSHIP ON THE QUMRAN COMMUNITY

DEVORAH DIMANT

Israeli research into the Qumran Scrolls starts with the discovery itself, so in a way its history and development reflect the general quest to understand these unique documents and the community that owned them.<sup>1</sup> Being Jewish, written mostly in Hebrew and Aramaic, and discovered in the Land of Israel, the Qumran Scrolls are accessible to the general public in Israel and are a constant source of keen interest. In fact, it was Eliezer Sukenik, an Israeli archaeologist of the Hebrew University, who in 1947 first contacted antiquities dealers in Jerusalem who had some ancient manuscripts for sale. After lively negotiations overshadowed by growing tension between Arabs and Jews on the eve of the vote on the United Nations resolution on the creation of the State of Israel (adopted November 29, 1947<sup>2</sup>), Sukenik acquired some of the first documents found by the Bedouin that year.

Sukenik's own personality seems to have been prepared for the task. Born in Bialystok, Poland, Eliezer Lipa Sukenik (1889-1953) studied at the University of Berlin and at Dropsie College, Philadelphia. As a young man he settled in Israel (1912), where he participated in various excavations, among them of several synagogues (Beth Alpha, Hammath-Gadara). He gained experience in reading ancient inscriptions, so when the time came he could recognize the antiquity and authenticity of the manuscripts found near the Dead Sea whose purchase he was about to finalize.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See the earlier surveys of Israeli scholarship on the Qumran Scrolls by Magen Broshi, "Fifty Years of Israeli Research in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Jewish Studies* 39 (1999): 161-7 (Hebrew); Emanuel Tov, "Israeli Scholarship on the Texts from the Judean Desert," in Kugler and Schuller, *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty*, 123-7. See also Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Confessionalism and the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Jewish Studies* 31 (1991): 3-14.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Yigael Yadin, *The Hidden Scrolls from the Judaean Desert* (Jerusalem and Tel Aviv: Schocken, 1958; 2nd ed.), 11 (Hebrew); *The Message of the Scrolls* (New York: Grosset and Dunlop, 1962), 14. The symbolic meaning of this date did not escape Sukenik or his son Yigael. However, this connection had no impact on the objectivity of their research, as pointed out by Tov in a rejoinder to the insinuation by George Nickelsburg that it did. See Tov, "Israeli Scholarship," 123.

<sup>3</sup> For details of the events surrounding the first discoveries, see now the account, based on fresh evidence, by Weston W. Fields, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Full History*, Volume 1: 1947-1960 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 23-113.

Following this prelude, one would expect Israeli scholars to have played a major role in subsequent discoveries and publications. But this was not the case. Following the State of Israel's purchase of the first seven scrolls found by the Bedouin in cave 1, three in 1948 via Sukenik and four in 1954 via his son Yigael Yadin, Israeli scholars were barred for three decades from direct access to the bulk of the manuscripts discovered later in the remaining caves, especially cave 4, unearthed while the area was under Jordanian rule. This circumstance had a far-reaching effect on Qumran scholarship in general, and in Israel in particular.<sup>4</sup> Only when the Scrolls came into the custody of the State of Israel in 1967 did this situation change. The unpublished manuscripts from cave 4 were redistributed among new editors, including Israelis. Israeli scholarship on the Qumran documents has therefore evolved in two distinct phases: the first from the initial discovery in 1947 until 1967, the second from that time on.

#### *1947 to 1967*

In 1948, Eliezer Sukenik completed the purchase of three of the first seven Scrolls found in cave 1: the *War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, later renamed the *War Scroll* (1QM), *Hodayot* (1QH<sup>a</sup>), and fragments from a scroll of Isaiah, later designated 1QIsaiah<sup>b</sup>.<sup>5</sup> He immediately recognized their authenticity, and suggested that they were connected to the Essenes, a Jewish group active in the Land of Israel in the Second Temple era and well known from the classical accounts of Philo and Josephus. So, from the outset, the study of the Scrolls in Israel and elsewhere became the study of the community of the Scrolls. Sukenik managed to prepare transcriptions of major parts of the three Scrolls but lived to publish only two short surveys before his untimely death four years after he had first set eyes on them.<sup>6</sup> His transcriptions, together with brief comments, were

---

<sup>4</sup> For the effect of the exclusion of Israeli and also Jewish scholars, see Schiffman, "Confessionalism."

<sup>5</sup> For the story of the purchase told by Sukenik himself, see the quotation of his remarks by Yadin, *The Hidden Scrolls*, 16-28; *The Message*, 15-30.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Eliezer L. Sukenik, *Megillot Genuzot: Scrolls Stored in an Ancient Geniza Found in the Judean Desert, First Survey* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1948); *Megillot Genuzot: Scrolls Stored in an Ancient Geniza Found in the Judean Desert, Second Survey* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1950), both published in Hebrew.

published posthumously in 1955 by his assistant Nahman Avigad, with the help of Jacob Licht.<sup>7</sup>

Nahman Avigad (1905-1992), a central figure in Israeli archaeology and Professor of Archaeology at the Hebrew University, was born in Zwalow, then in the Austro-Hungarian Empire; he settled in Israel in 1925. As Sukenik's assistant he participated in his above-mentioned synagogue excavations, and also at Beit Shearim and other digs. His specialty was ancient Hebrew and Aramaic scripts.<sup>8</sup> This expertise proved invaluable in the analysis of the scrolls that Sukenik had purchased. An experienced epigrapher, Avigad drew the first typological chart of the paleography of the Scrolls, placing the scribal hands of the new documents then known to him in the context of other contemporaneous epigraphic evidence as a means of dating them.<sup>9</sup> With Yigael Yadin, Sukenik's son, Avigad later published the Aramaic *Genesis Apocryphon*, one of the remaining four manuscripts from cave 1 acquired by Israel in 1954.<sup>10</sup> The *Genesis Apocryphon* scroll contains a midrashic elaboration on the biblical Genesis narratives. It was badly damaged, and Avigad and Yadin published only the columns they were able to decipher (cols. II, XIX-XXII).<sup>11</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Eliezer L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1955), with 58 plates.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. the obituary published by Avigad's fellow archaeologist Dan Barag, "The Scientific Œuvre of Nahman Avigad," *Jewish Studies* 32 (1992): 67-70 (Hebrew).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Nahman Avigad, "The Paleography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents," in Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin, eds., *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ScrHier 4; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1965; 2nd ed. [first published in 1958]), 56-87. The paleographic classification charts of the Qumran Scrolls were subsequently established by Frank Cross, who as a member of the editorial team had access to all the Qumran findings. See Frank M. Cross, "The Development of the Jewish Scripts," in George E. Wright, ed., *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1965), 170-264, which also appeared in his collected articles *Leaves from an Epigrapher's Notebook; Collected Papers in Hebrew and West Semitic Palaeography and Epigraphy* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003). See his final summary and charts "Paleography and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Peter E. Flint and James C. Vanderkam, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (2 vols.: Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1:379-402. In recent years, the talented Israeli epigraphist Ada Yardeni has made important contributions to this domain. See Ada Yardeni in Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. XIII: The Damascus Document*, 26-30; *Nahal Şe'elim Documents* (Beer-Sheva-Jerusalem: Ben-Gurion University - Israel Exploration Society, 1995) (Hebrew); *A Collection of Aramaic, Hebrew and Nabatean Documents from the Desert of Judah and Related Material* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 2000) (Hebrew).

<sup>10</sup> Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin, *Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judea* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1956).

<sup>11</sup> Avigad and Yadin, *Genesis Apocryphon*. See the recent additions to their edition by Matthew Morgenstern, "The Hitherto Unpublished Columns of the Genesis Apocryphon," *AbrN* 33 (1996): 30-53. Recent editions containing the additional text have been published by Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20)* (3rd rev. and enlarged ed.; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2004); Daniel A. Machiela, *The Dead Sea*

In 1955 the first volume in the newly established series, Discoveries in the Judean Desert (DJD), published the remaining fragments from cave 1, retrieved by the expedition organized on the Jordanian side.<sup>12</sup> The volume made it possible for Israeli scholars working on the already known scrolls to complete their information about the cave 1 finds.

Thus, during the first decades following the initial findings Israeli scholars investigated chiefly the Scrolls in the possession of the State of Israel (the *War Scroll* and *Hodayot*) or those whose photographs were published early on (the *Community Rule*, the *Pesher of Habakkuk* and the *Great Isaiah Scroll*<sup>13</sup>). Two of Sukenik's followers, his son Yigael Yadin and his assistant Jacob Licht, published editions and detailed commentaries on two of these Scrolls in Hebrew. The first full edition of the *War Scroll* (1QM) was published by Yadin in 1955. Two years later Licht produced his commentary on the *Hodayot*, based on Sukenik's edition.<sup>14</sup>

An archaeologist by training and a renowned specialist in ancient weaponry and military tactics, Yadin (1917-1984) was well suited to tackle the *War Scroll* with its extensive description of the eschatological war.<sup>15</sup> The scroll describes the future final battle between the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness. According to Yadin, the main intention of the scroll was to provide the members of the sect with a "detailed rule and program according to which they will conduct themselves" in this final battle. Yadin

---

*Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13-17* (STDJ 79; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Dominique Barthélemy and Józef T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD I; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955).

<sup>13</sup> All three were published by Millar Burrows, with the assistance of John C. Trever and William H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery* (2 vols.; New Haven: ASOR, 1950-1951).

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Yigael Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1955; 2nd ed. 1957) (Hebrew); all quotations below are from the second edition. English trans.: *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (trans. Batya and Chaim Rabin; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962); Jacob Licht, *The Thanksgiving Scroll* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1957) (Hebrew). Licht was first introduced to the *Hodayot* as Sukenik's assistant, and contributed to the *Hodayot* section in Sukenik's posthumous publication, as he writes in the preface to his commentary (viii). See the reminiscences of Hartmut Stegemann of his talks with Licht about that phase of the work on the *Hodayot*, in Hartmut Stegemann, "The Reconstruction of the Cave 1 *Hodayot* Scroll," in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years, 272, 276*.

<sup>15</sup> Yadin held various positions of command in the Israeli War of Independence. Between 1949 and 1952 he served as the second Chief of Staff of the fledgling Israeli army. After retiring from the army he spent the following years in academic research and taught at the Hebrew University. After completing his edition of the *Temple Scroll* he entered politics, formed with others a new political party, and from 1977 to 1981 served as a member of the Israeli cabinet.

stresses that the *War Scroll* is part and parcel of the literature produced by the sect, as attested by its style, language, ideas and manifold parallels to other scrolls. He also notes the numerous parallels to pseudepigraphic works such as *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees* and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.<sup>16</sup> As for the group reflected in this scroll, Yadin states that it censured the leadership of contemporary Judaism for practicing the Temple ritual not according to its own understanding of the Torah.<sup>17</sup> With the cave 4 copies and recensions of the *War Scroll*, unknown to Yadin at the time, we now know that the writing copied in the cave 1 manuscript is in fact a collection of earlier sources reworking the theme of the eschatological war, and not the work of a single author written at the end of the first century BCE, as Yadin thought.<sup>18</sup> Yadin dated the scroll as he did on the grounds that the weaponry described in this work is Roman.<sup>19</sup> This point is still debated. Israel Shatzman has recently re-analyzed the weaponry in the scroll and reached conclusions similar to Yadin's.<sup>20</sup> One of the early critics of Yadin's dating was Moshe Segal, who thought that the mood of the *War Scroll* matched the Maccabean Revolt, and therefore suggested a mid-second-century date.<sup>21</sup> A similar assessment has recently been proposed by Brian Schultz.<sup>22</sup> Yadin supported his own dating by arguing that the term Kittim in the scroll refers to the Romans, as in the *Pesher of Habakkuk*.<sup>23</sup> However, as noted by other scholars, an earlier, Hellenistic date is suggested by 1QM's references to the Kittim of Assyria and the Kittim of Egypt (1QM I, 2, 4),

<sup>16</sup> Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 3.

<sup>17</sup> Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 4.

<sup>18</sup> On the recensional character of cave 4 copies of the *War Scroll*, see Esther and Hanan Eshel, "Recensions of the War Scroll," in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years*, 251-63; Esther Eshel, "4Q471B: A Self-glorification Hymn," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 175-203; Rony Yishai, "The Model for the Eschatological War Descriptions in the Qumran Literature," *Meghillot* 4 (2005): 121-40 (Hebrew); "Prayers in Eschatological War Literature from Qumran: 4Q491-4Q496, 1QM," *Meghillot* 5-6 (2008): 129-48 (Hebrew).

<sup>19</sup> Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 224-5.

<sup>20</sup> Israel Shatzman, "On the Army in the Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness," in Aharon Oppenheimer, Isaiah Gafni and Daniel R. Schwartz, eds., *The Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman World: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern* (Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center, 1996), 105-31 (Hebrew); "The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness: Military Aspects," in Menahem Kister, ed., *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World* (2 vols.; Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2009), 1:341-83 (Hebrew). Shatzman rejects the claims of Gmirkin that this weaponry is earlier and dates to the end of the second century BCE (cf. Russell Gmirkin, "The War Scroll and Roman Weaponry Reconsidered," *DSD* 3 [1996]: 89-129).

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Moshe H. Segal, "The Qumran War Scroll and the Date of its Composition," in Rabin and Yadin, *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 138-43.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Brian Schultz, "The Literary Structure of the War Scroll," in Kister, *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*, 1:321-40 (329) (Hebrew).

<sup>23</sup> Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 225.



a distinction fitting the Seleucid and Ptolemaic Hellenistic kingdoms.<sup>24</sup> An earlier date is also suggested by the fact that the opening section of the *War Scroll* offers an actualizing interpretation of the unfulfilled prophecy in Dan 11:41-12:1, as shown by David Flusser.<sup>25</sup> But Yadin's learned treatment of the text still remains a mine of information on various aspects of the *War Scroll* in particular, and the Scrolls in general.

Yadin analyzed other texts related to the Qumran finds. In 1969 he published phylacteries from Qumran,<sup>26</sup> and in 1965 he edited a fragmentary manuscript of Ben Sira found at Masada.<sup>27</sup> In collaboration with Carol Newsom he published the Masada copy of the Qumranic work *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*.<sup>28</sup> Yadin was later to display his unusual talent for editing and interpreting unknown ancient texts by producing the first edition and commentary of the *Temple Scroll* from cave 11.<sup>29</sup> Yadin was also a gifted orator and writer and could present complex scientific issues in popular versions.<sup>30</sup> Charismatic and an excellent organizer, Yadin was the dominant figure in Israeli archaeology in his lifetime. He launched and led several major excavations in Israel. The most important for Qumran research are his Masada excavations in 1963-1965. He produced only a preliminary report

---

<sup>24</sup> For instance, Hanan Eshel, "The Kittim in the War Scroll and in the Pesharim," in David Goodblatt, Avital Pinnick and Daniel R. Schwartz, eds., *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmonians to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 37; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 29-44.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. David Flusser, "Apocalyptic Elements in the War Scroll," *Judaism of the Second Temple Period; Volume 1: Qumran and Apocalypticism* (Grand Rapids-Jerusalem: Eerdmans-Magnes Press, 2007) 140-58 (143-5) (first published in Hebrew in 1980). The English volume is a translation by Azzan Yadin of the Hebrew collection under the same title, edited by Serge Ruzer (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2002). All citations in the present article are from the English translation. See further comments of Brian Schultz, *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered* (STDJ 76; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 91-102.

<sup>26</sup> Yigael Yadin, *Tefillin from Qumran (X Q Phyl 1-4)* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1969).

<sup>27</sup> Yigael Yadin, *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society - The Shrine of the Book, 1965). The text, with comments, was recently republished by Elisha Qimron (see note 32 below).

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Carol A. Newsom and Yigael Yadin, "The Masada Fragment of the Qumran 'Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice,'" *IEJ* 34 (1984): 77-88.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. appreciations of Yadin's achievements in the Hebrew fascicule *In Memory of Yigael Yadin* (Jerusalem, 2006).

<sup>30</sup> See his popular publications: *The Message of the Scrolls; Masada: Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand* (New York: Random House, 1966); *Bar-Kokhba: The Rediscovery of the Legendary Hero of the Last Jewish Revolt against Imperial Rome* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971).

of this great enterprise,<sup>31</sup> while the final reports, in several volumes, were published by others.<sup>32</sup>

Jacob Shalom Licht (1922-1992) was of a different mold. Born in Vienna, he moved to Israel in 1940 and completed his studies at the Hebrew University. As an assistant to Sukenik and later to Avigad he was initiated into the study of the Scrolls from the very beginning. A biblical scholar by choice and training, he saw his vocation as providing a precise and exhaustive commentary on the scroll at hand.<sup>33</sup> His commentary on the psalm-like sectarian hymns, named by Sukenik *Hodayot* (1QH<sup>a</sup>), evinces his textual sensitivity and theological acumen. Even today, with the amended order of the columns of this cave 1 copy,<sup>34</sup> and with knowledge of other texts of *Hodayot* from cave 4,<sup>35</sup> Licht's commentary remains a treasury of insightful observations on the textual nature and literary form of these hymns. Licht viewed the *Hodayot* as "a collection of poems which expresses man's gratitude for God's benevolence."<sup>36</sup> Licht saw the uniqueness of the *Hodayot* in the negative view taken by the author of humanity and his consideration

<sup>31</sup> Yigael Yadin, *The Excavation of Masada 1963-1964: Preliminary Report* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1965), originally published in *IEJ* 15 (1965).

<sup>32</sup> See in particular *Masada VI: Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965: Final Reports* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society-The Hebrew University in Jerusalem, 1999). The volume contains the following: Shemaryahu Talmon, with contributions by Carol Newsom and Yigael Yadin: Hebrew fragments from Masada; Yigael Yadin, with notes by Elisha Qimron and bibliography by Florentino García Martínez: *The Ben Sira Scroll* from Masada.

<sup>33</sup> In an obituary of Licht, written by his younger colleague Yaira Amit, he is quoted as saying that his aim in the edition of the *Hodayot* was "to explain to the reader what in my opinion needs explanation so that he will be able to grasp the meaning of the scroll and enjoy reading it." Cf. Yaira Amit, "Jacob Licht and Interpretation as Vocation and Mission," *Jewish Studies* 33 (1993): 41-46 (42) (Hebrew). For another appreciation by a young colleague, see Frank H. Polak, "Jacob Shalom Licht - The Man and the Commentator," in Yair Hoffman and Frank H. Polak, eds., *A Light for Jacob: Studies in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of Jacob Shalom Licht* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1997), 1-6 (Hebrew). Licht taught at Tel Aviv University as Professor of Biblical Studies.

<sup>34</sup> Licht followed the column sequence of the cave 1 copy that was established by Sukenik in his posthumous publication, a sequence adopted by all early commentaries of this text. For the corrected sequence, worked out independently by Hartmut Stegemann and Émile Puech, cf. Émile Puech, "Quelques aspects de la restauration du rouleau des hymnes (1QH)," *JJS* 39 (1988): 38-55; Hartmut Stegemann, "The Material Reconstruction of 1QHodayot," in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years, 272-84*. For the final edition see Hartmut Stegemann with Eileen M. Schuller; translation of texts by Carol Newsom; in consultation with James Vanderkam and Monica Brady, *Qumran Cave 1.III: 1QHodayot<sup>a</sup>, with Incorporation of 4QHodayot<sup>a-c</sup> and 1QHodayot<sup>b</sup>* (DJD XL; Oxford: Clarendon, 2008). See Schuller's chapter in this volume on the American research of the Qumran sectarian texts.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Eileen M. Schuller, "427-432. 4QHodayot<sup>a-c</sup>," in Esther G. Chazon et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XXIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 69-232.

<sup>36</sup> Licht, *The Thanksgiving Scroll*, 17.

of himself as specially favored by God (19).<sup>37</sup> Yet Licht rejected Sukenik's suggestion that the author of *Hodayot* was the Teacher of Righteousness.<sup>38</sup> In his opinion, the personal writing style of the *Hodayot* could well be that of other central figures in the sect, such as the *mebaqqer* of the *Damascus Document* XIII, 8.<sup>39</sup> Licht shows the dependence in the *Hodayot* on biblical models as well as their innovative aspects. He set their poetic units in stanzas. To reconstruct the lacunae he used parallel passages from the *Hodayot*, from other scrolls and from the Hebrew Bible,<sup>40</sup> a method that would remain fundamental for interpreting the Qumran Scrolls.

Licht published his *Hodayot* commentary in 1955. Ten years later, in 1965, Licht was to show again his perceptive handling of the Scrolls in his exemplary Hebrew edition and commentary on the *Community Rule* from cave 1 (1QS), still the best available on this text.<sup>41</sup> This volume is structured like the commentary on *Hodayot*: a comprehensive general introduction to the various aspects of the scroll, its division into literary units, each prefaced by a summary of its contents, and extensive use of parallels from other sections of it and from other Qumran texts, the Hebrew Bible and contemporary Jewish literature. Unique at the time was his treatment in a single volume of the three rules covered in the scroll: the *Community Rule*, the *Rule of the Congregation* and the *Rule of Blessings*. Regrettably, unlike Yadin's commentary on the *War Scroll*, Licht's two Hebrew commentaries have never been translated.<sup>42</sup> Licht was not inclined to publish popular versions of his work on the Scrolls or other subjects. Besides his commentaries, the only more general survey of the Scrolls is published as an article in the Hebrew *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, of which he was an editor.<sup>43</sup> In later years he devoted most of his time and energy to editorial work at the *Encyclopaedia*, and published on biblical and pseudepigraphic themes.<sup>44</sup>

<sup>37</sup> See Bilhah Nitzan's chapter in this volume on Israeli scholarship on sectarian ideas.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Sukenik, *Megillot Genuzot, Second Survey*, 32.

<sup>39</sup> Licht, *The Thanksgiving Scroll*, 25.

<sup>40</sup> Licht, *The Thanksgiving Scroll*, vii.

<sup>41</sup> Jacob Licht, *The Rule Scroll* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965) (Hebrew). In his preface (vi), Licht notes that he completed his manuscript in 1960 and afterwards was able to introduce only sporadic corrections. This means that his volume reflects the state of research at that time.

<sup>42</sup> See the assessment of Schiffman, "Confessionalism," 9: "J. Licht's masterful Hebrew commentaries on the *Hodayot* and the *Megillat ha-Serakhim* were not read, to some extent because they were in Hebrew, and Yadin's *War Scroll*, a definitive work, was honored but not really fathomed."

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Jacob Licht, "The Dead Sea Scrolls," *Encyclopaedia Biblica* 4 (1962): 639-71 (Hebrew). See also his popular 63-page brochure, *The Sect of the Judean Desert and Its Writings* (Jerusalem: The Jewish Agency, 1957) (Hebrew).

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Jacob Licht, "Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic Books," *Encyclopaedia Biblica* 5

Yadin and Licht subscribed to the perception of the Qumran community prevalent at the time. Both underlined the links of the scrolls they commented on to other texts attributed to the community.<sup>45</sup> Both accepted the identification of the members of the community with the Essenes mentioned by Philo and Josephus.<sup>46</sup> But the caution in their formulations on the subject in these early contributions merits interest, especially considering the enthusiastic support for this identification at the time by overseas scholars.<sup>47</sup> Licht's methodological principle is illuminating: "The identification of the Essenes with the sect of the Judaean Desert appears to me justified. In any case we cannot disregard the parallels between what is contained in the Scrolls and our evidence about the Essenes. But in order to avoid combining the two types of evidence the content of the *Community Rule* will be discussed independently, without recourse to what is known about the Essenes."<sup>48</sup>

Yadin's and Licht's thorough and meticulous handling of the Qumran texts set an example for all subsequent Hebrew treatments of the Qumran Scrolls. One of the characteristics of their commentaries is the copious references to a wide array of Jewish Second Temple sources that illuminate and clarify the Qumran texts.<sup>49</sup> This scholarly tradition was to continue in all subsequent Israeli research.

Still, the two scholars differed in training and approach, and this is reflected in their commentaries. Yadin assembled as much information as he could from a variety of pertinent sources to shed light on the obscurities of the *War Scroll*. Due to the nature of this scroll he devoted many of his comments to weaponry and battle tactics. But his commentary also contains important introductory surveys on the practices and prayers of the community reflected in the scroll, and on its views about angels.<sup>50</sup> Licht

---

(1968): 1003-21 (Hebrew); *The Book of Fourth Ezra: Translation and Commentary* (Dorot Library 6; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1968) (Hebrew); *The Test in the Bible and in Judaism of the Second Temple Period* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1973) (Hebrew); *Storytelling in the Bible* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1978); *A Commentary on the Book of Numbers* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1985-1995) (Hebrew). This commentary was posthumously published from the unfinished manuscript left by Licht.

<sup>45</sup> Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 225 noted the links of the *War Scroll* to other scrolls such as the *Community Rule* and *Hodayot*. Licht, *The Thanksgiving Scroll*, 21-22 stresses the links of this work with the *Community Rule*.

<sup>46</sup> Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 226; Licht, *The Rule Scroll*, 5 n. 11, 9-10.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Yadin, *The Message of the Scrolls*, 176-78, 188.

<sup>48</sup> See Licht, *The Rule Scroll*, 9-10.

<sup>49</sup> Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, viii, states that his frequent references to parallels from the Hebrew Bible, Rabbinic literature and other scrolls are indispensable for elucidating the text at hand. See a similar statement by Licht, *The Thanksgiving Scrolls*, vii.

<sup>50</sup> Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 181-221.

is notable for his astute analysis of the sectarian ideology.<sup>51</sup> In his commentary on the *Hodayot* he provides a succinct outline of major tenets of sectarian thought such as dualism, predetermination, mysteries of creation, and the place and role of humans in the divine project for the world.<sup>52</sup> The work of Yadin and Licht illustrates the breadth and thoroughness attained by the Hebrew commentaries on the Qumran Scrolls and attests to the quality and high standard of analysis achieved by Israeli scholarship at an early stage of this research.

The purchase of cave 1 documents, among them the *Genesis Apocryphon*, and the early publication of the *Great Isaiah Scroll* (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>) were to play a key role in developing in Israel another branch of Qumran studies: study of the Hebrew and Aramaic employed by the Qumran documents.<sup>53</sup> The early publications of the *War Scroll* and the *Community Rule* had already prompted a spate of comments in the regular press as well as in scholarly journals on particular aspects of their Hebrew.<sup>54</sup> One of the most prominent among these first commentators was Henoah Yalon (1886-1970), a well-known specialist in Mishnaic Hebrew, who provided vocalization for the Hebrew edition of the Mishna produced by the great Talmudist Hanoch Albek.<sup>55</sup> Yalon was among the first to place the Hebrew of the Scrolls in the wider context of the linguistic traditions of Hebrew, from Biblical Hebrew through the ancient Bible versions to Mishnaic Hebrew.<sup>56</sup> He, as well as Ze'ev Ben-Hayyim (1907-), also offered insights into the Hebrew of the Scrolls from the perspective of Samaritan Hebrew.<sup>57</sup> Significant contributions to the linguistic study of the Hebrew of the Scrolls were also made by Chaim Rabin (1915-1996), already known for his im-

<sup>51</sup> Among Licht's discussions on specific theological notions of the Qumran community, see e.g. "The Plant Eternal and the People of Divine Deliverance," in Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin assisted by Jacob Licht, eds., *Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of E. L. Sukenik* (Jerusalem: The Shrine of the Book, 1961), 49-75 (Hebrew).

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Licht, *The Thanksgiving Scroll*, 27-44.

<sup>53</sup> For details on language studies in Israel, see the chapter by Steven Fassberg in this volume.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Christoph Burchard, *Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer* (BZAW 76; Berlin: A. Topelmann, 1959; 2nd ed.), 80-92; Michael Yizhar, *Bibliography of Hebrew Publications on the Dead Sea Scrolls 1948-1964* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967).

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Henoah Yalon, *Introduction to the Vocalization of the Mishna* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1964) (Hebrew).

<sup>56</sup> His various notes on the language of the Scrolls were assembled in a slim volume entitled *Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Philological Essays (1949-1952)* (Jerusalem: Kariat Sefer, 1967) (Hebrew).

<sup>57</sup> Cf. e.g. Yalon, *Philological Essays*, 99-100; Ze'ev Ben-Hayyim, "Traditions in the Hebrew Language, with Special Reference to the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Rabin and Yadin, *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 200-214.

portant edition of the Genizah versions of the *Damascus Document*,<sup>58</sup> and by Moshe Goshen-Gottstein (1925-2000).<sup>59</sup> However, it was Yechezkel Eduard Kutscher (1909-1971), a specialist in Aramaic and Mishnaic Hebrew, who undertook a systematic description of the peculiar linguistic tradition of the Hebrew used in the newly found documents.<sup>60</sup> He performed this task by studying in detail the *Great Isaiah Scroll*. The results of this study were published in 1959 in his monumental Hebrew volume on the language of this scroll.<sup>61</sup> Kutscher made another significant contribution to the study of the Scrolls, namely that of illuminating the character of the Aramaic employed by some of them. This was achieved by a detailed study of the Aramaic *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QGenApoc).<sup>62</sup>

Two other prominent scholars played a key role in early Israeli scholarship on the Dead Sea Scrolls, namely Shemaryahu Talmon (1920-2010) and David Flusser (1917-2000). Talmon was born in Poland and studied in Breslau, at that time part of Germany. But he managed to leave in 1939 and settled in Israel. He was a Bible scholar with an interest in the sociological context of the biblical world, as well as in the textual transmission and literary forms of the Hebrew Bible. Together with his colleagues Chaim Rabin and Moshe Goshen-Gottstein he laid the foundations for the Hebrew University Bible Project.

Talmon also wrote widely about various Qumran issues.<sup>63</sup> But he earned international renown for his textual studies and his groundbreaking demon-

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Chaim Rabin, "The Historical Background of Qumran Hebrew," in Rabin and Yadin, *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 144-61. For Rabin's commentary on the *Damascus Document*, see *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954; 2nd rev. ed. 1958). See his obituary by Shemaryahu Talmon, "Chaim Rabin - In Memoriam," *Jewish Studies* 37 (1997): 217-21 (Hebrew). For a detailed survey of linguistic studies in Israel see the chapter by Steven Fassberg in this volume.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Moshe Goshen-Gottstein, "Linguistic Structure and Tradition in the Qumran Documents," in Rabin and Yadin, *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 101-37. Cf. the obituary by his colleague Shemaryahu Talmon, "Moshe Goshen-Gottstein: His Contribution to the Study of the Hebrew Bible," *Jewish Studies* 32 (1992): 61-66 (Hebrew).

<sup>60</sup> See the obituaries of Kutscher by Hayyim B. Rosén in Yechezkel E. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIs<sup>a</sup>)* (Leiden: Brill, 1974), ix-xi, and by Aharon Dotan in Yechezkel E. Kutscher, *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic*, edited by Ze'ev Ben-Hayyim, Aharon Dotan and Gad Ben-Ami Sarfatti (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1977), xiii-xvii (Hebrew).

<sup>61</sup> Yechezkel E. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1959) (Hebrew). An English translation was published after Kutscher's death, and fifteen years after the original Hebrew came out; Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll*.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Yechezkel E. Kutscher, "The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon: A Preliminary Study," in Rabin and Yadin, *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1-35 (6-7).

<sup>63</sup> Most of his Qumran articles are assembled in his volume *The World of Qumran from Within* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1989). Talmon was later to edit the literary texts discovered at



stration that the Qumran sectarian texts adhered to a 364-day calendar.<sup>64</sup> He did so on the basis of a passage from the *Pesher of Habakkuk* (1QpHab XI, 4-9) and a fragment enumerating the Priestly Courses (4Q360 4 iii),<sup>65</sup> previously published by Józef Milik.<sup>66</sup> He argued that in describing how the Wicked Priest persecuted the Teacher of Righteousness in his abode during the Day of Atonement the *Pesher of Habakkuk* implies that the two celebrated this holy day according to different calendars: it would have been unthinkable for a priest, even a wicked one, not to be present at the Temple to participate in the Day of Atonement ritual. When the remaining cave 4 texts were later re-distributed among scholars, Talmon was entrusted with editing the cave 4 calendrical texts from Qumran. He published them with the assistance of a younger scholar, Jonathan Ben-Dov.<sup>67</sup> Talmon emphasized that it is religious practice and not religious ideology that engenders schism, and in the case of the Qumran community it was the different calendar that engendered their separatist tendencies.<sup>68</sup> In his early studies, Talmon supported the view that the community described in the Scrolls was Essene,<sup>69</sup> but in later years he asserted that the Qumran documents must be understood on their own terms.<sup>70</sup> He devoted several studies to showing that the Qumranites saw themselves as carrying on the biblical reality. In

---

Masada in Yadin's excavations. Cf. Shemaryahu Talmon, "Hebrew Fragments from Masada," in *Masada VI*.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Shemaryahu Talmon, "Yom Ha-Kippurim in the Hab. Scroll," *Bib* 32 (1951): 549-63; "The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judaean Desert," in Rabin and Yadin, *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 162-99.

<sup>65</sup> The scroll is now labeled 4QCalendrical Document/Mishmarot A, published by Shemaryahu Talmon, Jonathan Ben-Dov and Uwe Glessmer, *Qumran Cave 4.XVI: Calendrical Texts* (DJD XXI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), 37-63.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Józef T. Milik, "Le travail d'édition des manuscrits du désert de Juda," *Volume du congrès, Strasbourg 1956* (VTSup 4; Leiden: Brill, 1957), 17-26 (24-25).

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Talmon, Ben-Dov and Glessmer, *Qumran Cave 4.XVI: Calendrical Texts*. Later, Jonathan Ben-Dov published other articles on calendrical matters. Cf. e.g. "The Initial Stage of Lunar Theory at Qumran," *JJS* 54 (2003): 125-38; "Dwg and Lunar Phases in Qumran Calendars: New Mesopotamian Evidence," *Meghillot* 3 (2005): 3-28 (Hebrew); "The 364-Day Year in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pseudepigrapha," in Kister, *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*, 2:435-76 (Hebrew). See also Jonathan Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years: Astronomy and Calendars at Qumran in Their Ancient Context* (STDJ 78; Leiden: Brill, 2008).

<sup>68</sup> Cf. e.g. Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judaean Desert."

<sup>69</sup> See e.g. Talmon, "The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect," 104.

<sup>70</sup> See Shemaryahu Talmon, "Between the Bible and the Mishna: The World of Qumran from 'Within,'" in Magen Broshi et al., eds., *The Scrolls of the Judaean Desert: Forty Years of Research* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1992), 10-48 (Hebrew). Still later, Talmon refuted the identification of the Qumranites with the Essenes. Cf. e.g. Shemaryahu Talmon, "Comments Concerning the 'Qumran-Essenes' Hypothesis," in Gabriele Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and Qumranic Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 294-7 (294-5).

his opinion, the covenanters of Qumran believed that their own halakhic writings were inspired books, and hence akin to the canonical books. This, he thought, was expressed in the Qumranites' freedom in reworking the biblical text.<sup>71</sup> Talmon was among the first to note the plurality of textual forms displayed in the biblical manuscripts found at Qumran and to point out that they did not display any theological turn related to the specific sectarian ideology.<sup>72</sup> He observed that the evidence of the Qumran biblical texts, together with that of the ancient Bible versions, indicated that the textual scribal transmission often blended with literary creativity.<sup>73</sup>

One of the most remarkable figures in early Israeli Qumran research is David Gustav Flusser (1917-2000). Born in Vienna and brought up in Prague, he studied classics at the University of Prague.<sup>74</sup> When he settled in Israel in 1939 he completed his studies in classics and Jewish history at the Hebrew University. His interests were Second Temple literature and the New Testament as products of post-biblical Judaism.<sup>75</sup> This training, combined with a keen and imaginative mind, prepared him especially to deal with the newly discovered Dead Sea Scrolls. His vast erudition and extraor-

---

<sup>71</sup> See Talmon, "Between the Bible and the Mishna," 19, 25-32. A debate foreshadowing a later inquiry into the function of various Qumran texts centered on the *Psalms Scrolls* from cave 11 (11QP<sup>s</sup>), published in 1965 (see James A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 [11QP<sup>s</sup>]* [DJD IV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965]). In Sanders's opinion it is a sectarian Psalms canon, whereas Moshe Goshen-Gottstein and Shemaryahu Talmon view it as a liturgical collection. See Moshe Goshen-Gottstein, "The Psalms Scroll (11Ps<sup>s</sup>)," *Textus* 5 (1966): 22-33; Shemaryahu Talmon, "Pisqah be'emsa' pasuq and 11QP<sup>s</sup>," *Textus* 5 (1966): 11-21.

<sup>72</sup> See Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Old Testament Text," in Peter R. Ackroyd and Christopher F. Evans, eds., *The Cambridge History of the Bible From the Beginnings to Jerome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 159-99 (reproduced in Frank M. Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon, eds., *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975], 1-41).

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible - A New Outlook," in Cross and Talmon, *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, 321-400. On Talmon's textual research, see the chapter by Emanuel Tov in this volume.

<sup>74</sup> The close friendship and mutual respect of David Flusser and Jacob Licht, both born in Vienna, are evinced in a number of comments. Flusser thanks Licht "for his valuable help in preparing the English version of this article as also for much advice and criticism in other matters." The comment is appended to the article "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity," in Rabin and Yadin, *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 215-66 (215). In his preface to *The Rule Scroll*, Licht writes: "The part in this book of my friend and teacher Prof. David Flusser is particularly great. I sat with him regularly and discussed with him each detail ..." (vi).

<sup>75</sup> See the appreciation by the editors in the collection presented to him on his 75th birthday in Ithmar Gruenwald, Shaul Shaked and Gedaliahu Stroumsa, eds., *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity* (TSAJ 32; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), v-vi, and the obituary by Hannah and Shmuel Safrai, "In Memoriam: Professor David Flusser," *Jewish Studies* 40 (2000): 175-8 (Hebrew).



dinary sensitivity to the particular exegesis and worldview of the Scrolls drew from Flusser's pen some of the finest studies on Qumran sectarian ideas, such as the dualism of Light and Darkness, apocalyptic expectations, and the controversies with other Jewish groups. He produced a classic analysis of the references to three groups in the *Peshet of Nahum* (4Q169), which tallies with Josephus' presentation of the three Jewish schools: the Pharisees, the Sadducees and the Essenes.<sup>76</sup> Recent research and additional texts demonstrate that the value of Flusser's observations has not diminished. In Flusser's opinion, the sect founded by the Teacher of Righteousness came into being during the reign of Alexander Janneus out of disappointment over "the failure to maintain the purity of morals and decent standards of combat practiced by the first Hasmoneans."<sup>77</sup> Not all his theories have stood the test of time. In an article he originally published in Hebrew in 1954<sup>78</sup> Flusser argued that the militaristic preoccupation of the *War Scroll* reflects the early stage of the Qumran community, while what he perceived as "conditional pacifism" in the *Community Rule* and the *Hodayot* belonged to the second phase of this group, and resulted from the non-fulfillment of its anticipated imminent final victory.<sup>79</sup> In a later publication, Flusser explains the change in the Qumran community's thinking as being based on its more mystical and spiritual nature following the conquest of the Land of Israel by the Romans in 63 BCE.<sup>80</sup> However, the paleographic dating of 1QS to around 100 BCE disproves this chronological reconstruction. Flusser also thought that the Qumranites' dualistic belief was the main motive for their schismatic attitude and their rift with Israel at large.<sup>81</sup> But the subsequent publication of 4QMMT showed that the disputes over halakhic matters played a major role in this rift. Flusser's particular contribution to early Israeli scholarship on the Scrolls centers on the relationship between the Scrolls and early Christianity, especially the writings of the New Testament. In his early publications he noted that the influence of the sectarian ideology may be detected mainly on the second stratum of the New

---

<sup>76</sup> See David Flusser, "Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes in Peshet Nahum," *Qumran and Apocalypticism*, 214-57 (first published in Hebrew in 1970).

<sup>77</sup> Cf. David Flusser, *The Spiritual History of the Dead Sea Sect* (trans. Carol Glucker; Tel Aviv: MOD Books, 1989), 40-41. The Hebrew original was published in 1985, based on Flusser's series of radio talks.

<sup>78</sup> See David Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Its Worldview," *Qumran and Apocalypticism*, 1-31.

<sup>79</sup> He dated the *War Scroll* to 89 BCE. See Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Its Worldview," 4-5, 24; "The Apocalyptic Elements in the War Scroll."

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Flusser, *The Spiritual History of the Dead Sea Sect*, 42.

<sup>81</sup> Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Its Worldview," 10-11.

Testament, namely the epistles, especially those of Paul, the Letter to the Hebrews<sup>82</sup> and the Gospel of John. Among other things he pointed out the similarity of these New Testament writings to the sectarian ideas of dualism, predestination, election of grace, the New Covenant and the notion that the community functioned as a spiritual temple.<sup>83</sup>

The first phase of Qumran research in Israel saw no comprehensive edition of the Scrolls of the kind issued early on in English, French and German. The only one available was the volume published by Abraham Habermann in 1959. Abraham Meir Habermann (1901-1981) was not a specialist of the Qumran Scrolls but a prolific writer in Hebrew on various subjects. In 1959 he assembled a collection of all the Scrolls known at the time.<sup>84</sup> This volume provides a vocalized text, with short comments and a concordance. In the early years of research this fairly popular manual served both students and scholars in Israel.

Also, unlike the case with European languages, very few non-Hebrew general surveys of the Qumran texts were translated into Hebrew. Important volumes of synthesis such as Milik's *Ten Years* and Cross's *The Ancient Library of Qumran* were read by scholars, but rarely by students or the general public in Israel.

As emerges from the foregoing survey, early Israeli research on the Scrolls developed along three lines: (a) first editions and commentaries of scrolls in Israel's possession, (b) the study of their linguistic and textual character, and (c) the study of their particular ideology against the backdrop of contemporary Jewish and other literatures. Besides sporadic comments on specific details, no comprehensive treatment of the history of the Qumran community was written in Israel during this early phase. This is perhaps because the *Peshet of Habakkuk*, the main source of information on this subject, was published outside Israel and repeatedly analyzed by various non-Israeli scholars.<sup>85</sup> As noted, Israeli scholars of the first generation subscribed to the identification of the community described by the Scrolls as

<sup>82</sup> In this connection, see Yigael Yadin, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews," in Rabin and Yadin, *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 36-55.

<sup>83</sup> Cf. David Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity," in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*, 23-74 (first published in Rabin and Yadin, *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 215-66); "The Baptism of John the Baptist and the Sect of the Judaean Desert," in *Jewish Sources in Early Christianity* (Tel Aviv: Sifriat ha-Poalim, 1979) 81-112 (82-86) (Hebrew) (first published in 1968).

<sup>84</sup> Abraham M. Habermann, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Tel Aviv: Maḥbarot Le-sifrut, 1959) (Hebrew).

<sup>85</sup> Cf. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, volume 2, part 2.; William H. Brownlee, *The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary From Qumran* (JBLMS 11; Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1959).

Essene, as first suggested by Sukenik and developed by Dupont-Sommer and others. At first, Yadin and Licht concurred, yet with a note of caution; Flusser did so enthusiastically. Yadin, Licht and Flusser also endorsed the view that Qumran was the community's settlement, its place of exile "in the desert." This was the general scholarly opinion based on two conjectures: one identifies the exile mentioned in the *Damascus Document* (VI, 5) and the *Pesher of Habakkuk* (XI, 6) with Qumran; the other understands the pesher of Isa 40:3, cited by the *Community Rule* (1QS VIII, 13-15), as a directive to go out and study the Torah in a real desert.<sup>86</sup> Although Talmon remarked that the "return" of the Qumranites mentioned in the Scrolls should be understood as spiritual rather than concrete,<sup>87</sup> he accepted the current opinion that the sectaries settled in an actual desert.<sup>88</sup> However, Israeli scholarship shared the general assessment that despite its schismatic tendencies the Qumran group was part of a larger movement within Judaism.<sup>89</sup> This was surmised from the remarkable affinity of many aspects of the Scrolls to Jewish apocalypses, some of which were found among the Qumran documents (e.g. *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees* and the *Aramaic Levi Document*, first deemed a copy of the Greek *Testament of Levi*).

Strikingly, two subjects intimately linked with the new documents are conspicuously absent from early Israeli scholarship: the archaeology of Qumran and the halakhah of the Qumran texts. That no Israeli archaeological survey of Qumran took place is readily explained by the fact that the excavations there were conducted under the auspices of the Jordanian authorities. Therefore Israeli archaeologists had to rely on the results of

<sup>86</sup> See Licht, "The Dead Sea Scrolls," 664.

<sup>87</sup> Note Talmon, "Between the Bible and the Mishna," 38: "... in the spiritual world of the Qumran authors the semantic field of שׁוּב ('return') and similar expressions represent a moral-religious 'repentance' and not a concrete-physical 'return.' Therefore the ensemble of the images of 'exile and return' in the Qumran literature refers to 'spiritual return' and is not to be understood as a physical return experienced by the Qumranites in their socio-historical reality."

<sup>88</sup> Cf. Shemaryahu Talmon, "The 'Desert Motif' in the Bible and in Qumran Literature," in Alexander Altmann, ed., *Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations* (Studies and Texts 3; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966), 31-63 (55, 62-63); "The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect," 80.

<sup>89</sup> In Licht's formulation in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 661: "This sect is a radical faction of a wide religious movement, which was active during the Second Temple period, and it is known to us from several pseudepigraphic books (such as *Enoch*, *Jubilees* and the *Ascension of Moses*) and also Josephus Flavius alludes to it. This movement was expressed in the Apocalyptic literature and its main content was an ardent expectation of the End of Days."

the Qumran excavations by Roland de Vaux and on his interpretation of them.<sup>90</sup>

But the absence of halakhic studies from early Israeli scholarship, despite the presence in Israel of outstanding scholars in the area of rabbinic halakhah, is remarkable. It cannot be entirely explained by the paucity of halakhic texts from the findings in cave 1 since the *Damascus Document*, with its halakhic material, was already known from the Genizah copies.<sup>91</sup> It was perhaps the fiery debate on the nature of this document when first published by Solomon Schechter in 1910 that deterred later scholars from focusing on it.<sup>92</sup> Fifty years on, copies of the *Damascus Document* were found at Qumran; but with their full publication taking forty more years,<sup>93</sup> scholars again were hesitant to base their work on uncertain factual grounds.<sup>94</sup> This reluctance, with the initial barring of Israeli Talmudic scholars from studying unpublished halakhic texts, such as the *Damascus Document* and *Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah*, delayed adequate understanding of the Qumran library for several decades. It generated a one-sided depiction of the Qumran community as a secluded group similar to the early Christians, and played down, or even disregarded, the stringent halakhic character of this community.<sup>95</sup> This was soon to change radically with the second phase of Israeli research.

<sup>90</sup> See Roland de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973). Essentially it is de Vaux's picture that is presented by Magen Broshi, "The Archaeology of Qumran: A Reconsideration," in Broshi, *The Scrolls of the Judaean Desert: Forty Years of Research*, 49-62 (Hebrew).

<sup>91</sup> In fact, the research on this aspect of the Dead Sea Scrolls was initiated by Jewish scholars outside Israel. Cf. Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Studies in Qumran Law* (SJLA 24; Leiden: Brill, 1977); Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (SJLA 16; Leiden: Brill, 1975). See Schiffman's comments in Schiffman, "Confessionalism," 6-8.

<sup>92</sup> See Solomon Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work: Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910). Schechter thought that the document reflected a Sadducean sect, whereas Ginzberg judged it to be a Pharisaic document. Cf. Louis Ginzburg, *Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte* (New York: 1922; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1972). This publication contained only part of the author's work. The full commentary was published posthumously in an English version, *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1976).

<sup>93</sup> Published by Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document*.

<sup>94</sup> Thus Yaacov Sussmann, "The History of Halakhah and the Dead Sea Scrolls - Preliminary Observations on *Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (4QMMT)," *Tarbiz* 59 (1989-1990), 11-66 (15-20) (Hebrew); "The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (DJD X; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 179-200 (183-4). Early Talmudic scholars active in Israel, all of the traditional mold, were perhaps reluctant to deal with "sectarian" or "unorthodox" halakhah.

<sup>95</sup> See the comments by Aharon Shemesh and Alex Jassen in their respective chapters in this volume.

*1967 and Thereafter*

From the start, Qumran research has been intimately associated with the publication of new texts, so each phase of the research has been shaped by the character of those available to it. The initial phase was based mainly on the cave 1 scrolls, most of which are specifically connected to the peculiar organization and ideology of the group described in them. Hence early Qumran research, in Israel as elsewhere, was typified by the perception of the Qumran library as a homogeneous collection, the product of an isolated, ascetic Jewish group, close to apocalyptic circles and early Christianity, identified with the Essenes and living in isolation at Qumran.<sup>96</sup>

This picture was transformed in the wake of new political circumstances in 1967 when all Jerusalem, including the Rockefeller Museum with its Scrolls collection, came under the jurisdiction of the State of Israel. It permitted Israeli scholars to play a central role in the altered situation.

*The Final Publication of All the Scrolls and Its Effects*

Until 1967, the major portion of still unpublished cave 4 documents remained in the hands of the first few editors, who continued to work on them privately. When in 1967 the Rockefeller Museum passed into the hands of Israel, the rights of these scholars were protected by an agreement between Roland de Vaux, then Editor-in-Chief of the Dead Sea Scrolls Publication Project, and Israeli representatives, among them Yigael Yadin. De Vaux died in 1971 and was succeeded by Pierre Benoit from the École Biblique in Jerusalem. On Benoit's death in 1985, John Strugnell was ap-

---

<sup>96</sup> See Flusser's telling comment in his 1954 article: "The present study assumes that the sectarian writings found in the Qumran caves were produced by a single group...and belong to a library of the community... The texts all refer to a select group, outside of which there is no salvation." Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Its Worldview," p. 1, n. 2. The survey published by Devorah Dimant in 1984 summarized this first stage of the research. She was, however, able to include a section on the *Temple Scroll*. See Devorah Dimant, "Qumran Sectarial Literature," in Michael E. Stone, ed., *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT II; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 483-550. In keeping with the outlook of the early research, the term "sect" was used to describe the Qumran group, a label strongly influenced by later Christian terminology but inappropriate to the Qumran reality. This label continues to be widely used. Some scholars try to avoid it by using various other terms such as "community," "covenant-group" or "the Yahad." The present chapter employs the term "sect" without implying its later Christian connotation of a secessionist group. However, it designates here a single community, for in the opinion of the present writer there is no evidence for assuming that "the Yahad" branched off from the Essene movement, or that the "group which settled at Qumran" was not synonymous with the Essenes, as some scholars would have it today.

pointed Editor-in-Chief of the Scrolls' Publication Project with the approval of the Israeli authorities. However, the publication process continued to lag.<sup>97</sup> In an effort to speed up the publication of the remaining Qumran Scrolls, a scientific committee was established by the Israeli Antiquities Authority (IAA) to supervise and accelerate the appearance in print of all extant texts.<sup>98</sup> In 1990 an Israeli scholar, Emanuel Tov of the Hebrew University, was nominated by the IAA, in accord with other members of the international team, as Editor-in-Chief of the Publication Project to succeed Strugnell and to continue publication of the Scrolls in the Oxford-based series *Discoveries in the Judean Desert* (DJD). The series includes the texts from Qumran caves and also literary and documentary texts found in various locations in the Judean Desert. Under Tov's editorship from 1990 to 2010, texts were redistributed to new editors, and some 90 scholars from various countries, this time including 20 Israelis, were recruited to the task. During Tov's 20-year tenure, 31 DJD volumes were produced, compared with the eight DJD volumes published during the preceding 40 years.<sup>99</sup>

As a specialist in Septuagint studies, and a student of Shemaryahu Talmon, Emanuel Tov has made the textual character of the Qumran biblical manuscripts his special object of study.<sup>100</sup> From 1977 to 2004, Tov served as one of the editors of the Hebrew University Bible Project. He has published numerous contributions on various aspects of the Scrolls,<sup>101</sup> and edited a

<sup>97</sup> On public controversies surrounding the publication of the Scrolls, see Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Battle of the Scrolls: Recent Developments in the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Cathedra* 61 (1991): 3-23 (Hebrew); "The Many 'Battles of the Scrolls,'" *Qumran and Jerusalem: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 15-43 (21-22).

<sup>98</sup> Appointed in 1990 by Amir Drori, Director of the new Israel Antiquities Authority (established in 1985). The committee consisted of Magen Broshi, at the time curator of the Shrine of the Book, together with Jonas Greenfield and Shemaryahu Talmon from the Hebrew University. Ayala Sussmann of the IAA served as coordinator. Thanks are due to Pnina Shor, head of the Dead Sea Scrolls Projects at the IAA, for providing the data on IAA activities related to the Scrolls mentioned in this chapter.

<sup>99</sup> See the history of the Publication Project of the Scrolls as traced by Emanuel Tov, "History of the Series," in Emanuel Tov, ed., *The Texts from the Judean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judean Desert Series* (DJD XXXIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 1-3.

<sup>100</sup> Born in Amsterdam to parents who perished in the Holocaust, Tov (1941-) immigrated to Israel in 1961. He studied Hebrew Bible and Classics at the Hebrew University and from 1986 until his retirement in 2009 taught there as Professor of Biblical Studies. Tov wrote a dissertation under the supervision of Shemaryahu Talmon and Frank Cross, published as Emanuel Tov, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of the LXX of Jeremiah 29-52 and Baruch 1:1-3:8* (HSM 8; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976).

<sup>101</sup> Emanuel Tov's comprehensive and meticulous research is illustrated by his volume *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54;

number of major Qumran texts.<sup>102</sup> He was the first Israeli scholar to publish a volume in the DJD series, then still under John Strugnell's editorship.<sup>103</sup>

As the official publication process of the Scrolls was being reorganized, some unofficial information emerged. An unauthorized collection of the Palestine Archaeological Museum (PAM) photographs of the Scrolls was issued in the United States.<sup>104</sup> Another unofficial publication of cave 4 Scrolls was printed by reconstruction from the card concordance compiled by the editors of the Scrolls for their private use.<sup>105</sup> Under these circumstances, the IAA initiated the publication of the first official inventory of all the Qumran manuscripts.<sup>106</sup>

The surge of new data and publications, which culminated in the entire Qumran library becoming available to scholars, transformed Qumran research in general and Israeli scholarship on the Scrolls in particular. The field of inquiry saw such expansion that it branched off into sub-fields related to particular expertise. The present state of Qumran research in Israel is therefore best surveyed through the presentation of recent developments according to the various types of subject-matter and their respective issues.

---

Leiden: Brill, 2004). It is an indispensable tool for any editorial work on the Scrolls. See also Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1992; 2nd rev. ed. 2001).

<sup>102</sup> Cf. e.g. Emanuel Tov and Sidnie White, "364-367. 4QReworked Pentateuch<sup>b-c</sup>," in Harold W. Attridge et al., *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (DJD XIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 187-351.

<sup>103</sup> Cf. Emanuel Tov, with the collaboration of Robert A. Kraft, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)* (DJD VIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990; repr. with corrections, 1995). John Strugnell was the only member of the first international team of Scroll editors to invite Israeli scholars to share with him the editorial work on several manuscripts in his lot. Elisha Qimron worked with Strugnell on *Miqṣat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (4QMMT), Emanuel Tov edited the *Reworked Pentateuch* (see Tov's chapter in this volume) and Devorah Dimant published *Pseudo-Ezekiel* and the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*. All three began their cooperation with Strugnell before the redistribution of the Qumran manuscripts to new additional editors, but their editions were published under Tov's editorship.

<sup>104</sup> Cf. Robert H. Eisenman and James M. Robinson, *A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2 vols.; Washington: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991).

<sup>105</sup> See Ben-Zion Wacholder and Martin G. Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four* (4 vols.; Washington: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991-1996).

<sup>106</sup> Cf. Stephen M. Reed, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Catalogue: Documents, Photographs, and Museum Inventory Numbers* (Resources for Biblical Study 32; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994). A microfiche edition of all the photographs was issued by the IAA a year later. Cf. Emanuel Tov and Stephen J. Pfann, *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judean Desert* (1993; 2nd. rev. ed.: Leiden: Brill, 1995).



*The Temple Scroll and the Nature of the Qumran Library*

The change in understanding of the Qumran manuscripts was triggered by the publication of the *Temple Scroll* (11QT<sup>a</sup>) in 1977.<sup>107</sup> As noted, the view of the Qumran library prevailing in the first three decades of research depicted it as a homogeneous sectarian collection. The publication of the *Temple Scroll* (11QT<sup>a</sup>) sowed the first seeds of doubt about this view. The *Temple Scroll*, the longest scroll so far discovered (some 9 meters long) was recovered from cave 11 at the time of the initial discoveries, but only came into the hands of Yigael Yadin in 1967, after the Six Day War. Partly composed and edited during the Hasmonean period,<sup>108</sup> the bulk of the scroll concerns the Temple that Israel is commanded to build. It is augmented by diverse legal passages from the Pentateuch, reworked and enlarged with non-biblical additions. Yadin's superb editing and detailed commentary, and his grasp of the content and character of the scroll, remain valid today. However, Yadin's attribution of the *Temple Scroll* to the specific sectarian literature has been debated. Yadin based his assessment on the use of the 364-day calendar in the scroll<sup>109</sup> and the affinity of some of its legal rulings to those of the *Damascus Document*. Some scholars contest this attribution, noting that the *Temple Scroll* does not contain the typical sectarian nomenclature or ideas, and the presence of the 364-day calendar and similar legal attitudes may be explained differently.<sup>110</sup>

Be that as it may, the *Temple Scroll* demonstrated that the Qumran Scrolls collection contained compositions that could not simply be assigned to the ascetic sect. This conclusion coincided with the growing amount of information from new texts that highlighted the variegated character of the Qumran library. Questions about the precise nature of the various works

<sup>107</sup> See Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977) (Hebrew). An English translation was published under the same title in 1983. All references in this article are to the Hebrew edition. Two other copies of the *Temple Scroll* are known, 11Q20 and 4Q524. See Émile Puech, "524. 4QRouleau du Temple," *Qumrân Grotte 4: Textes hébreux (4Q521-4Q528, 4Q576-4Q579)* (DJD XXV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 85-114; Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11.II: (11Q2-18, 11Q20-31)* (DJD XXIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 358-409.

<sup>108</sup> Schiffman dates the present final version to the reign of Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 BCE). Cf. Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll* (ed. Florentino García Martínez; STDJ 75; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 8-10.

<sup>109</sup> Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1985), 85.

<sup>110</sup> A critique of Yadin's approach along these lines was published by Baruch Levine, "The Temple Scroll: Aspects of its Historical Provenance and Literary Character," *BASOR* 232 (1978): 5-23. Schiffman too rejects the attribution of the *Temple Scroll* to the Qumran community. See his recent formulation in *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord*, 10-11.



unearthed in the caves of Qumran became an important topic on the scholarly agenda.

In response to the need for a fresh assessment of the Qumran documents, and using the newly available data, Devorah Dimant published in 1995 the first classified inventory of all the non-biblical Qumran manuscripts. In this catalogue, she systematized all the Scrolls for the first time, grouping them into sectarian and non-sectarian categories.<sup>111</sup> Thus, the overall library of some 900 manuscripts known at the time<sup>112</sup> fell into three distinct groups: 200 manuscripts are copies of biblical books, a quarter are sectarian writings, and the remaining manuscripts, mostly reworking the Hebrew Bible in different ways and to varying degrees, are non-sectarian as they lack sectarian markers. The classification also demonstrated that all the Qumran manuscripts belong to a single collection of a specific character that is related to the Qumran site since it was recovered from caves nearby. The importance and accuracy of the distinction between sectarian and non-sectarian texts is now generally recognized and has become part of the prevailing procedure for analyzing Qumran texts. Dimant later refined her classification by providing a list of specifically sectarian terms that are linguistic markers of sectarian texts.<sup>113</sup> In this second elaboration she establishes that only organizational and polemical terms may be taken as quintessential sectarian markers, whereas theological ones, related to more diffuse ideas such as dualism and predestination, should be taken as such

---

<sup>111</sup> Cf. Devorah Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," in Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman, eds., *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989-90* (STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23-58. Devorah Dimant (1939-) was a student of David Flusser and has published widely on various Qumran issues, texts, and the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic books related to the Scrolls. From 1974 until her retirement in 2009, she was Professor of Ancient Jewish Literature at the University of Haifa.

<sup>112</sup> A fresh count, including the additional manuscripts identified among fragments previously assigned to single manuscripts, reached a total of more than 1000 manuscripts. Cf. Devorah Dimant, "The Vocabulary of Qumran Sectarian Texts," in Jörg Frey, Carsten Claußen and Nadine Kessler; eds., *Qumran und die Archäologie - Qumran and Archaeology* (WUNT 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 347-95. The article is an updated version of the Hebrew "Criteria for the Identification of Qumran Sectarian Texts," in Kister, *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*, 1:49-86 (Hebrew) (repr. and updated in *Connected Vessels: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Literature of the Second Temple Period* [Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2010], 54-96 [Hebrew]).

<sup>113</sup> See Dimant, "The Vocabulary of Qumran Sectarian Texts," 352; "Sectarian and Non-sectarian Texts from Qumran: The Pertinence and Usage of a Taxonomy," *RevQ* 24 (2009): 7-18.

markers only in association with the other, more explicit ones.<sup>114</sup> She also proposed adding a third, intermediate category to cover works with theological affinities to the sectarian texts but lacking their distinctive terminology and style (e.g. the *Temple Scroll*, the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* and the *Apocryphon of Joshua*<sup>115</sup>).

The appearance of the *Temple Scroll* also enhanced interest in the techniques of reworking the Hebrew Bible.<sup>116</sup> In fact, the *Temple Scroll* was among the first Qumran specimens of what would later be known as “re-written” or “reworked” Bible texts. Analysis of this type of texts would reach full maturity only later, when all the cave 4 texts were out.<sup>117</sup> But the *Temple Scroll* already presents the entire array of issues involved in this literary and interpretative procedure.

The peculiar character and subject matter of the *Temple Scroll* initiated a discussion on another field of investigation, namely the nature and character of the law espoused by this document and its relation to other sectarian writings, especially the *Damascus Document*.<sup>118</sup> However, it was the work

<sup>114</sup> There have been a few dissenting voices to the second classification. See Menahem Kister, “Some Further Thoughts on Identifying Sectarian Writings at Qumran,” in Kister, *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*, 1:87-90 (Hebrew); Florentino García Martínez, “Sectario, No-sectario, o Que?” *RevQ* 23 (2008): 383-94; “Aramaica qumranica apocalyptica?” in Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, eds., *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June-2 July 2008* (STDJ 94: Leiden: Brill, 2010), 435-48 (439-46). See Dimant’s responses to this criticism in “The Vocabulary of Qumran Sectarian Texts,” 356-8.

<sup>115</sup> See Devorah Dimant, “Between Sectarian and Non-Sectarian: The Case of the *Apocryphon of Joshua*,” in Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant and Ruth A. Clements, eds., *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran: Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran, 15-17 January, 2002* (STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 105-34; “Between Qumran Sectarian and Non-sectarian Texts: The Case of Belial and Mastema,” in Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture. Proceedings of the International Conference held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008)* (STDJ 93; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 235-56.

<sup>116</sup> Cf. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:60-73. Cf. Emanuel Tov, “The Temple Scroll and the Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible,” *ErIs* 16 (1982): 100-111 (Hebrew); Gershon Brin, *Studies in Biblical Law: From the Hebrew Bible to the Dead Sea Scrolls* (JSOTSup 176; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994).

<sup>117</sup> For details of Israeli contributions to this theme, see Michael Segal’s chapter in this volume. Also in this volume is the chapter by Sidnie White Crawford on the American research in this domain.

<sup>118</sup> Cf., e.g., the debate on the meaning of the *Temple Scroll*’s (LXIV, 7-9) ruling for hanging (*tlh*). Yadin thought that it prescribed crucifixion for treason, and therefore proposed understanding the *Pesher of Nahum* (4Q169 3-4 i 5-8) as approval of Alexander Jannaeus crucifying of Pharisees. Cf. Yigael Yadin, “Pesher Nahum (4Q pNahum) Reconsidered,” *IEJ* 21 (1971): 1-12; “Epigraphy and Crucifixion,” *IEJ* 23 (1973): 18-22. However, Joseph Baumgarten argues that the verb *tlh* in the *Temple Scroll* does not mean death by cru-

known as *Miqṣat Ma'āse ha-Torah* (4QMMT) that really focused attention on the law of the Qumran community. With its publication, Lawrence Schiffman saw the *Temple Scroll* as attesting to Sadducean law.<sup>119</sup>

*Miqṣat Ma'āse ha-Torah* (4QMMT) and the Qumran halakhah

The history of the publication and research into this unique document is in some respects emblematic of the entire Qumran collection. For 40 years almost nothing was known of this important work. It fell in John Strugnell's lot, and he worked on it for several decades. Later he invited Elisha Qimron to share the editorial work. Their first short presentation was published in 1985,<sup>120</sup> but it took another decade to produce the final edition in 1994.<sup>121</sup> However, the explosive implications of this new document were made public already in June 1987. At a Jerusalem symposium Yaacov Sussmann, a renowned Talmudist of the Hebrew University, consulted by the editors of 4QMMT,<sup>122</sup> read a seminal paper on the halakhah (Jewish law) of this document and its meaning for the Qumran community and for the history of Jewish halakhah in general.<sup>123</sup>

---

cifixion but by hanging. Cf. Joseph M. Baumgarten, "Does *ilb* in the Temple Scroll Refer to Crucifixion?" *JBL* 91 (1972): 472-81.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 253. In a recent formulation, Schiffman reckons that the similarities of certain halakhic rulings in the *Temple Scroll*, the *Damascus Document* and the 4QMMT are due to their common Sadducean background. Cf. Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Damascus Document and the Serakhim," in Kister, *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*, 1:275-98 (284). However, in light of various differences between the *Temple Scroll* and contemporary sources, Schiffman's latest statement is more cautious: "We cannot expect to locate the provenance of the *Temple Scroll* in any of the already known sects," in *The Courtyards of the House of Lord*, 17.

<sup>120</sup> Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, "An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran (4Q394-399)," in Janet Amitai, ed., *Biblical Archaeology Today; Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, April 1984* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1985), 400-407.

<sup>121</sup> Qimron and Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqṣat Ma'āse ha-Torah*.

<sup>122</sup> Yaacov Sussmann (1931-), a specialist in the Talmud Yerushalmi and rabbinic midrashim and renowned for his broad erudition, was born in Budapest into a family of many celebrated rabbinic ancestors. Escaping the Nazis with his family, he reached Switzerland where he studied at a yeshiva. In 1949 he settled in Israel and continued his studies in the famous Hebron Yeshiva. He then turned to academic studies at the Hebrew University and taught there for many years as Professor of Talmud.

<sup>123</sup> The lecture was first published with copious notes in "The History of Halakhah" (*Tarbiz* 59), and later in a shorter version without notes in 1992. See Yaacov Sussmann, "The History of Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Broshi, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, 99-127 (Hebrew). This shorter version was translated into English in "The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls." In 1991, three years before the publication of the official edition, an unauthorized text of 4QMMT was published by Robert

Preserved in six copies (4Q394-4Q399), *Miqṣat Ma'āse ha-Torah* is written as a letter from a group, undoubtedly the Qumran community, to another group and its leader, in which are specified some 20 halakhic issues in which the writers dispute the addressees' practice. The practices defended by the writers are strikingly similar to the Sadducees' halakhah known from the Pharisees' disputes with them as recorded in the Mishna.<sup>124</sup> Sussmann concluded, then, that the Qumranites espoused a Sadducean halakhah, which is strict and concerned mainly with the Temple, purity and priesthood.<sup>125</sup> Sussmann does not reject the Qumran community's characterization as Essene,<sup>126</sup> but regarding halakhah he proposes to identify the Essene sectarians with the Beitousin, a Sadducean group mentioned in rabbinic sources.<sup>127</sup> Sussmann suggests that in the Second Temple period there were in Israel only two halakhic schools, that of the Pharisees and that of the Sadducees, and that the Sadducean system was adhered to by various contemporary groups, among them the sectarians of Qumran.<sup>128</sup>

These new facts gave rise to the idea that the Qumran community was Sadducean rather than Essene.<sup>129</sup> However, in Israel the data of 4QMMT were variously assessed. Devorah Dimant advanced the idea that the data offered by 4QMMT may be explained by the assumption that two halakhic schools existed at the time in Israel, one Pharisaic and another to which both the Sadduceans and the Qumranites subscribed. She also stressed that

---

H. Eisenman and James M. Robinson, *A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2 vols.: Washington: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991). As Schiffman notes, use of the term "halakhah" is appropriate for the rabbinic legal traditions but not for the Qumranic, although it also serves for Qumran literature in the absence of a better nomenclature. See Schiffman, *Qumran and Jerusalem*, 34.

<sup>124</sup> Sussmann gives two examples: a dispute over when an impure man is rendered pure, either directly following immersion, as prescribed by the Pharisees, or only after both immersion and the setting of the sun, as required by the Sadducees; and the matter of a liquid poured from a pure to impure receptacle. The Pharisees think that this stream does not become impure, whereas the Sadducees hold that it does (*m. Para* 3:7; *m. Yad.* 4:7). For details, see Aharon Shemesh's chapter in this volume.

<sup>125</sup> Sussmann, "The History of Halakhah" (*Tarbiz* 59), 26-27.

<sup>126</sup> Sussmann, "The History of Halakhah" (*Tarbiz* 59), 59 n. 186.

<sup>127</sup> Sussmann, "The History of Halakhah" (*Tarbiz* 59), 54-55.

<sup>128</sup> Sussmann, "The History of Halakhah" (*Tarbiz* 59), 48-53, 68-69.

<sup>129</sup> The most outspoken proponent of this approach is Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994), e.g. 87-88, 157. See also Schiffman's Hebrew volume, *Law, Custom and Messianism in the Dead Sea Sect* (Jerusalem: Merkaz Shazar, 1993). Schiffman reaffirms his positions in his latest publication. Notably his most recent version of the Qumran community's history contains nothing about the rift related to the high priesthood or the exile of the Teacher of Righteousness. See *Qumran and Jerusalem*, 81-83, 119-20. For details, see Alex Jassen's chapter in this volume.

the ideological differences between the Jewish sects, as described by Josephus and confirmed by the Scrolls, should not be underplayed.<sup>130</sup>

Menahem Kister observed that the examples adduced by Sussmann of purification and liquid stream are the only ones that show real affinity to the rabbinic formulation of the Sadducean halakhah. In his opinion, this similarity does not necessarily imply or reflect the same halakhic system.<sup>131</sup> He therefore rejects the suggestion that the Qumran sect was Sadducean and re-asserts the view that the Qumran literature refers to three groups, as does Josephus.<sup>132</sup> A similar conclusion was reached by Daniel Schwartz.<sup>133</sup> Yet Kister, like Sussmann, emphasizes that the three were defined mainly along halakhic lines.<sup>134</sup>

*Miqṣat Ma'āse ha-Torah* thus thrust the community's halakhah into the center of Qumran research. At the same time it reopened the discussion on fundamental issues such as the nature and identification of the Qumran community, the general character of this halakhah, its role within the Qumran community's life, and its relation to other halakhic systems in Judaism. The questions and solutions became more nuanced as the next decade saw the publication of other halakhic texts from Qumran.<sup>135</sup>

Sussmann concluded his article with a call to scholars to exploit the new sources offered by the Scrolls to reconstruct the history of the halakhah.<sup>136</sup> Much of what is being done in Israel in this domain seems to be going in this direction. Aharon Shemesh observes that two models have been advanced to explain the context of the halakhah gleaned from the Qumran

<sup>130</sup> First in a lecture entitled "Les Origines de la Communauté de Qumran," delivered on February 1, 1988 at the Collège de France, Paris. These views were later published in Devorah Dimant, "Signification et importance des manuscrits de la mer Morte. L'état actuel des études qoumrâniennes," *Annales : Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 51 (1996) : 975-1003.

<sup>131</sup> Cf. Menahem Kister, "Studies in 4QMiqṣat Ma'āse ha-Torah and Related Texts: Law, Theology, Language and Calendar," *Tarbiz* 68 (1999): 317-71 (Hebrew).

<sup>132</sup> Kister's (1957-) doctoral dissertation (1994) was written under the supervision of Yaacov Sussmann and is published as *Studies in Avot de-Rabbi Nathan: Text, Redaction and Interpretation* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi and the Hebrew University, 1998) (Hebrew). Kister teaches at the Hebrew University and has published on various Qumran and rabbinic themes.

<sup>133</sup> See Daniel R. Schwartz, "MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees," in John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein, eds., *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*, (SBLSymS 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 67-80 (80).

<sup>134</sup> See Menahem Kister, "Studies in 4QMiqṣat Ma'āse ha-Torah and Related Texts."

<sup>135</sup> The cave 4 copies of the *Damascus Document*, containing much new halakhic material, were published first. Cf. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document*. The remaining halakhic manuscripts found in the caves were published in another volume; see Joseph M. Baumgarten et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XXV: Halakhic Texts* (DJD XXXV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999).

<sup>136</sup> Sussmann, "The History of Halakhah," (*Tarbiz* 59), 66.

documents. One model perceives the Qumran halakhah as an older stage preceding the rabbinic halakhah. The other regards the two as contemporary and competing systems, on the assumption that the rabbinic one reflects the Pharisaic halakhah of the Second Temple period. In Shemesh's opinion both models serve to explain the complex picture emerging from the sources.<sup>137</sup> Vered Noam opts for the second model, maintaining that the Qumran halakhah and the Tannaitic halakhic system "do not represent a simple picture of chronological layers, but a wide common basis... Both corpora preserve a fundamental layer of basic halakhic assumptions."<sup>138</sup> The two systems, Noam asserts, were based on ancient biblical interpretations, yet each went its own way and incorporated original and novel elements: the Qumran halakhah was closer to the literal meaning of the biblical text and aspired to create a sacred space in human life. By contrast, the halakhah represented by later Tannaitic sources aimed at "sophistication, conceptualization and abstraction" and enlargement of the profane domain.<sup>139</sup> Daniel Schwartz proposed explaining the differences between the two schools by positing that the Qumranic-Sadducean halakhah is "realistic," namely that it understands the Torah laws as deriving from the natural order, whereas the rabbinic halakhah is "nominalistic," namely based on understanding the way the Torah formulates its laws.<sup>140</sup> Cana Werman stresses that the halakhic system of the Qumranites is in many respects close

<sup>137</sup> Cf. Aharon Shemesh, *Halakhah in the Making: The Development of Jewish Law from Qumran to the Rabbis* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 3-7.

<sup>138</sup> Vered Noam, *From Qumran to the Rabbinic Revolution: Conceptions of Impurity* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2010), 355 (Hebrew). The formulation is taken from her general statements concluding her analysis of purity and impurity in the Qumran halakhah as compared with the Tannaitic halakhah. See also her discussion in Vered Noam, "Qumran and the Rabbis on Corpse-Impurity: Common Exegesis - Tacit Polemic," in Charlotte Hempel, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Contexts* (STDJ 90; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 397-430.

<sup>139</sup> Noam, *From Qumran to the Rabbinic Revolution*. See also her analysis of the exegetical techniques used by the Qumranites to elaborate biblical legal injunctions in "Creative Interpretation and Integrative Interpretation in Qumran," Roitman, Schiffman and Tzoref, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture*, 363-76. Vered Noam (1960-) is a Professor of Talmudic Studies at Tel Aviv University. She wrote a doctoral dissertation under the supervision of Yaacov Sussmann, and published it as *Megillat Tā'anit: The Versions, Their Interpretation and Their History, with a Critical Edition* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2003) (Hebrew). She has contributed studies on several aspects of Qumran halakhah.

<sup>140</sup> Cf. Daniel R. Schwartz, "Law and Truth: On Qumran-Sadducean and Rabbinic Views of the Law," in Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 229-40; "Arguments a minore ad majore (gal wahomer) - Sadducean Realism," *Massekhet* 5 (2006): 145-56 (Hebrew). Daniel Schwartz (1952-) is a historian and teaches as Professor of Ancient Jewish History at the Hebrew University. He occasionally publishes studies on Qumranic issues.

to the biblical law, especially in that it is anonymous and uniform. It is also rigidly inclusive and decisive.<sup>141</sup>

It is nevertheless significant that most of these views of the Qumran halakhah are taken from the perspective of rabbinic halakhah. While such an approach is correct and fruitful,<sup>142</sup> the relationship between the Qumran community's legal system and its specific organization and particular ideas is yet to be systematically analyzed. Sporadic contributions to this major aspect of the Qumran legal texts have been made by Israeli scholars.<sup>143</sup> Menahem Kister estimates that the elaborate theology of the sect, formulated in universal and non-halakhic terms, is based on their feeling of sinfulness and the inadequacy of the way in which they practiced the Torah directives.<sup>144</sup> Aharon Shemesh has shown that the practical distinction between the sectaries as the Sons of Light, the "true" Israel, and the outsider Sons of Darkness parallels the distinction between Israel and the Gentiles. This parallelism enabled the sectaries to apply halakhic rulings concerning Gentiles to the Sons of Darkness.<sup>145</sup> Devorah Dimant demonstrates that the sobriquet "volunteers" for those who joined the community (e.g. the *Community Rule* [1QS], V, 1, 21-22 and especially IX, 3-6) is in fact an interpretation of the Torah law about voluntary sacrifice (Lev 22:21), for the adherents of the community were perceived as voluntarily devoting their lives to the community's pious ways just as the voluntary sacrifice was offered to God.<sup>146</sup>

---

<sup>141</sup> Cf. Cana Werman, "The Characterization of the Halakhic System in the Second Temple Period," in Cana Werman and Aharon Shemesh, *Revealing the Hidden: Exegesis and Halakhah in the Qumran Scrolls* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2011), 104-45 (104) (Hebrew). Cana Werman (1957-) writes about Qumran and pseudepigrapha issues. She teaches at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer Sheva.

<sup>142</sup> See Joseph M. Baumgarten, "Tannaitic Halakhah and Qumran: A Re-evaluation," in Steven D. Fraade, Aharon Shemesh and Ruth A. Clements, eds., *Rabbinic Perspectives: Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 62; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 1-11. See also Aharon Shemesh's chapter in this volume.

<sup>143</sup> See the comments and specific instances related to this aspect discussed by Schiffman, *Qumran and Jerusalem*, 6-8.

<sup>144</sup> Cf. Menahem Kister, "Some Aspects of Qumranic Halakhah," in Trebelle Barrera and Vegas Montaner, *The Madrid Congress*, 2:571-88.

<sup>145</sup> Cf. Aharon Shemesh, "The Origins of the Laws of Separatism: Qumran Literature and Rabbinic Halacha," *RevQ* 18 (1997): 223-41; "He Who Separates the Sons of Light from the Sons of Darkness and Israel from the Nations," in Daniel Boyarin et al., eds., *Atara Le-Haim: Studies in the Talmud and Medieval Rabbinic Literature in Honor of Professor Haim Zalman Dimitrovsky* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2000), 209-20 (Hebrew).

<sup>146</sup> Cf. Devorah Dimant, "The Volunteers in the Rule of the Community: A Biblical Notion in Sectarian Garb," *RevQ* 23 (2007): 233-45.



*The Identification of the Qumran Community*

The information gained from *Miqṣat Ma'ase ha-Torah* reopened the old debate on the relationship between the Qumran library and Josephus' description of the three schools in Second Temple Judaism: the Pharisees, the Sadducees and the Essenes. For more than 30 years scholarly consensus identified the Qumranites with the Essenes, but the new halakhic data suggested similarity to Sadducean halakhah. In Israel different assessments of the halakhic character of the authors of the Scrolls were offered. Some subscribe to Sussmann's identification of the sectarian halakhah as Sadducean;<sup>147</sup> others reject it.<sup>148</sup> Yet others make a clear distinction between the halakhah of the Qumranites, deemed partly or wholly close to the that of the Sadduceans, and the social-religious identity, taken to be that of the Essenes.<sup>149</sup> In any case, most Israeli scholars agree with the assessment that the new texts, especially 4QMMT, confirm the picture of the stringent dissenting attitude of the Qumran community, known from earlier texts.<sup>150</sup>

<sup>147</sup> Cf. e.g. Schwartz, "Law and Truth"; "Arguments *a minore ad maiore* (*gal wahomer*) - Sadducean Realism"; Cana Werman, "Introduction: The Qumran Scrolls," in Werman and Shemesh, *Revealing the Hidden*, 14.

<sup>148</sup> Thus Eyal Regev, *The Sadducees and Their Halakhah* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2005), 36-41 (Hebrew). Regev argues that the Beitousin of the rabbinic sources, identified there with the Sadducees, differed socially and ideologically from the Essenes as in the classical descriptions. See also Kister's reservations about this identification in his "Studies in 4Q*Miqṣat Ma'ase ha-Torah* and Related Texts," 329.

<sup>149</sup> Cf. e.g. Kister, "Studies in 4Q*Miqṣat Ma'ase ha-Torah* and Related Texts," 329. See the compilation by Daniel R. Schwartz of all the evidence for the existence of the three separate schools in Second Temple Judaism in his "The Dead Sea Sect and the Essenes," in Kister, *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*, 2:601-12 (Hebrew).

<sup>150</sup> Cf. Sussmann, "The History of Halakhah," (*Tarbiz* 59), 27, 34-35; Kister, "Studies in 4Q*Miqṣat Ma'ase ha-Torah* and Related Texts," 327. But see the different assessment by Vered Noam, who argues that the Qumranites' approach reflects a literary reading of Scriptures, whereas Tannaitic leniency is in fact a far-reaching revolution. Vered Noam, "Stringency in Qumran: A Reassessment," *JSJ* 40 (2009): 342-55. Among the few who believe that the members of the Qumran community were originally Sadducean priests is Lawrence Schiffman. However, he too argues that later in their history these Sadduceans became Essenes. Cf. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 87-95. A similar model is espoused by Cana Werman, "Introduction: The Qumran Scrolls," 13-15. Of a different character is Rachel Elior's argumentation. Trained as a scholar of the Chassidic movements in the 18th and 19th centuries, Elior (1949-) became interested in Qumran issues. She denies the existence of the Essenes and describes the Qumranites as Sadducean priests rejected and persecuted by the Pharisaic establishment. Elior's assertions have proven to be based on faulty arguments and therefore are not accepted. See Rachel Elior, *Temple and Chariot, Priests and Angels, Palace and Palaces in Ancient Jewish Mysticism* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2002) (Hebrew), reviewed by Devorah Dimant in *Zion* 71 (2006): 97-10 (Hebrew); Rachel Elior, *Memory and Oblivion: The Mystery of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Tel Aviv-Jerusalem: Hakibbutz Hameuchad-Van Leer Institute, 2009) (Hebrew), reviewed by Sacha Stern, "Rachel Elior on Ancient Jewish Calendars: A Critique," *Aleph* 5 (2005): 293-305, and by Devorah Di-



*The History of the Qumran Community*

Interestingly, the final publication of the cave 4 manuscripts and the new halakhic materials has hardly affected the reconstructed history of the Qumran community. This picture, based on the already known *Pesharim*, the *Damascus Document*, the *Community Rule*, *Hodayot* and the *War Texts*, is still accepted by most scholars, with differences only in detail. It dates the origins of the community to around 170 BCE, among the events leading up to the Maccabean Revolt in 167-163 BCE. Accordingly the community's leader, the Teacher of Righteousness, is often equated with a Sadducean high priest ousted from office by Jonathan the Hasmonean (152-143 BCE) or another priestly figure. It is assumed that a rift between him and the Hasmonean rulers prompted the Teacher and his followers to leave Jerusalem and retire to exile, and that this exile was at Qumran.<sup>151</sup> Furthermore, many scholars still hold that Damascus, mentioned in the *Damascus Document* as the early community's place of exile, is a code name for Qumran.<sup>152</sup>

Basically this remains the picture also adhered to by most Israeli scholars.<sup>153</sup> Hanan Eshel<sup>154</sup> introduced a few modifications to it. According to him the community came into being in Damascus rather than in Jerusalem. It separated from Israel at large due to rivalries with the Hasmonean rulers as well as with ideological opponents, and went to the desert. Eshel thinks that initially this place of refuge was not Qumran but another locality; only later did the Teacher's followers settle there.<sup>155</sup> The theory that the group

---

mant, "On Remembering and Forgetting Research," *Katharsis* 13 (2010): 22-53 (Hebrew). See also the critique by the late Edna Ullmann-Margalit, "The Identity, Identification and Existence of the Sects: The 'Zadokite Priests', the Essenes, and the Scrolls," *Cathedra* 139 (2011): 31-54 (Hebrew).

<sup>151</sup> See, for instance, the recent statement by Émile Puech, "The Essenes and Qumran, the Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest, the Origins," in Boccaccini, *Enoch and Qumran Origins*, 298-302.

<sup>152</sup> See e.g. Schiffman, "The Damascus Document and the Serakhim," 279. Note his arguments for this identification in *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 92-95.

<sup>153</sup> Cf., for instance, the chapter summarizing the historical background of the *Pesher of Habakkuk* by Bilhah Nitzan, *Pesher Habakkuk: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea (1QpHab)* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1986), 123-45 (Hebrew). A popular summary of the current scholarly theory about the Scrolls published in Hebrew is written along the same lines. See Magen Broshi, *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Qumran and the Essenes* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2010) (Hebrew).

<sup>154</sup> Hanan Eshel (1958-2010) was an archaeologist and a Qumran scholar who taught at Bar-Ilan University. His untimely death interrupted a prolific academic career.

<sup>155</sup> Cf. Hanan Eshel, "The History of the Qumran Community and Historical Aspects of the Pesharim," in Kister, *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*, 1:191-208 (Hebrew). See also Hanan Eshel, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2004) (Hebrew); English trans.: *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State*

that settled at Qumran split off at an early stage from the Essene movement<sup>156</sup> has recently gained in popularity but enjoys little support in Israel.<sup>157</sup>

The complexity of the issues involved in reconstructing the history of the Qumran community from fragmentary and at times conflicting sources may be illustrated by the text 4Q448. It contains a prayer for the welfare of King Jonathan, whose identity has sparked intense debate. Obviously he could only be a Hasmonean ruler, but the positive attitude to such a ruler does not agree with anti-Hasmonean passages in other Scrolls. The text has elicited many proposals but none has resolved the difficulty.<sup>158</sup>

But the new data gave rise to other insights and a few different assessments of several points in the history of the community. The conciliatory tone of 4QMMT and its authors' attempt to persuade the addressees to embrace their own praxis have been taken to indicate its origin in the Qumranites' early phase, when they still hoped to win their opponents over to their own views.<sup>159</sup> Qimron and Strugnell thought that 4QMMT is "a treatise on certain points of traditional Zadokite legal practice," written by the Qumranites to the Hasmonean ruler Jonathan (152-142 BCE).<sup>160</sup> Kister similarly suggests that the addressee was the high priest of the time, and therefore a Hasmonean ruler. Yet Kister observes that nothing is said in 4QMMT of the high priesthood in general or of a specific high priest in

---

(Grand Rapids-Jerusalem: Eerdmans-Yad Ben-Zvi, 2008), 59-61. With a different assessment, Flusser argued that the community that settled in Damascus, whose history is told in the *Damascus Document*, was more open and therefore not the same as that "which settled in the Dead Sea area." Cf. Flusser, *The Spiritual History of the Dead Sea Sect*, 11-12.

<sup>156</sup> The idea was first put forward by the so-called Groningen Hypothesis. See Florentino García Martínez, "Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis," *Qumranica Minora I* (STDJ 63; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 3-29 (first published in 1988).

<sup>157</sup> One of the few followers in Israel of this line of argument is Eyal Regev, "Between Two Sects: Differentiating the Yahad and the Damascus Covenant," in Hempel, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Contexts*, 431-49.

<sup>158</sup> Published by Esther Eshel, Hanan Eshel and Ada Yardeni, "A Qumran Composition Containing Part of Ps. 154 and a Prayer For the Welfare of King Jonathan and His Kingdom," *IEJ* 42 (1992): 199-229; "448. 4QApocryphal Psalm and Prayer," in Esther Eshel et al., *Qumran Cave 4. VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (DJJD XI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 403-25. The authors identified the person with the Hasmonean king Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 BCE). Other historical information was gleaned from 4Q248 by Magen Broshi and Esther Eshel. They suggest that the king referred to in this small fragment is Antiochus IV (175-164 BCE) and the circumstances described therein relate to his campaign in Egypt in 170-168 BCE. Cf. Magen Broshi and Esther Eshel, "The Greek King is Antiochus IV (4QHistorical Text = 4Q248)," *JJS* 48 (1997): 120-29.

<sup>159</sup> See e.g. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 89.

<sup>160</sup> See Qimron and Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah*, 121.

particular.<sup>161</sup> Hence, the manuscript provides no evidence for the idea that the Teacher of Righteousness served for some years as high priest.<sup>162</sup>

Much has been made of the declaration by the 4QMMT writers that they “separated from the majority of the people,” as restored by the editors (4QMMT D, 4).<sup>163</sup> It has been taken as evidence of the group’s dissent from the Jewish society of the time based on disputes over halakhic practices.<sup>164</sup> In turn, this has been linked to the separatist and stringent tendencies displayed by the sectarian writings known earlier.<sup>165</sup> Albert Baumgarten has criticized this notion. He points out that since the number of possible positions on any given halakhic issue is limited, similarity of halakhic attitudes, for example, between 4QMMT and the Sadducean halakhah, cannot be taken as a cause of sectarian schism. In his judgment different calendars were not the reason either; where a compromise sought it could have been found.<sup>166</sup>

Daniel Schwartz and Hanan Eshel likewise advance a different assessment. They argue that the polemics in 4QMMT is not with the Pharisees over halakhic matters but with the Temple Sadducean priesthood over pu-

<sup>161</sup> See Kister, “Studies in 4QMiḡṣat Ma’āse ha-Torah and Related Texts,” 323.

<sup>162</sup> Cf. Kister, “Studies in 4QMiḡṣat Ma’āse ha-Torah and Related Texts,” 323. One of the staunch proponents of this theory was Hartmut Stegemann. For details, see Annette Steudel’s chapter in this volume.

<sup>163</sup> שִׁפְרָשְׁנוּ מִרִּבּוֹ הַעָם.

<sup>164</sup> Thus Sussmann, “The History of Halakhah” (*Tarbiz* 59), 36; Kister, “Studies in 4QMiḡṣat Ma’āse ha-Torah and Related Texts,” 326. Albert Baumgarten sets this rift in the context of similar sects and dissident groups. He suggests discussing the Qumran community as a phenomenon parallel but not identical to the Essenes. Cf. Albert L. Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (JSJSup 55; Leiden: Brill, 1997); “Greco-Roman Voluntary Associations and Ancient Jewish Sects,” in Martin Goodman, ed., *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 93-111; “Who Cares and Why Does it Matter? Qumran and the Essenes, Once Again!” *DSD* 11 (2004): 174-90 (187-8); “Reflections on the Groningen Hypothesis,” in Gabriele Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and Qumran Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 256-62. Albert Baumgarten is a historian of ancient Judaism and taught at Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan. See also Eyal Regev, “Comparing Sectarian Practice and Organization: The Qumran Sects in Light of the Regulations of the Shakers, Hutterites, Mennonites and Amish,” *Numen* 51 (2004), 146-81. For a comparison of the sectarian organization with Hellenistic voluntary associations, see also Moshe Weinfeld, *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect* (NTOA 2; Fribourg-Göttingen: Editions universitaires-Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).

<sup>165</sup> See Kister, “Studies in 4QMiḡṣat Ma’āse ha-Torah and Related Texts,” 327.

<sup>166</sup> Cf. Albert I. Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (JSJSup 55; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 75-78; “But Touch the Law and the Sect Will Split’: Legal Dispute as the Cause of Sectarianism,” *Review of Rabbinic Judaism* 5 (2002): 301-15 (305-8).

rity and cult.<sup>167</sup> A different chronological history of the Scrolls community has also been proposed. Based on the chronological calculation of the *Animal Apocalypse* (= *1 Enoch* 89:59-90:7) Devorah Dimant suggests dating the beginnings of the Qumran sect around 200 BCE, when the Seleucids took control of the Land of Israel and brought to an end a century of Ptolemaic rule.<sup>168</sup> She argues that the social-political appearance of the sect as a historical entity should be separated from its traditions and literature, which appear to be much older.<sup>169</sup> Following others, Dimant argues that although the connection between the site of Qumran and the owners of the Scrolls seems secure, this does not mean that Qumran was the sole habitation of the Qumranite Essenes, as both the *Damascus Document* (XIV, 3, 9) and the evidence of Philo and Josephus indicate that they lived in communities throughout Judea.<sup>170</sup> She also points to the absence of evidence that the Teacher of Righteousness served as high priest for a short time, or that the covenanters' sojourn in Damascus, mentioned in the *Damascus Document*, was actually at Qumran.<sup>171</sup> Finally she establishes that the *pesher* of Isa 40:3 introduced by the *Community Rule* (VIII, 14-16; IX, 19-20) should not be understood as the withdrawal of the Qumran group to a real desert but to a metaphoric one, symbolizing the community's isolation in its devotion to practicing the Torah correctly.<sup>172</sup> This understanding casts doubt

<sup>167</sup> Cf. Schwartz, "MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees," 79-80; Hanan Eshel, "4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period," in Kampen and Bernstein, *Reading 4QMMT*, 53-65 (60).

<sup>168</sup> Cf. Devorah Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," 542-7.

<sup>169</sup> Cf. Devorah Dimant, "The History of the Qumran Community in Light of New Developments in the Study of the Scrolls," *Connected Vessels*, 15-39 (37-39) (Hebrew). See the third-century BCE dating of the *Astronomic Book* (= *1 Enoch* 72-82) and the *Aramaic Levi Document* by Michael E. Stone, "Enoch Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origins," *JSJ* 19 (1988):159-70. In this connection it is worth noting Eyal Regev's suggestion that the halakhah in the *Temple Scroll*, 4QMMT and *Jubilees* precedes the full development of the sectarian viewpoint. Cf. Eyal Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (RelSoc 45; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 95-161, 219-41. Noteworthy too is Rofé's suggestion that the Jewish sects of the second century BCE had antecedents in the third or fourth century BCE. See Alexander Rofé, "The Onset of Sects in Postexilic Judaism: Neglected Evidence from the Septuagint, Trito-Isaiah, Ben Sira, and Malachi," in Jacob Neusner et al., eds., *Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Kee: The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 39-49.

<sup>170</sup> Dimant, "The History of the Qumran Community," 29-30.

<sup>171</sup> Cf. Dimant, "The History of the Qumran Community," 32-33. See Kister's observations on 4QMMT mentioned above.

<sup>172</sup> Devorah Dimant, "Non pas l'exile au désert mais l'exile spirituel: l'interprétation d'Isaïe 40,3 dans la Règle de la Communauté," in *Qumrân et le judaïsme du tournant de notre ère*, sous la direction d'André Lemaire et Simon A. C. Mimouni (*Collection de la Revue des Études Juives*; Paris: Peeters, 2006), 17-36; "The History of the Qumran Community," 34-35. Interestingly, in the past Schiffman opined that the withdrawal into the desert referred

on the idea of “exile in the desert.”<sup>173</sup> It has been proposed recently that the 4QMMT key-phrase “we separated from the majority of the peop[le,” which has been taken to affirm real dissent from Israel in general, may be reconstructed differently: “we separated from the majority of the peop[les,” alluding to avoidance of mixed marriages to retain Israel’s holiness.<sup>174</sup> This proposal demonstrates that a different reading of this crucial 4QMMT line is as plausible and thus may dissolve the textual basis for the notion that the authors of the Scrolls separated from Israel. In the light of such an understanding, the Qumranites’ self-designation as “those who depart from the way of the people” (e.g. CD I, 13; VIII, 16; 11QMelch ii 24) may also be understood metaphorically.

### *The Site of Qumran and the Community of the Scrolls*

The debate on whether the Scrolls and their authors were connected to the site of Qumran has continued unabated into the present phase of Qumran research. Fresh archaeological findings and reassessment of Roland de Vaux’s work have essentially confirmed his interpretation of the Qumran site as a sectarian settlement connected with the Scrolls found in the nearby caves.<sup>175</sup> However, de Vaux’s chronology of Qumran has been revised in two important points: first, the settlement during the Second Temple period appears to have begun around 100 BCE rather than 150 BCE. Secondly, no considerable gap in the settlement at the site seems to appear after

---

to by this pesher is indeed metaphoric. Cf. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 94-95. But he did not draw general conclusions on the history of the Qumran community from this observation.

<sup>173</sup> The idea that Qumran is the “desert” to which the sect withdrew has been criticized also because in antiquity the area of Qumran and Jericho was inhabited and cultivated, and well known for its fertility.

<sup>174</sup> Cf. Elizur Bar-Asher, “Who Separated from Whom and Why? A Philological Study of 4QMMT,” *RevQ* (forthcoming). He argues that under the influence of Aramaic, the expression פָּרְשָׁנוּ מִרֵּיב הָעַמִּים should be understood as a late Hebrew equivalent of the biblical formulation נִבְדַּלְנוּ מִרֵּיב הָעַמִּים used in context for mixed marriages and impurity. I thank Elizur Bar-Asher for placing at my disposal the manuscript of his article.

<sup>175</sup> Cf. Eshel, “The History of the Discoveries at Qumran,” in Kister, *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World* 1:3-24 (Hebrew). For several new developments in archaeology at the Qumran site, together with a survey of other finds in the Judean Desert, see Eshel’s chapter in this volume. For general assessments of the de Vaux excavations and interpretations, with updated adjustments, see Jodi Magness, “A Reassessment of the Excavation of Qumran,” in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years, 708-19* (714); *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002); Eric M. Meyers, “Khirbet Qumran and its Environs,” in Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: University Press, 2010), 21-45.

the earthquake of 31 BCE, mentioned by Josephus.<sup>176</sup> A third important feature of the Qumran site, the adjacent cemetery, has been reassessed by several scholars. Roland de Vaux's figure of more the 1000 graves has been confirmed by a recent count.<sup>177</sup> The few burials of women and children, mainly in the secondary cemeteries, were identified by Joseph Zias as late Bedouin, and not of the Second Temple period.<sup>178</sup> But some graves with women's remains are nevertheless from the Second Temple period. Thus, the question of whether or not the ancient inhabitants of Qumran were celibate cannot be resolved by these data.<sup>179</sup>

The verification of de Vaux's main archaeological interpretations has not prevented certain scholars from suggesting various other theories about the character of Qumran.<sup>180</sup> The most outspoken Israeli archaeologists who deny the sectarian Essene character of the Qumran site are Yizhar Hirschfeld and Yitzhak Magen with Yuval Peleg. The late Yizhar Hirschfeld claimed that the site was a rural estate,<sup>181</sup> while Yitzhak Magen and Yuval Peleg suggest that it was a factory for ceramic ware.<sup>182</sup> Their interpretations of the archaeological findings have not convinced other archaeologists, and their theories, as well as those of others, remain on the fringe of the scholarly discussion. It is worth noting that all the alternative interpretations of the Qumran site start with a critique of the accepted view, which connects Qumran with the Essenes and the Scrolls. Yet, as noted by Devorah Di-

---

<sup>176</sup> Cf. Magen Broshi, "The Archaeology of Qumran - A Reconsideration," in Dimant and Rappaport, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, 103-15 (105-6).

<sup>177</sup> Cf. Hanan Eshel et al., "New Data on the Cemetery East of Khirbet Qumran," *DSD* 9 (2002): 135-65.

<sup>178</sup> Joseph E. Zias, "The Cemeteries of Qumran and Celibacy: Confusion Laid to Rest?" *DSD* 7 (2000): 220-53.

<sup>179</sup> See the recent survey of the evidence by Rachel Hachlili, "The Qumran Cemetery Reassessed," in Lim and Collins, *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 46-78 (71-74).

<sup>180</sup> See the list of proposals compiled by Magen Broshi, "Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Contentions of Twelve Theories," in Douglas R. Edwards, ed., *Religion and Society in Roman Palestine* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 162-9.

<sup>181</sup> Cf. Yizhar Hirschfeld, "Qumran During the Second Temple Period: Re-Evaluating the Archaeological Evidence," *Cathedra* 109 (2003): 5-50 (Hebrew). See the critical responses by Hanan Eshel, "Qumran and the Scrolls - Response to the Article by Yizhar Hirschfeld," *Cathedra* 109 (2003): 51-62 (Hebrew), and by Magen Broshi, "A Monastery or a Manor House? A Reply to Yizhar Hirschfeld," *Cathedra* 109 (2003): 63-68 (Hebrew); "Agriculture at Qumran?" *Cathedra* 114 (2004): 5-10 (Hebrew). See also Yizhar Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004).

<sup>182</sup> Cf. Yitzhak Magen and Yuval Peleg, "Back to Qumran: Ten Years of Excavation and Research, 1993-2004," in Katharina Galor, Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Jürgen Zangenberg, eds., *Qumran, the Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates: Proceedings of a Conference Held at Brown University, November 17-19, 2002* (STDJ 57; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 55-113.

mant, the original identification of the covenanters as Essenes rests mainly on the close affinity of two types of literary descriptions: one of the Scrolls and the other of the classical descriptions of the Essenes. So whether Qumran is or is not connected to the owners of the Scrolls does not affect this identification.<sup>183</sup> In general, the character of the Qumran site has been debated without account of the new developments in the study of the Scrolls themselves.<sup>184</sup> Besides the ongoing investigation of the texts produced by the community, new vistas have opened with the numerous new works apparently not composed by this group but preserved in its library.

### *The Qumran Community and the Non-Sectarian Texts*

From the first years of Qumran research it was known that the Scroll repository contains Hebrew and Aramaic copies of pseudepigraphic writings previously extant only in ancient translations. *1 Enoch*, available in full only in Ethiopic, is now represented by 11 fragmentary Aramaic copies. The *Book of Jubilees*, complete only in the traditional Ethiopic version, is represented by 17 Hebrew copies (two doubtful). A third work, the *Aramaic Levi Document*, related to the Greek *Testament of Levi*, is extant in eight Aramaic copies. All three are heavily tinged with apocalyptic speculations, so their presence at Qumran and their numerous links with the Scrolls have contributed to the characterization of the Qumran group as an apocalyptic community. However, the publication of the remaining cave 4 texts considerably augmented the corpus of pseudepigraphic books and enriched it with both Hebrew and Aramaic works unknown from any other source. This expansion reveals new dimensions of the Qumran collection and significantly modifies its previous assessment. Israeli scholars have substantially effected this change of perspective. They demonstrate that besides their affinity to the Qumran writings these pseudepigraphic works share themes with a wide array of other literary documents beyond Qumran. Devorah Dimant has written several studies on various aspects of *1 Enoch*,<sup>185</sup> has published

<sup>183</sup> Cf. Dimant, "The History of the Qumran Community," 29-32. For this reason, the theoretical-philosophical criticism of the late Edna Ullmann-Margalit also misses the point, since she addresses the common but simplistic version of the Essene theory rather than its more judicious one. Cf. Edna Ullmann-Margalit, *Out of the Cave: A Philosophical Inquiry into the Dead Sea Scrolls Research* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006).

<sup>184</sup> One gap has been noticed, namely between the fresh dating of the beginning of the Qumran settlement to around 100 BCE and the previous dating of the start of the community's settlement there at around 150 BCE, but it has not been explained.

<sup>185</sup> Cf. Devorah Dimant, *Fallen Angels in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Pseudepigraphic Books Related to Them* (Ph.D. diss.; Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1984) (Hebrew), written



surveys of the apocryphal literature found among the Scrolls,<sup>186</sup> and has edited and studied two unknown Hebrew apocryphal works from Qumran.<sup>187</sup> Additionally, Dimant has described in detail the peculiarities of the Aramaic texts found among the Scrolls. She draws attention to the prominence of themes related to the Flood and the Patriarchs, as well as courtly pieces connected with the book of Daniel.<sup>188</sup> The specific configuration of the Aramaic texts has also been noted by Michael Stone. He finds it striking that in contrast to the heavy emphasis on the priestly aspect in many of the Qumran Aramaic pseudepigrapha, works attributed to Adam, Baruch or Ezra, so popular in non-Qumranic pseudepigrapha, are absent.<sup>189</sup> Together with Jonas Greenfield and Esther Eshel he edited the *Aramaic Levi Document*.<sup>190</sup> Esther Eshel has devoted several studies to the Aramaic *Gen-*

---

under the supervision of David Flusser; "1 Enoch 6-11: A Methodological Perspective," *SBLSP* (1978): 323-39; "The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch," *VT* 33 (1983): 14-29; "1 Enoch 6-11: A Fragment of a Parabiblical Work," *JJS* 53 (2002): 223-37; "Israel's Subjugation to the Gentiles as an Expression of Demonic Power in Qumran Documents and Related Literature," *RevQ* 22 (2006): 373-88; "Theology and History according to the *Animal Apocalypse* (1 Enoch 85-90)," *Connected Vessels*, 266-94 (Hebrew); "Jerusalem and the Temple in the *Animal Apocalypse* in Light of Qumran Sectarian Thought," *Connected Vessels*, 295-313 (Hebrew). In her article on history in the *Animal Apocalypse* (= 1 Enoch 85-90), Dimant judged that it describes the early history of the Qumran group. Menahem Kister thinks that this work describes the history of "a certain separatist and reformist sect similar to the Qumran sect." See Menahem Kister, "Concerning the History of the Essenes: A Study of the *Animal Apocalypse*, the Book of Jubilees and the Damascus Document," *Tarbiz* 56 (1986-1987), 1-18 (Hebrew).

<sup>186</sup> Cf. Devorah Dimant, "Apocalyptic Texts at Qumran," in Eugene Ulrich and James C. VanderKam, eds., *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993), 175-91; "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha at Qumran," *DSD* 1 (1994): 151-9; "Old Testament Pseudepigrapha at Qumran" in James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. II: *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 447-67.

<sup>187</sup> The two are *Pseudo-Ezekiel* and the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*. See Devorah Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (DJD XXX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001).

<sup>188</sup> Cf. Devorah Dimant, "The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community," in Hilhorst, Puech and Tigchelaar, *Flores Florentino*, 197-205; "Themes and Genres in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran," in Berthelot and Stökl, *Aramaica Qumranica*, 16-45.

<sup>189</sup> See Michael E. Stone, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pseudepigrapha," *DSD* 3 (1996): 270-93.

<sup>190</sup> Cf. Jonas C. Greenfield, Michael E. Stone and Esther Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*: edition, translation, commentary (SVTP 19; Leiden: Brill, 2004). Jonas Greenfield's contributions to Qumran research are included in the collection of his articles, published posthumously: Shalom M. Paul, Michael E. Stone and Avital Pinnick, eds., *Al Kanfei Yonah: Collected Studies of Jonas C. Greenfield on Semitic Philology* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2001). See the obituary by Michael Sokoloff, "In memory of Jonas Greenfield," *Jewish Studies* 36 (1996): 183-6 (Hebrew). Jonas Greenfield (1926-1995) was Professor of Semitic Philology at the Hebrew University.



*esis Apocryphon*, examining its traditions in light of the Qumran literature and other contemporary writings.<sup>191</sup>

One of the interesting features that have emerged from recent research is the number of underlying traditions shared by these pseudepigraphic works, chiefly *Jubilees*, the *Aramaic Levi Document* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*.<sup>192</sup>

Particular attention has been directed lately to the *Book of Jubilees*. The variety of connections it displays with the sectarian and pseudepigraphic texts from Qumran still awaits precise mapping and a systematic interpretation. An important step in this direction has been taken by Michael Segal. In a detailed analysis, referring to numerous sources, he argues that the book went through a revision, which adapted it to ideas similar to those of the Qumran community.<sup>193</sup> Cana Werman dates the composition of this work to the late- rather than mid-second century BCE, which is the time accepted by most scholars. From an analysis of *Jubilees* 23 she argues that the entire composition was composed in sectarian circles.<sup>194</sup>

<sup>191</sup> Cf. Esther Eshel, "The Imago Mundi of the Genesis Apocryphon," in Lynn LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber, eds., *Heavenly Tablets, Texte Imprimé: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism* (Leiden, 2007), 111-31; "The Dream Visions in the Noah Story of the *Genesis Apocryphon* and Related Texts," in Andreas Klostergaard et al., eds., *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 80; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 41-61; "The Proper Marriage according to the *Genesis Apocryphon* and Related Texts," *Meghillot* 8-9 (2010): 12-29 (Hebrew); "The *Genesis Apocryphon* and Other Related Aramaic Texts from Qumran: The Birth of Noah," in Berthelot and Stökl, *Aramaica Qumranica*, 271-95; "The *Genesis Apocryphon*: A Chain of Traditions," in Roitman, Schiffman and Zoref, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture*, 181-93. Esther Eshel (1958-) wrote a doctoral dissertation on *The Belief in Demons in the Land of Israel during the Second Temple Period* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1999) (Hebrew) under the supervision of Michael Stone. She contributes studies on the Qumran literature and various epigraphic documents. She teaches at Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan.

<sup>192</sup> Cf. e.g. Menahem Kister, "Some Aspects of Qumranic Halakha"; Esther Eshel, "The Imago Mundi of the Genesis Apocryphon"; "The Dream Visions in the Noah Story of the Genesis Apocryphon and Related Texts"; "The Noah Cycle in the Genesis Apocryphon," in Michael E. Stone, Aryeh Amihay, and Vered Hillel, eds., *Noah and His Book(s)* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), 77-95; Vered Hillel, "Demonstrable Instances of the Use of Sources in the Pseudepigrapha," in Hempel, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*, 325-37.

<sup>193</sup> Cf. Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (JSJSup 117; Leiden: Brill, 2007), based on his Ph.D. dissertation written under the supervision of Menahem Kister. Segal has contributed articles on various aspects of the rewritten Bible texts from Qumran. Michael Segal (1972-) is teaching Biblical Studies at the Hebrew University and since 2010 has served as the director of the Hebrew University Bible Project. See his chapter in this volume.

<sup>194</sup> See Werman, "The Book of Jubilees and the Qumran Community," *Meghillot* 2 (2004): 37-56 (Hebrew). See also her discussion in Cana Werman, "Jubilees in the Hellenistic Context," in LiDonnici and Lieber, *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism*, 133-58.

The special interest in *Jubilees* developed because of the many points of contact between this writing and the sectarian literature, but also due to its particular character as a work rewriting the biblical sources. Until recently, *Jubilees* was one of the few known ancient specimens of this literary type, but the publication of all the cave 4 manuscripts brought to light manifold similar texts, unknown before the Qumran finds. These rewritten Bible texts do not contain any of the idioms or specific ideological formulations of the sectarian literature composed by the Qumran community. But they do display many contacts with biblical interpretation known from contemporary Jewish literature beyond Qumran.<sup>195</sup>

The newly revealed aspects of the Qumran library by no means diminish the weight of the apocalyptic ideas embedded in the Qumran texts, especially in the sectarian literature and several Hebrew and Aramaic pseudepigrapha. Further research and new insights into various aspects of this literature demonstrate that much is still to be learnt about them. For example, Devorah Dimant has analyzed the particular concept of time underlying the Scrolls and the Apocalyptic literature.<sup>196</sup>

### *The Qumran Community and Its Writing: A Complex Picture*

The expansion of the number of Qumran works available for study and the rapid burgeoning of the related research deployed a vast array of inner connections as well as external junctures. One line of research undertaken by Israeli scholars broadens the approach to the sectarian writings by analysis of their underlying sources, especially those of the *Damascus Document* and the *War Scroll*.<sup>197</sup> Another line of research probes the links

<sup>195</sup> Cf. e.g. the illustrative survey of Ya'akov Kaduri (James Kugel), "The Qumran Scrolls and Biblical Interpretation," in Kister, *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*, 2:387-408 (Hebrew).

<sup>196</sup> Cf. Devorah Dimant, "The Peshar on the Periods (4Q180) and 4Q181," *IOS* 9 (1979): 77-102; "On Righteous and Sinners: 4Q181 Reconsidered," in C. Batsch and M. Vártejanu-Joubert, eds., *Manières de penser dans l'Antiquité méditerranéenne et orientale. Mélanges offerts à Francis Schmidt par ses élèves, ses collègues et ses amis* (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2009), 61-85 (showing that 4Q180 and 4Q181 are not two copies of one and the same work); "Resurrection, Restoration, and Time-Curtailling in Qumran, Early Judaism, and Christianity," *RevQ* 19 (2000): 527-48; "Time, Torah and Prophecy at Qumran," in Reiner Hirsch-Luipold, Herwig Görgemanns and Michael von Albrecht, eds., *Religiöse Philosophie und philosophische Religion der frühen Kaiserzeit* (STAC 51; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 147-98; "Exegesis and Time in the Pesharim from Qumran," *REJ* 168 (2009): 373-93. See also Cana Werman, *Apocalyptic Literature of the Second Temple Period* (Ministry of Defense, 2005) (Hebrew).

<sup>197</sup> For the *Damascus Document* see Menahem Kister, "The Development of the Early Recensions of the Damascus Document," *DSD* 14 (2007): 61-76; Liora Goldman, *Bible*

between non-sectarian texts, such as the pseudepigraphic texts, and non-Qumranic sources.<sup>198</sup> A third line of investigation inspects texts that display both sectarian elements and connections with non-Qumranic texts. This dual character is typical of several groups of texts found among the Scrolls: liturgical compositions,<sup>199</sup> pseudepigraphic writings,<sup>200</sup> and biblical interpretation attested by various scrolls<sup>201</sup> and, as shown above, by the Qumran halakhic documents.

The links between the Scrolls and early Christianity have furnished an important field of inquiry from the inception of Qumran research in Israel. Most of the pertinent points of contact have been noted by David Flusser. Kister has recently contributed additional observations. He stresses that Jesus sayings are better explained by the rabbinic literature than by the Qum-

---

*Interpretation and Pesher Exegesis in the Damascus Document* (Ph.D. diss.; Haifa: University of Haifa, 2007) (Hebrew); "A Comparison of the Genizah Manuscripts A and B of the *Damascus Document* in Light of Their *Pesher* Units," *Meghillot* 4 (2006): 169-89 (Hebrew). For the *War Scroll* see Esther and Hanan Eshel, "Recensions of the War Scroll"; Esther Eshel, "4Q471B: A Self-glorification Hymn"; Rony Yishai, *The Qumran Literature Related to the Eschatological War* (Ph.D. diss.; Haifa: University of Haifa, 2006) (Hebrew); "The Model for the Eschatological War Descriptions in the Qumran Literature"; "Prayers in Eschatological War Literature from Qumran."

<sup>198</sup> Note, e.g., *Pseudo-Ezekiel* and its connections to *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*. See Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*; "Resurrection, Restoration, and Time-Curtailing in Qumran, Early Judaism, and Christianity," *RevQ* 19 (2000): 527-48 (543).

<sup>199</sup> Cf. the surveys by Esther G. Chazon, "Prayers from Qumran and Their Historical Implications," *DSD* 1 (1994): 265-84; "Hymns and Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Flint and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*, 1:244-70. A specialist in prayers and liturgy at Qumran, Esther Chazon (1953-) wrote a Ph.D. dissertation on *A Liturgical Document from Qumran and Its Implications: 'Words of the Luminaries' (4QDib-Ham)* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1992) (Hebrew), supervised by Michael Stone. Since 1979 she has taught at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. On the debate on the origin and character of the Qumran liturgical compositions, see the chapter by Bilhah Nitzan in this volume.

<sup>200</sup> See, e.g., the case of the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*, analyzed by Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*, and the case of *Jubilees*, described by Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*. In general, Israeli scholars do not subscribe to the view that the Qumranites considered pseudepigraphic writings such as *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* to be authoritative, like the biblical books. For this view see the summary of James C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 190-93. This idea is based, among other things, on the notion that the *Jubilees* title is cited by the *Damascus Document* XVI, 3-4. For a critique of this idea see Devorah Dimant, "Two 'Scientific' Fictions: The So-called *Book of Noah* and the Alleged Quotation of *Jubilees* in CD 16: 3-4," in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*, eds. Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov and James C. VanderKam (VTSup 101; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 230-49; "What is the Book of the Divisions of Times?" in *Connected Vessels*, 97-109 (Hebrew).

<sup>201</sup> This fact has been noted in many Israeli studies, from the very first by Yadin and Licht. Cf. recently Kaduri, "The Qumran Scrolls and Biblical Interpretation."

ran Scrolls, whereas the Scrolls shed much light on John the Baptist and the Pauline letters. In Kister's opinion, this fact suggests that Jesus was close to the Pharisees.<sup>202</sup> Daniel Schwartz advances a different assessment of the data. In his opinion the affinity between the Scrolls and John the Baptist, Jesus teacher, suggests that Jesus too was familiar with the sectarian ideas of Qumran. Schwartz argues that the sectarian universalistic and spiritualized ideology corresponded to the Hellenistic character of Christianity, and therefore could be easily accommodated by the nascent religion.<sup>203</sup>

The complex character of the writings contained in the Qumran library is further revealed by various contacts displayed in the Scrolls with sources outside the immediate Jewish sphere. For instance, the Iranian influence on sectarian ideas and terminology has long been noted, especially by Shaul Shaked.<sup>204</sup> Yet many additional linguistic and literary contacts have been observed with Babylonian and Iranian literary sources, especially in the recently published Aramaic texts from Qumran.<sup>205</sup>

While the general picture of the Qumran community has changed dramatically from one of a secluded, isolated group to a central one, not all the riddles presented by the extraordinary collection of the Qumran documents are solved. A century-old puzzle relates to the *Damascus Document*. How such a sectarian work came into the hands of the medieval Jewish Karaite dissidents remains a mystery. This problem preoccupied the first scholars who dealt with the Genizah manuscripts of this text, such as Schechter and Ginzberg, but few pursued this research. One who did is the Israeli scholar Yoram Erder, who has contributed much to resolving this thorny question. In several articles and a monograph he has argued that sectarian ideas were known especially to the Jerusalem Karaite group, the Mourners of Zion.<sup>206</sup>

---

<sup>202</sup> Menahem Kister, "Texts from Qumran and Early Christianity," in Kister, *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*, 2:629-48 (Hebrew).

<sup>203</sup> Cf. Daniel R. Schwartz, "Qumran and Early Christianity," in Kister, *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*, 2:613-28 (628) (Hebrew).

<sup>204</sup> Cf. Saul Shaked, "Qumran and Iran: Further Considerations," *JOS* 2 (1972): 433-46; "Qumran: Some Iranian Connections," in Ziony Zevit, Seymour Gitin and Michael Sokoloff, eds., *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 277-81. See the latest survey by Albert de Jonge, "Iranian Connections in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Lim and Collins, *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 479-500.

<sup>205</sup> Cf., e.g., Dimant, "Apocalyptic Texts at Qumran"; Shaked, "Qumran: Some Iranian Connections"; Ben-Dov, "Dwg and Lunar Phases in Qumran Calendars: New Mesopotamian Evidence."

<sup>206</sup> Erder believes that the Karaites were familiar with the Qumran literature and the Apocryphal writings related to it. Cf. Yoram Erder, "When Was the First Contact between the Karaites and the Apocryphal Literature Related to the Dead Sea Scrolls?" *Cathedra* 42 (1987): 54-68 (56); *The Karaite Mourners of Zion and the Qumran Scrolls: On the History*

*Publication and Preservation of the Scrolls in Israel*

The plethora of new texts and the sweeping developments in Qumran research have prompted fresh editions in modern Hebrew. Numerous Israeli scholars have produced first editions, published in the DJD series and in many individual articles. In 1986 Bilhah Nitzan published in Hebrew a new edition of the cave 1 *Pesher of Habakkuk* (1QpHab), with a detailed commentary and introduction.<sup>207</sup> Elisha Qimron has undertaken a comprehensive re-edition of the entire Qumran collection. The first volume of the long documents was issued in 2010.<sup>208</sup>

As the country in which the Scrolls were found and are being preserved, Israel has a special role in maintaining them and providing research facilities for all scholars who wish to work on them. These functions are now the domain of the Israel Antiquities Authority (IAA), under whose aegis the Scrolls were housed first at the Rockefeller Archaeological Museum and now at the Israel Museum in Jerusalem. As noted, the IAA re-organized the Publication Project of the Dead Sea Scrolls and has supervised all procedures of their publication. The IAA is also responsible for keeping and preserving the Scrolls, and since 1991 has operated a long-term project of conservation to prevent their further deterioration. It has also constructed a climate-controlled storage facility to preserve the photographic negatives of the Scrolls, taken in the 1950s and 1960s. In an attempt to share the Dead Sea Scrolls with the public worldwide, the IAA has organized several international exhibitions of the Scrolls and is now engaged in a project to present an online digitalized version of the original negatives.

---

*of an Alternative to Rabbinic Judaism* (Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 2004) (Hebrew). However, Ben-Shammai expressed reservations in regards to Erder's conclusions and interpretation of the sources. Cf. Haggai Ben-Shammai, "Some Methodological Notes Concerning the Relationship Between the Karaites and Ancient Jewish Sects," *Cathedra* 42 (1987), 69-84 (Hebrew). Doubts about the influence of the pesher technique on the Karaites have been expressed by Meira Polliack. Cf. Meira Polliack, "On the Question of the Pesher's Influence on Karaite Exegesis," in Brin and Nitzan, *Fifty Years, 275-94* (Hebrew).

<sup>207</sup> Bilhah Nitzan, *Pesher Habakkuk: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (1QpHab) (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1986) (Hebrew). Bilhah Nitzan (1933-) was a student of Jacob Licht and has written widely on the *pesharim*, the Qumran liturgy and biblical interpretation at Qumran. She taught at Tel Aviv University.

<sup>208</sup> Cf. Elisha Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings*, volume 1 (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2010) (Hebrew). It contains the *Damascus Document* (Genizah manuscripts and Qumran copies), *Hodayot* (cave 1 and cave 4 copies), the *War Scroll* (cave 1 and cave 4 documents) the *Temple Scroll*, the *Rule Scroll* (1QS, 1QSa, 1QSB) and the *Pesher of Habakkuk*. In cases where there is more than one copy (the *Damascus Document*, *Hodayot* and the *War Rule*), Qimron proposes combined texts.

Also collaborating in this activity is the Shrine of the Book, now part of the Israel Museum. Built in 1965 to house the seven cave 1 scrolls in Israel's possession at the time, it now holds also the *Temple Scroll*, various artifacts from the Qumran site and other ancient objects. It organizes exhibitions and conferences of its own.<sup>209</sup>

The presence in Israel of the Scrolls, the new publications, and the initiation of a new generation of Qumran scholars have prompted the establishment in Israel of centers for Scrolls research and publication, and new publication enterprises. In 1995 the Orion Center, under the auspices of the Hebrew University, was founded by Michael Stone, who directed it until 1999.<sup>210</sup> This has been an important hub for Israeli as well as international Qumran studies. To date, the Center has hosted 13 international conferences, for ten of which volumes of *Proceedings* have appeared. The Orion Center also organizes various lecture series and grants fellowships. A particularly important feature of the Center's activity is an online updated bibliography of Qumran studies, two volumes of which also appear in print.<sup>211</sup>

Another center of activity related to the Qumran Scrolls is the Academy of Hebrew Language, based in Jerusalem. The Scroll readings are checked as part of the preparation of the primary sources for the Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language, and incorporated into the dictionary database,

---

<sup>209</sup> Magen Broshi (1929-) is an archaeologist and Qumran scholar. He has written on various aspects of the Qumran site and the Scrolls. Broshi was the first curator of the Shrine of the Book and served in this role from 1964 to 1994, when he was succeeded by Adolfo Roitman. Broshi, together with Emanuel Tov, was instrumental in submitting samples of the Scrolls to advanced radio-carbon tests in order to date them and other artifacts by objective scientific procedure. See the survey in Magen Broshi, "The Dead Sea Scrolls, the Sciences and New Technologies," *DSD* 11 (2004): 133-42. See also Israel Carmi, "Radio-carbon dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years*, 881-8. Some of Broshi's articles are assembled in the volume *Bread, Wine, Walls and Scrolls* (JSPSup 36; Sheffield: Academic Press, 2001). I thank Adolfo Roitman for providing me with the information pertinent to the Shrine of the Book.

<sup>210</sup> Esther Chazon served in this office from 1999 to 2005, and Steven Fassberg from 2006 to 2009. He was succeeded by the present director Menahem Kister. I thank Esther Chazon and Menahem Kister for providing me with the information about the Center.

<sup>211</sup> Avital Pinnick, *Orion Center Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls (1995-2000)* (STDJ 41; Leiden: Brill, 2001); Ruth Clements and Nadav Sharon, *The Orion Center Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature (2000-2006)* (STDJ 71; Leiden: Brill, 2007). See the Center's website <http://Orion.mscc.huji.ac.il> (visited June 21, 2011).

available online.<sup>212</sup> New results obtained by this process are often published in *Lešonenu*, the Academy's official journal.

Nevertheless, the absence of a regular publication in Hebrew devoted exclusively to the Dead Sea Scrolls and related literature prompted Moshe Bar-Asher and Devorah Dimant to establish in 2003 a new Hebrew annual, *Meghillot*, based at the University of Haifa. Nine volumes have appeared to date. Publication of this annual is undertaken by the well-established publishing house, the Bialik Institute. In this way, it maintains its tradition of bringing out books about the Scrolls, for this publisher issued the first works of Sukenik, Yadin and Licht.

In recent years, the Jerusalem Hebrew publisher Yad Ben-Zvi Press has also taken up publications in this domain. Among other works, it initiated the re-edition of all the Scrolls by Elisha Qimron, as well as the two-volume survey of the Qumran field edited by Menahem Kister.<sup>213</sup> The Dead Sea Scrolls are taught in the major universities in Israel, where a new generation of Qumran scholars is being trained.

In sum, in recent decades Israeli scholarship has closed the gap opened by the circumstances of the early phase of Qumran research. It can now boast of leading scholars in all aspects of Qumran research: texts, language, theology, archaeology, halakhah, and related Jewish literature. This remarkable growth is due partly to the training and preparation of younger scholars by their elders, and partly to the opening of the Qumran collection to the scholarly public. Another stimulus has been the appearance in recent decades of documents, chiefly of non-literary character, from various sites in the Judean Desert. Their discovery and study are owed mainly to Israeli scholars.<sup>214</sup> The most significant achievement of Israeli scholarship on the Qumran Scrolls is its major contribution to the new picture of the Qumran group and library as a central component for the understanding of Second Temple Judaism.

---

<sup>212</sup> On the dictionary website: <http://hebrew-treasures.huji.ac.il> (visited June 21, 2011). It is also available on compact disks. In 1988, a microfiche edition was produced of the sources used for the dictionary for the period 200 BCE to 300 CE. I thank the president of the Academy, Moshe Bar Asher, for providing me with this information.

<sup>213</sup> Cf. Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings*, vol. 1; Kister, *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*.

<sup>214</sup> See the list of documents found at various sites in the Judean Desert other than Qumran, compiled by Emanuel Tov, *The Texts from the Judaean Desert* (DJD XXXIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 90-114, as well as the chapter by Hanan Eshel in this volume.



# ISRAELI RESEARCH ON THE IDEOLOGY OF THE QUMRAN COMMUNITY

BILHAH NITZAN

## *Introduction*

The very first scrolls to be discovered, the *Community Rule* (1QS), the *Thanksgiving Scroll* (1QH<sup>a</sup>) and the *War Scroll* (1QM), proved heavily tinged with apocalyptic ideas. Sharing this outlook with the authors of similar non-Qumranic writings, such as the book of Daniel, *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, the community whose members wrote and owned these scrolls attempted to realize its implications in their everyday lives. The main principles of Qumranic apocalyptic ideology are laid down in the *Community Rule* (1QS III, 13-IV, 26), while its implications for various aspects of life are also expressed in numerous other scrolls. So, from the inception of Qumran research, scholars have studied the apocalyptic thinking of the Qumran community. This article surveys Israeli scholars' analyses of the various aspects of this doctrine.

One of the principal issues related to the apocalyptic doctrine of the Qumran community is its realization in its everyday life, and how this influenced its relations with other contemporary Jewish circles. A fundamental contribution to this research was made by Jacob Licht, who dealt first and foremost with the theoretical aspects of the doctrine.

Jacob Shalom Licht (1922-1993) began his research of the Dead Sea Scrolls by assisting Eliezer Sukenik and Nahman Avigad in publishing the scrolls from cave 1, held by the Hebrew University, shortly after their discovery.<sup>1</sup> In his own research of the Scrolls Licht edited, interpreted and published the texts of the *Thanksgiving Scroll* (1QH<sup>a</sup>)<sup>2</sup> and the *Rule Scroll*, which includes the *Community Rule* (1QS), the *Rule of the Congregation*

---

<sup>1</sup> Eliezer L. Sukenik, *Otzar ham-megillot hag-genuzot shebiydey ha-universitah ha-ivrit* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute and the Hebrew University, 1954), brought to completion by Nahman Avigad.

<sup>2</sup> Jacob Licht, *The Thanksgiving Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1957) (Hebrew).



(1QSa) and the *Rule of the Blessings* (1QSb).<sup>3</sup> The *Rule Scroll* outlines the apocalyptic doctrine and its practical implications. Licht analyzed this doctrine as part of his comprehensive overview of the Qumran ideology.

In his analysis of the *Treatise of the Maskil* (1QS III, 13-IV, 26), which details the basic apocalyptic concept of the community, Licht explains that it stems from its sense of struggle with the existence of evil. The existence of good and evil, represented by light and darkness, is determined by God, who planned and created the world, and is embodied in two groups of angels and of human beings (1QS III, 15-IV, 1). In humans this principle is manifested in traits peculiar to the righteous and wicked (1QS IV, 2-14). However, according to the principle of divine justice, each individual will be tried by God in the final judgment. The righteous will be rewarded, and the wicked punished, for their deeds (1QS IV, 6-8, 12-14). Until this final and decisive moment the two groups struggle endlessly throughout history for hegemony over the created world (1QS IV, 15-18). This dualistic struggle, which inflicts suffering on humanity, will end with the ultimate eschatological victory of the righteous over the wicked, and with the demise of evil and the final and complete annihilation of the evildoers (1QS IV, 18-26).<sup>4</sup> The members of the community believed themselves to belong to the camp of light and goodness, maintaining their righteousness by the correct practice of Torah precepts, the interpretation of which was revealed to them in their own times (1QS I, 1-9; VIII, 1-2, 12-16).<sup>5</sup> The Qumranites maintained that under the influence of the Sons of Darkness the people of Israel at large were living in error regarding the correct practice of the Torah's instructions. They hoped that in the final eschatological era the entire people of Israel would accept their way of practicing these rulings and thus would join the community of the righteous (1QSa; cf. 4QpNah 3 1-8).<sup>6</sup> The *War Scroll* (1QM I, 2) expresses the view that the wicked Israelites, who will join the camp of darkness, will be annihilated in the final eschatological war. In this redemptive era the division within Israel will disappear.

Studying these Qumran ideas in conjunction with the Jewish apocryphal and pseudepigraphic texts, especially regarding the concept of predeter-

---

<sup>3</sup> Jacob Licht, *The Rule Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea. 1QS. 1QSa. 1QSb* (Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 1965) (Hebrew).

<sup>4</sup> Licht, *The Rule Scroll*, 81-105.

<sup>5</sup> Licht, *The Rule Scroll*, 57-58, 176-7.

<sup>6</sup> Licht, *The Rule Scroll*, 241-70.

mined historical principles,<sup>7</sup> Licht defined the general outline of the sectaries' beliefs according to their three major aspects: determinism, periodization and teleology. In the determinist framework the sectaries viewed history as a continuous deterministic process, accompanied by an ongoing process of revelation of the proper interpretation of the law in the legal codes for each era (cf. 1QS VIII, 12-16; IX, 12-14, 19-23; X, 19). Periodization divides the predetermined historical process into many ages (1QpHab VII, 13-14), and thus is depicted also in many apocryphal apocalypses.<sup>8</sup> The teleological view holds that the destined purpose of the historical process is final eschatological salvation from the yoke of wickedness.<sup>9</sup>

The expression and application of these apocalyptic notions are apparent in several facets of Qumran sectarian thinking, as recorded in numerous scrolls: the determinist principle in the cosmological context, the impact of the determinist-dualist principle on the individual's emotions, the periodic activity during the historical process. The relation of apocalyptic theology to the Qumran wisdom literature, and to Qumran liturgy and halakhah, is significant. Israeli research in these aspects is surveyed next.

### *The Deterministic Principle in the Cosmological Context*

A hymn to the Creator found in the *Thanksgiving Scroll* IX[I] addresses this theme.<sup>10</sup> Its author meditates on God's implementation of his preordained plan for creation and its application to humanity. Licht shows how the overall determinist concept is apparent in the creative process, in which each cosmological body functions according to its fixed, predetermined natural law (1QH<sup>a</sup> IX, 11-15[I, 9-13]; 1QH<sup>a</sup> V, 24-27[XIII,7-10]).<sup>11</sup> He demonstrates that an analogous law applies to the history of humanity, similarly preordained by God. But special principles operate for the human sphere

<sup>7</sup> Jacob Licht, "Time and Eschatology in Apocalyptic Literature and in Qumran," *JJS* 16 (1965): 177-82; "The Theory of Periods of the Judean Desert Sect and of Other Calculations of Periods," *Erlsr* 8 (1967): 63-70 (Hebrew); "The Attitude to Past Events in the Bible and Apocalyptic Literature," *Tarbiz* 60 (1990): 1-18 (Hebrew).

<sup>8</sup> Licht, "The Attitude to Past Events," illustrates it by several references to apocalyptic works, e.g. *1 Enoch* 85-90; *2 Bar.* 56-68; *T. Levi* 16-17.

<sup>9</sup> Licht, "Time and Eschatology," 181; "The Theory of Periods," 66, 69.

<sup>10</sup> The numbers of 1QH<sup>a</sup> columns are referred to according to the recent edition of Carol Newsom, Hartmut Stegemann, and Eileen Schuller, *Qumran Cave 1.III: 1QHodayot<sup>a</sup>, with Incorporation of 4QHodayot<sup>a-f</sup> and 1QHodayot<sup>b</sup>* (DJD XL; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2008). Licht's numeration, following Sukenik's earlier edition, is indicated in square brackets.

<sup>11</sup> Licht, *The Thanksgiving Scroll*, 55 points to a similar idea in *1 Enoch* 41:5-9.

since human history is divided into a sequence of generations, each allotted a predetermined destiny.<sup>12</sup> This idea, Licht explains, is clearly expressed in the Qumranic poem of *Hodayot* (1QH<sup>a</sup> IX, 16-22 [I, 15-20]). Just as the laws of creation permanently ensure the existence of the physical world, so too the laws of creation for humanity, for they secure the permanent existence of all generations.<sup>13</sup>

*The Impact of the Determinist-Dualist Principle on the Individual's Emotions*

Licht shows how, according to the thinking of the *Thanksgiving Scroll*, the determinist-dualist worldview affects the individual's feelings. The author of this scroll, Licht explains, bemoans his suffering due to persecution by his wicked opponents (e.g. X, 22-39[II, 20-36]). He meditates on the nature of God's justice: God has preordained the existence of wickedness, and long refrains from punishment of the wicked for the injury they have inflicted on the righteous. The problem of the unjust suffering of the righteous already vexed the biblical authors, who strove to produce various explanations for it (e.g. Jer 12:1-2; Hab 1:13; Ps 73:2-12). Qumranic theology resolves the problem by its determinist outlook, expressed, as Licht shows, in two complementary ways. First, punishment for the evil inflicted by the wicked is predetermined and bears witness to divine glory and greatness as evinced in meting out justice (1QH<sup>a</sup> X, 25-26[II, 23-24]; VII, 32-34[XV, 19-21]).<sup>14</sup> Second, the duality of the righteous and the wicked, as well as their respective final reward and demise, are predetermined (1QH<sup>a</sup> VII 27-30[XV, 14-17]). Licht considers this view one of the harshest and most unforgiving features of the determinist-dualist outlook, since it unhesitatingly espouses the creation of the wicked for the purpose of their destruction. However, the evildoing justifies the elimination of the wicked as the determinist notion does not undo the principle of retribution.<sup>15</sup> But Licht points out that for those who endured affliction from the wicked in historical times punishment at the far-distant eschatological end is problematic, even though the delay in implementing justice is accepted.

<sup>12</sup> Licht, *The Thanksgiving Scroll*, 27-28, 55-59.

<sup>13</sup> For the development of this idea in other scrolls see Bilhah Nitzan, "The Idea of Creation and Its Implications in Qumran Literature," in Henning G. Reventlow and Yair Hoffman, eds., *Creation in Jewish and Christian Tradition* (JSOTSup 319; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 240-64.

<sup>14</sup> Licht, *The Thanksgiving Scroll*, 31, 69-70.

<sup>15</sup> Licht, *The Thanksgiving Scroll*, 195.

Nevertheless, the confidence of the author of the *Thanksgiving Scroll* in divine grace comforts him. As Licht asserts, suffer as he does from persecution by evil opponents, and from his own mortal and impure human state, the righteous one, through his determinist consciousness, can express his gratitude for the divine grace of being chosen for righteousness. He is thereby saved from becoming submerged in human evil. Licht considers this personal sentiment the major religious experience of the author of the scroll (e.g. XVIII, 5-9[X, 3-7]; XX, 27-34[XII, 24-31]). This religious experience of grace is linked to the author's sense of the destiny of the righteous through proper observance of the Law of Moses, and assures him of being saved at the final judgment.<sup>16</sup>

### *Periodic Activity During the Historical Process*

This subject is treated in numerous scrolls from various perspectives: the history of the past; the historical-eschatological periodization; the reality of the present; the messianic age.

Past history: The various doctrines of historicism are repeatedly analyzed in Licht's studies of biblical, apocryphal and Qumranic texts.<sup>17</sup> Comparing biblical and apocalyptic approaches to past events, Licht observes that whereas the Hebrew Bible views history deterministically in respect of the establishment and election of Israel, it is pragmatic and involves free will with regard to later historical events. Apocalyptic literature, by contrast, is for the most part determinist, discerning in the sequence of biblical events the gradual realization of a preordained divine plan. Licht stresses that this approach leads to a mechanistic understanding of the past, which affects predictions about the future.<sup>18</sup> Other scholars advance a similar understanding of the apocalyptic view.

Devorah Dimant (1939-), much of whose research concerns the relation of the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic books of the Second Temple period to the Qumran Scrolls, discerns the literary homogeneity expressed in the apocalypses of the complete preordained historical course, and their use of typological prefiguration. For instance, the evil of the Flood generation and

<sup>16</sup> Licht, *The Thanksgiving Scroll*, 39-40.

<sup>17</sup> Jacob Licht, "The Biblical Claim of Establishment," *Shnaton* 4 (1980), 98-128 (Hebrew); "Biblical Historicism," in Haim Tadmor and Moshe Weinfeld, eds., *History, Historiography and Interpretation* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1983), 107-20; "The Attitude to Past Events in the Bible and in Apocalyptic Literature," *Tarbiz* 60 (1990): 1-18 (Hebrew).

<sup>18</sup> Licht, "The Attitude to Past Events," 17-18.

its punishment became a symbol for the evil of humanity in all generations (CD II, 16-III, 12); Noah's righteousness and his rescue from the Flood prefigures the righteous of later periods whose survival is typified by that of Noah (CD II, 11-12), namely the Qumranites themselves.<sup>19</sup> In another article, re-editing 4Q462, Dimant shows how the author likens the Exodus story regarding the plague of darkness—when the Egyptians were in total darkness while the Israelites were not (Exod 10:21-23)—to his own evil times, in contrast to the awaited eschatological era of redemption.<sup>20</sup>

Regarding the attitude to history, Dimant explains the dilemma of Jewish authors after the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE. She shows that it is reflected in the answer Ezra receives to his questioning of the logic and justification of this destruction in the pseudepigraphic *4 Ezra*: "The creation cannot make more haste than the Creator" (5:44). Dimant notes that, despite its predetermined periodization, history is considered by *4 Ezra* a single organic entity, in which human deeds and their retribution are to be considered according to their teleological end within the historical sequence as a whole. By means of such a view, the author of this book strove to instill in individuals as well as the entire people the hope that justice would be done at the appointed time.<sup>21</sup>

The literary technique of prefiguration, according to which past events are understood to prefigure the predicted future, is discussed by Shemaryahu Talmon (1920-2010) as well. Talmon suggests that the *Damascus Document* (XX, 14) employs the biblical reference to the annihilation of "all the men of war" (Deut 2:14) to allude to the punishment awaiting the opponents of the sectarian leader, the Teacher of Righteousness. Talmon thinks that the title "the exiles of the wilderness" for the Sons of Light used by the *War Scroll* (1QM I, 2) as a similar analogy, namely the wandering of Israel in the desert, prefigures the hardship and isolation of the members of the Qumran community, while the Israelites' entrance into Canaan stands for the entrance of the Sons of Light into Jerusalem in the redemp-

<sup>19</sup> Devorah Dimant, "Election and Laws of History in the Apocalyptic Literature," in *Connected Vessels: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Literature of the Second Temple Period* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2010), 255-65 (1991) (Hebrew). Dimant notes that this idea appears already in the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (1 Enoch 91:11-17; 93:1-10), which compares the period of the Flood to the Eschatological era (257).

<sup>20</sup> Devorah Dimant, "Egypt and Jerusalem in Light of the Dualistic Doctrine at Qumran (4Q462)," in *Connected Vessels*, 177-207 (195-6) (Hebrew).

<sup>21</sup> Dimant, "Election and Laws of History," 263-5.

tive era (1QM I, 3).<sup>22</sup> Thus a prefigurative exegesis was used in the Qumran writings to prove the determinist concept.

Historical-eschatological periodization: The periodization of the history of Israel according to the preordained divine plan is presented in the Qumran Scrolls and the apocryphal writings by means of various calculations, and is discussed by several Israeli scholars. Dimant re-edited and partly reconstructed the *Peshar on the Periods* (4Q180), which presents a scheme of ten generations. She suggests that this calculation prefigured the first ten generations from Adam to Noah at the second stage of history.<sup>23</sup> In discussing the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* (4Q385a; 4Q387-4Q390), an apocalyptic text from Qumran that she edited, Dimant analyzes the computation of ten preordained historical jubilees introduced by this work. This chronology is well known from Daniel (9:24), where the 70 years of subjugation to Babylon, prophesied by Jeremiah as Israel's punishment, are presented as 70 weeks of years, amounting to a span of 490 years.<sup>24</sup> Dimant shows how the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* surveys Jewish history from biblical times to the author's day, probably in the second century BCE. The particularity of this work, writes Dimant, lies in the idea that in the final evil part of history, the evil "Angels of Mastemoth" will rule Israel and lead it to sin. In this context Dimant notes close similarities between the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*, the *Damascus Document* and the *Animal Apocalypse* (=1 Enoch 85-90).

Cana Werman (1957-) studied this text as well.<sup>25</sup> In her opinion, 4Q390 comes from a work different from that preserved in 4Q385a, 4Q387 and 4Q388a. She accordingly analyzes 4Q390 independently and argues that its detailed calculation of ten jubilees of years is an interpretation of the 70-year scheme in Daniel 9.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Shemaryahu Talmon, "Messianic Expectation at the End of the Era," in *King, Cult, and Calendar in Ancient Israel: Collected Studies* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1986), 202-24 (222-4).

<sup>23</sup> Devorah Dimant, "The Peshar on the Periods (4Q180) and 4Q181," *IOS* 9 (1970): 77-102; "On Righteous and Sinners: 4Q181 Reconsidered," in Christophe Batsch and Madalina Vártejanu-Joubert, eds., *Manières de penser dans l'Antiquité méditerranéenne et orientale. Mélanges offerts à Francis Schmidt par ses élèves, ses collègues et ses amis* (JSJSup 134; Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2009), 61-85. Dimant has demonstrated that contrary to the current view, 4Q180 and 4Q181 are not two copies of the same work.

<sup>24</sup> Devorah Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (DJD XXX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), 91-253.

<sup>25</sup> Cana Werman, "Epochs and End-time: The 490-year Scheme in Second Temple Literature," *DSD* 13 (2006): 229-55.

<sup>26</sup> See Dimant's criticism of Werman's analysis in Devorah Dimant, "Pseudo-Ezekiel and the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* in Perspective," *RevQ* 25 (2011): 18-39 (33-36).

Shemaryahu Talmon interprets another calculation of this period in respect of the history of the community that appears in the *Damascus Document*. Talmon's research in the Dead Sea Scrolls primarily clarifies their literary and ideological relation to the biblical books. In his essay on the subject<sup>27</sup> Talmon describes the Qumran covenanters' expectations of the messianic age as radical in Second Temple Judaism. This radical approach, he believes, is related to their determinist concept. The unrealized hopes for restoration of those who returned to Zion after Cyrus' declaration has revealed to the Qumranites that their period precedes the messianic age, one that will inaugurate the period of 390 years after the destruction of the First Temple (CD I, 5-6 interpreting Ezek 4:4-5). This number, according to Talmon, should be taken together with Daniel's vision (9:24) of 70 week-years (= 490 years). So according to this calculation the messianic salvation will be fulfilled 100 years after the first appearance and searching of the first Qumranite group, described in the *Damascus Document* (CD I, 9).<sup>28</sup>

The calculation of ten jubilees of years is likewise mentioned in the scroll of 11QMelchizedek, but there it is part of the description of the messianic age, discussed below.

David Flusser (1917-2000), one of the first Israeli scholars to study the Dead Sea Scrolls, addressed the historical-eschatological periodization from another angle. Flusser examined the Qumran ideology in terms of a wide range of religious, ideological and social circumstances that developed during the Second Temple period. An expert in the development of Christianity, Flusser inquired into the historical background that might have influenced the different directions taken by the two socio-religious entities, the Qumran community and ancient Christianity.

In 1964 Flusser probed the ideological outlook of the Qumran community in light of the publication of the sectarian scrolls from cave 1.<sup>29</sup> Since the Qumran apocalyptic doctrine is expressed in these sectarian scrolls from various aspects, Flusser assumed that the development of these ideas re-

<sup>27</sup> Shemaryahu Talmon, "Waiting for the Messiah – The Conceptual Universe of the Qumran Covenanters," *The World of Qumran from Within* (Jerusalem-Leiden: Magnes-Brill, 1989), 273-300. See also his "Messianic Expectation at the End of the Era," in which he surveys the messianic expectations of the Samaritans, the Qumran community and Early Christianity.

<sup>28</sup> Talmon, "Messianic Expectation at the End of the Era," 217-9; 222-4.

<sup>29</sup> David Flusser, "The Ideology of the Judean Desert Sect," *Zion* 19 (1964): 89-103 (Hebrew). Eng. trans. by Azzan Yadin, in David Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Its World view," *Judaism of the Second Temple Period: Volume 1: Qumran and Apocalypticism* (Grand Rapids-Cambridge-Jerusalem: Eerdmans-Magnes, 2007), 1-24.



flected the changing historical circumstances in the Second Temple period. Flusser held that the statement “You apportioned their service in all their generations” (1QH<sup>a</sup> IX, 18[I, 16]), and similar expressions, account for the sectarian vision of humanity’s historical development according to a preordained divine plan. Flusser saw the expression of this view in the *Community Rule*’s statement that every revelation “which has been concealed from Israel and is found by someone who has studied – he shall not conceal it from the council of the men of the community” (1QS VIII, 11-12). This viewpoint may be compared to Licht’s later formulation regarding the “continuous revelatory process of...the legal codes for each epoch” that characterized the community’s ideology.<sup>30</sup> Flusser further shows the connections between sectarian ideas and contemporary historical circumstances. He suggested that the *War Scroll*’s plan for an active eschatological war against Israel’s enemies was composed in the Hellenistic period,<sup>31</sup> but must have been amended after Rome expanded its domination eastwards, taking over lands ruled by Greece.<sup>32</sup>

Present reality: The apocalyptic outlook on present reality is expressed in the Qumran writings through the exegetical method of the *pesher*. This method, applied in particular to the biblical Prophetic books, rested on the belief that God’s plan for history was revealed to the biblical prophets, but its realization in its appointed determinist time was to be revealed to a chosen messenger of God in the final generation. In the Qumranite view such a messenger was the Teacher of Righteousness, “to whom God made known all the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets” (1QpHab VII, 1-5, interpreting Hab 2:2). This exegetical method was used by the *pesherim* authors to depict the political, social and religious circumstances of the Hasmonean period from the perspective of the Qumranic ideology. Flusser describes the Qumranites’ criticism of the Hasmonean rulers’ atti-

<sup>30</sup> See Licht, “The Theory of Periods,” 63-64.

<sup>31</sup> Flusser’s suggestion that the *War Scroll* was composed during the Hellenistic period was not accepted by Yadin, who dated the composition of 1QM to the Roman period, especially on account of its depiction of the system of Roman arms. However, in view of the subsequent publication of the cave 4 recensions of this work (4Q491-4Q496), which do not mention these arms, and the dating of its oldest version, 4Q493, to the first half of the first century BCE, Yadin’s position cannot be maintained. One may now suggest that the ancient recensions of the *War Scroll* were composed in the Hellenistic period, while the edition of 1QM was penned after the Roman occupation of Judea in 63 BCE. On the composite nature of 1QM see Philip R. Davies, “War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness,” in Schiffman and VanderKam, *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 965-8 (966).

<sup>32</sup> Flusser, “The Dead Sea Sect and Its World View,” 3-4, suggested that the *Pesher of Habakkuk* was written before the Roman occupation of Judea.



tude to Rome,<sup>33</sup> but states that this pacifist ideology did not prevent the author of the *Pesher of Habakkuk* from criticizing these rulers' greed and depredations: they were denounced just like the Romans (1QpHab VIII, 8-13; IX, 4-7; X, 1-5; XII, 7-10). Flusser argues for an anti-Roman and anti-imperialist attitude by the Qumran Essenes by pointing out its contrast to the Hasmonean idealization of the Romans in 1 Macc 8.<sup>34</sup>

The *peshtarim* have been a major theme in the research of Bilhah Nitzan (1933-; taught at Tel Aviv University). Her general research of the Dead Sea Scrolls has focused on the *peshtarim* genre, the liturgical texts and the ideological doctrine of the community. Following the approach of her mentor, Jacob Licht, Nitzan addresses the Scrolls' literary and ideological aspects. However, the *Pesher of Habakkuk* enjoys a special place in her publications. She re-edited it, and published the new edition together with a comprehensive introduction and commentary, summarizing the research in all its aspects.<sup>35</sup> In that volume she included an important chapter analyzing the exegetical method of the *peshtarim*.

Viewing the didactic and method of the *peshtarim* as a corollary of the community's apocalyptic doctrine (see 1QpHab II, 5-10; VII, 1-5), Nitzan observes that the author of the *Pesher of Habakkuk* reads the dualistic struggle between good and evil into his own times in Judea and the world at large. This is the perspective taken both to the community's polemics against its opponents over the correct practice of Torah precepts<sup>36</sup> and to the Qumranites' political and social stance against the Hasmonean rulers and the Roman menace. Members of the Qumran community believed that this dualist situation would end only in the final eschatological era with the annihilation of all the wicked in Judea and the world (XII, 10-XIII, 4).

<sup>33</sup> David Flusser, "The Roman Kingdom in the Eyes of the Hasmonean Dynasty and from an Essene Perspective," *Zion* 48 (1983): 149-76 (Hebrew); Eng. trans. by Azzan Yadin, "The Roman Empire in Hasmonean and Essene Eyes," in *Qumran and Apocalypticism*, 175-206.

<sup>34</sup> From a wider perspective on the history of the Second Temple period, Flusser claims that the conquests and rule of the western peoples—Hellenistic and Roman—over the eastern countries was one of the factors that reinforced the apocalyptic doctrine of historical determinism held by the occupied eastern nations, among them Israel. See David Flusser, "The Four Empires in the Fourth Sibyl and in the Book of Daniel," *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988), 317-44.

<sup>35</sup> Bilhah Nitzan, *Pesher Habakkuk: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea (1QpHab)* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1986) (Hebrew).

<sup>36</sup> This theme is reflected in the self-identification of the Qumran community as the "new covenant." See Bilhah Nitzan, "The Concept of Covenant in Qumran Literature," in David M. Goodblatt, Avital Pinnick and Daniel R. Schwartz, eds., *Historical Perspectives from the Hasmoneans to Bar-Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 37; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 85-104.

The messianic age: The messianic age and its character occupied the thoughts of various Jewish circles in the Second Temple period. The central messianic idea of the Qumran community was, according to Flusser, the restoration of the messianic leadership of the First Temple period through three different messianic figures: a prophet, a priest, and a king (see 1QS IX, 11).<sup>37</sup> Interpreting 1 Macc 14:41, Flusser concludes that from the rule of Simeon (142-135 BCE) the Hasmoneans favored the combination of all three functions in a single personality, claiming that John Hyrcanus personified all of them (Josephus, *J. W.* 1.68; *Ant.* 13.209; *y. Soṭa* 9.13; *b. Soṭa* 33a; *t. Soṭa* 13.5 and *Cant. Rab.* 8.11). Flusser further argues that this view was intended to impart legitimacy to the Hasmonean rule. He points out that the three functions were also attributed to the messianic personality of Jesus (Matt 12: 6, 41-42).<sup>38</sup>

In Flusser's opinion, the supernatural messianic figure of Melchizedek, as he appears in the *Pesher Melchizedek* (11QMelch), probably originated in the non-human messianic vision of Dan 7:13, and later became important in Christian theology.<sup>39</sup> Flusser suggests that even though the figure of Melchizedek appears only in the above *pesher*, his appearance as supernatural figure in other apocalyptic texts (2 *Enoch*) may hint at his well-developed character already in the Second Temple period.<sup>40</sup> A supernatural, heavenly figure is hinted at in another Qumranic poem, the so-called "Hymn of Self-Glorification" (cf. 4Q427 7 i 5-13a; 4Q471b 1a-b; 4Q491 11 i 12-18).

---

<sup>37</sup> David Flusser, "The Essene Community and Its Ideology," *Qadmoniyot* 30 (1998): 94-96 (Hebrew; Eng. trans. by Azzan Yadin, "The Essene World View," in *Qumran and Apocalypticism*, 25-31); see also Jacob Liver, "The Teaching of the Two Messiahs in the Sectarian Literature in the Second Temple Period," in *Studies in Bible and Judean Desert Scrolls* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1972), 155-85 (Hebrew).

<sup>38</sup> See Flusser, "The Essene Community and Its Ideology," 95. Flusser discussed at length the issue of the messianic attributes of Jesus in his "The Reflection of Jewish Messianic Concepts in Early Christianity" in Zvi Baras, ed., *Messianism and Eschatology* (Jerusalem: Shazar Center, 1983), 103-34 (116-20) (Hebrew).

<sup>39</sup> David Flusser, "Melchizedek and the Son of Man," in *Jewish Sources in Early Christianity* (Tel Aviv: Syfriat Ha-Poalim, 1979), 275-82 (Hebrew); "The Essene Community and Its Ideology," 96.

<sup>40</sup> Flusser, "The Reflection of Jewish Messianic Concepts in Early Christianity," 106-13. Flusser deals with the supernatural messiah in 1 *Enoch* 46; 4 *Ezra* 13 and the *Testament of Abraham* 12-13, arguing that in these Jewish apocalyptic writings the description of this figure reflects its origins prior to the Christian messianic ideology.

*Apocalyptic Theology and Qumran Wisdom Literature*

The determinist division of humanity into good and bad is expressed in the sectarian wisdom writings by the distinction between knowledge and folly. Bilhah Nitzan analyzed this notion as expounded in the wisdom work *Mysteries* (4Q299-4Q300-4Q301[?]).<sup>41</sup> The knowledge imparted by God to the righteous is defined in this work as “the root of wisdom” (שורש חכמה - 4Q300 1 ii 3), in contrast to the knowledge of the wicked, defined as “disappearing wisdom” (חכמה נכחדת - 4Q300 1 ii 4) or “the wisdom of evil cunning” (חוכמת עורמת רוע) (4Q299 3 ii 5). In this work (4Q300 3 2; and 4Q303 lines 1-2) and in another text, titled *The Words of the Maskil to All Sons of the Dawn* (4Q298 3-4 ii 2-10<sup>42</sup>), it is the righteous who receive divine revelation of the preordained historical sequence since their correct way of life will save them from punishment. By contrast, the wicked “did not know what shall befall them, and they did not save their lives from the mystery of that which was coming into being” (1Q27 1 i 3-4; 4Q299 1 03-04; 4Q300 3 3-4). This view agrees with the periodic aspect of God’s predetermined historical plan which preordains the activity of each generation.<sup>43</sup>

Menachem Kister (1957-), whose contribution to Qumran research is characterized by a wide knowledge of the Scrolls’ historical and theological background, including rabbinic literature, discusses the opposition in 4Q392 of good and evil as expressed in the distinction between light and darkness.<sup>44</sup> This text treats light and darkness as symbols of the different divine and human realms, but not as representations of good and evil, as does the *Community Rule* (1QS III,17-IV, 1). 4Q392 states that God created light and darkness, but the divine light itself “is the most perfect light, and all darkness rests in his presence” (4Q392 1 5)—that is, there is no darkness in his presence but only light (cf. Ps 139:12; Job 28:3). Kister thereby explains that the distinction between light and darkness governed by the luminaries was created for the sake of human beings (4Q392 1 6). Analyzing the meaning of the term “perfect light” (אורתום) in the Qumranic texts,

<sup>41</sup> Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, in Torleif Elgvin et al., in consultation with Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Qumran Cave 4.XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1* (DJD XX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 35-116. It is discussed by Nitzan, “The Idea of Creation,” 250-56.

<sup>42</sup> The text is edited by Stephen J. Pfann and Menachem Kister, DJD XX, 1-30.

<sup>43</sup> See Bilhah Nitzan, “Apocalyptic Historiography in Qumran Literature: Its Origins and Perspectives in the Legacy of Jacob Licht,” in Gershon Brin and Bilhah Nitzan, eds., *Fifty Years of Dead Sea Scrolls Research* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2001), 37-56 (Hebrew).

<sup>44</sup> Menachem Kister, “4Q392 1 and the Conception of Light in Qumran ‘Dualism,’” *Megillot* 3 (2005): 125-42 (Hebrew).

Kister concludes that it designates the perfect knowledge of God (4Q403 1 i 45; 4Q404 5 4), unobtainable by men. Yet he notes that *Hodayot* states that the “light of knowledge” will be revealed to the righteous in the eschatological era (1QH<sup>a</sup> XXI, 13-16[XVIII, 28-30]), and compares this idea with *1 Enoch* 58:1-6 and *2 Enoch* 65:8-10. Kister deduces that light symbolizes the absence of evil. So light and darkness created for human beings do not just serve for the physical distinction between different times, but also stand for the dualist distinction between good and evil.

### *Liturgical Expressions of the Apocalyptic Theology*

Bilhah Nitzan conducted a comprehensive survey of the Qumran community’s liturgical practices. Among other things she shows how the apocalyptic theology espoused by the Qumran community is also expressed in the recitations of its ceremonies.<sup>45</sup>

Nitzan follows Licht’s analysis indicating that the annual covenantal ceremony described in the *Community Rule* (1QS I, 16-II, 25) was intended to express the members’ commitment to observe its rules, but also to present the dualist distinction between community, as the lot of God, and its wicked opponents, as the lot of Belial.<sup>46</sup> Nitzan expanded this dualist notion by examining the distinction between the blessed and the cursed ones in the covenantal ceremony in 4QBerakhot,<sup>47</sup> in the anti-demonic ceremony (4Q511 52-59) and in the ceremony to be held during the eschatological war set forth in the *War Scroll* (1QM XIII, 2-6).<sup>48</sup> Yet this dualist distinction is absent from the eschatological ceremonies in the *Rule of the Blessings* (1Qsb = 1Q28b) and in 4QSefer ha-Milhamah (4Q285 8 = 11Q14), where only a blessing for all Israel after the victory over the wicked nations is recorded.<sup>49</sup>

Nitzan also surveyed the presentation of the demonic powers in dualist terms, as they feature in the *Apocryphal Psalms* (11Q11 IV, 7-9; V, 7-9; see

<sup>45</sup> Bilhah Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (trans. Jonathan Chipman; STDJ 12; Leiden; Brill, 1994), 119-54.

<sup>46</sup> Licht, *The Rules Scroll*, 54.

<sup>47</sup> Besides humans, the dualist distinction also involves the angelic hosts against Belial’s hosts, presented in 4Q286 7ii (= 4Q287 6) and 4Q280. A dualist distinction made by a priest is present in the covenantal ceremony of 4Q266 11 as well. See Bilhah Nitzan, “Blessing and Curses,” in Schiffman and VanderKam, *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:95-100.

<sup>48</sup> Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 135-9.

<sup>49</sup> Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 156-70.

*Jub.* 10:10). The determinist perspective is also put forward in the magical hymns of 4Q510-4Q511, in which the demons' activity is considered as taking place only in the present rule of wickedness (4Q510 1 6-7 = 4Q511 10 3-5). This temporary status also applies to the activity of the Qumranic sage, who knows that the final annihilation of the demons is preordained for the final day of judgment (see 4Q511 1; 35 1-2; 37; 52-59 iii 4-5); hence, his magic strength acts against the demons only in the time of evil dominion (4Q510 1 6-8; 4Q511 10 3-6; 4Q511 8 4-5; 35 6-8), threatening them with their final annihilation in the future.<sup>50</sup>

Menahem Kister also addresses the Qumranites' view of the demonic realm.<sup>51</sup> He discusses the statement in the *Damascus Document* (XVI, 4-6) that on the day that a person takes an oath to return wholeheartedly to the Torah of Moses, the archdemon Mastema will cease troubling him. The *Damascus Document* notes that this is why "Abraham was circumcised on the day of his knowing." Kister links the idea that Abraham's covenantal circumcision protects the Israelites from annihilation through sin caused by Belial with *Jub.* 15:25-32. According to that passage, due to the covenant between God and Israel the latter is ruled by God alone, not by an angel or a spirit.<sup>52</sup> Kister remarks that the sectaries' covenantal ceremony in the *Community Rule* (1QS I, 7-9) also refers to the biblical covenant of Abraham by applying its formulation in Gen 17:1.

### *Apocalyptic Theology and Qumran Halakhah*

In a long analysis of the so-called *Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah* (4QMMT) Kister discusses its dualist aspects.<sup>53</sup> The author of this text, written as a letter to a Hasmonean leader, tries to persuade him to instate in Israel the correct practice of the Law of Moses so as to ensure their salvation (C 13-22; cf. *Jub.* 1:15, 23-24). The letter explains this request by stating, "This is the End of Days when they will return in Israel to the I[aw]" (C 21-22). Kister notes that the context of 4QMMT makes it clear that by the term "End of Days" the author refers to his own time. This accords with the community's view that its own generation is the last (1QpHab II, 7; VII,

<sup>50</sup> See Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 244-52.

<sup>51</sup> Menahem Kister, "Demons, Theology and Abraham's Covenant (CD XVI, 4-6 and Related Texts)," in Kugler and Schuller, *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty*, 167-84.

<sup>52</sup> Similarly the *War Scroll* (1QM XIV, 8-10).

<sup>53</sup> Menahem Kister, "Studies in *4QMiqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah* and Related Texts: Law, Theology, Language and Calendar," *Tarbiz* 68 (1999): 317-71 (Hebrew).

2, 12; 1QS IV, 17; CD I, 12; see *1 Enoch* 93:10). Thus, Kister notes, the letter to the Hasmonean leader requests him to accept the author's practices "for your own welfare and for the welfare of Israel" (C 28-32).

Cana Werman, whose analysis of the *Book of Jubilees* occupies an important place in her research, addresses the apocalyptic aspect of this writing. She discusses the problem by analyzing the terms תורה ("Torah") and תעודה ("testimony") found in *Jubilees* 1, their literary and ideological meaning, and their usage in the Qumran scrolls.<sup>54</sup> Both terms are also found in Hebrew copies of *Jubilees* from Qumran: "God revealed to Moses both what (was) in the beginning and what will occur (in the future), the account of the division of all of the days of the *torah* and the *te'udab*." Werman explains that the phrase "*torah* and *te'udab*" in *Jub.* 1:4 (= 4Q216 1 10-12) refers to God's predetermined plan regarding history and the law for the determinist periodic division of history. According to *Jub.* 1:8-14 (= 4Q216 II, 4-17), revelation of the plan of history and the law to Moses in Sinai was intended as testimony that the interpretation of the law thus imparted was predetermined, even though Israel, according to Deut 31:19-21, will forget it in the future.<sup>55</sup> The *Damascus Document* (CD III, 12-16), observes Werman, also alludes to this idea; it refers to hidden things revealed to the sectaries but not to Israel at large.

### Conclusion

The work of the Israeli scholars surveyed above has shown that the ideological framework of the Qumran community was not confined to the theoretical level, but affected all aspects of the life, practices and historical circumstances of the Qumran community. Publication of the sectarian and apocryphal works found among the Scrolls has cast fresh light on the close link between theory and practice among the Qumranites, and the detailed studies published by Israeli scholars have helped to uncover it and to place this aspect in the context of Second Temple Judaism.

<sup>54</sup> Cana Werman, "The '*Torah*' and the '*Te'udab*' on the Tablets," *Tarbiz* 68 (1999): 473-92 (Hebrew); "The '*Torah*' and the '*Te'udab*' Engraved on the Tablets," *DSD* 9 (2002): 75-103.

<sup>55</sup> In the Qumran literature, the term *te'udab* is derived from the root יעד in the sense of "destiny," namely something that was destined to exist according to God's decree (e.g. 4Q402 4 12-15; 4Q298 3-4 ii 4-10). See Licht, *The Rules Scroll*, 60-61; Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS 29; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 115; Menahem Kister, "Commentary to 4Q298," *JQR* 85 (1994): 244; Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 215-17.



# ISRAELI SCHOLARSHIP ON THE BIBLICAL TEXTS FROM THE JUDEAN DESERT

EMANUEL TOV

## *Beginnings*

This survey covers the contributions by Israeli scholars to the scholarly investigation of the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek biblical fragments found at Qumran and other sites in the Judean Desert.<sup>1</sup> For this purpose, the term “Bible” includes the traditional books of Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Scriptures, excluding the so-called Apocrypha.

The first scrolls, biblical and non-biblical, were found in 1947, at a decisive moment in history, the time of the birth of the State of Israel. As Eliezer Sukenik would assert,<sup>2</sup> they were part of the “Jewish heritage,” “which at this moment could hardly be compartmentalized from an awareness of contemporary events.”<sup>3</sup> Indeed, the Scrolls inspired Israelis to delve more deeply into the period they covered. The interests were scholarly and probably also somewhat nationalistic for some,<sup>4</sup> but this did not distort their scholarly objectivity. On the other hand, Christian terminology and views colored the first two decades of Scrolls research on the non-biblical texts in non-Jewish circles.<sup>5</sup>

The first three scrolls to reach the hands of scholars were bought by Sukenik on behalf of the Hebrew University in 1947-1948. Four additional scrolls were purchased in 1954 on behalf of the State of Israel, and were ex-

---

<sup>1</sup> For an earlier and far less detailed study, see my “Israeli Scholarship on the Texts from the Judean Desert,” in Kugler and Schuller, *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty*, 123-7. See also Magen Broshi, “Fifty Years of Dead Sea Scrolls Research in Israel,” *SJ* 8 (1999): 83-90.

<sup>2</sup> Sukenik’s words are reported by John C. Trever, *The Dead Sea Scrolls—A Personal Account* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 125.

<sup>3</sup> George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Currents in Qumran Scholarship: The Interplay of Data, Agendas, and Methodology,” in Kugler and Schuller, *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty*, 89.

<sup>4</sup> In the preface to his book *The Message of the Scrolls* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1957), 14, Yigael Yadin states: “I cannot avoid the feeling that there is something symbolic in the discovery of the scrolls and their acquisition at the moment of the creation of the State of Israel ... These facts may have influenced my approach to the scrolls.”

<sup>5</sup> See Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia/Jerusalem: Jewish Publication Society: 1994), xxi-xxiv, 16-19.



hibited between 1957 and 1965 at the Hebrew University and thereafter in the Shrine of the Book at the Israel Museum.<sup>6</sup> Feelings of pride in these scrolls in Israel were mixed for two reasons: (1) from an Israeli and Jewish standpoint the Jewish Scrolls had been “hijacked” by Gentiles: from the beginning of the research until the mid-1980s Jews (including Israelis) were banned from the official publication team that operated in and from east Jerusalem (part of Jordan until 1967) working on the Scroll fragments in the Palestine Archaeological (“Rockefeller”) Museum; (2) in its reflections on the text of Hebrew Scripture, organized religious Judaism, as opposed to individual religious scholars, did not see beyond the manuscripts of the Masoretic Text penned in the Middle Ages. Ancient scrolls of the Bible were disregarded, certainly when they differed from the Masoretic Text, but even when they were identical to its consonantal framework. In a way, the texts of the Scrolls from sites other than Qumran (such as Masada) from the first centuries CE could have been used to “prove” the early origin of the Masoretic Text, but organized religious circles have never pursued this, as far as I know. The traditionally transmitted text was assumed to reflect the original text of Hebrew Scripture even before the period of the Judean Desert Scrolls, although it included the vowels and accents attached to it only in the 9<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> centuries CE. Jewish tradition perceived these later layers of exegesis as having divine origin, just like the consonantal text.

Generalizing, I would say that Israeli Scrolls scholarship is sober, objective, and text-based, as opposed to tending to theologize. Israeli scholars have written important studies on individual scrolls, on philological, linguistic and exegetical aspects, and on textual theory in general. It remains an open question as to whether the ability of Israelis, or Jews in general, to read the script of the Scrolls has facilitated or encouraged more scholarly involvement by them than by Gentiles. However, not all the Scrolls can be read with the same ease as the *Great Isaiah Scroll* (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>), and while at the student level skills vary, at the scholarly level Jewish and non-Jewish specialists hardly differ in ability.

Israeli archaeologists played no part in the excavations in the 1940s and 1950s at Qumran and its surroundings, but in later years they found numerous biblical fragments at Masada and Naḥal Ḥever. These excavations broadened the involvement of the local scholarly community. However, Israeli excavations at Qumran and other sites in the 1990s and early 2000s did not yield any biblical material.

---

<sup>6</sup> I am grateful to Adolfo Roitman, Director of the Shrine of the Book, for providing me with the exact dates.

Since 1948 a relatively large number of studies have been published in Hebrew (for details, see notes 7 and 8). Such studies written between 1948 and 1964 are covered by Yizhar's bibliography.<sup>7</sup> Subsequent Hebrew scholarship is covered by the bibliography of García Martínez and Parry<sup>8</sup> and the ongoing bibliographical surveys by the Orion Center in the *Revue de Qumran* and on the website of that center (since 1995).<sup>9</sup>

### *Critical Editions of the Scrolls*

One of the claims to fame of Israeli scholarship is the role played by Eliezer Lipa Sukenik (1889-1953)<sup>10</sup> and his son Yigael Yadin (1917-1984). Sukenik, who was the first to recognize the ancient character and importance of the Scrolls, produced the first pioneering editions and also wrote some initial studies. At amazing speed, never matched by any subsequent edition, he published a "First Survey" of the known scrolls in September 1948, certainly a great achievement in the pre-computer era and during the siege of Jerusalem in the War of Independence. The first publication<sup>11</sup> contained a comparison of these scrolls with the script of the Nash Papyrus and the Uziahu inscription, and it further presented selections from the scrolls from cave 1. The "Second Survey," published in 1950, improved on the first.<sup>12</sup> His facsimile edition of the photographs of the major texts from cave 1 from 1954 contains an improved version of that survey, with additional transcriptions of texts and more introductory analyses.<sup>13</sup> These books are now collectors' items. Especially valuable are the photographs, which include the only published photographs to date of the *War Scroll* (1QMilhamah), and those of 1QHodayot and 1QIsa<sup>b</sup>, fully published only in 2009 and

<sup>7</sup> Michael Yizhar, *Bibliography of Hebrew Publications on the Dead Sea Scrolls 1948-1964* (HTS 23; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967).

<sup>8</sup> Florentino García Martínez and Donald W. Parry, *A Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1970-95* (STDJ 19; Leiden: Brill, 1996).

<sup>9</sup> <http://orion.mscc.huji.ac.il/>.

<sup>10</sup> See Neil A. Silberman, "Sukenik," in Schiffman and VanderKam, *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:902-3.

<sup>11</sup> *Megillot Genuzot: Scrolls that Were Stored Away from an Ancient Genizah Found in the Judean Desert, First Survey* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1948) (Hebrew).

<sup>12</sup> *Megillot Genuzot: Scrolls that Were Stored Away from an Ancient Genizah Found in the Judean Desert, Second Survey* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1950) (Hebrew).

<sup>13</sup> Eliezer L. Sukenik, *Otzar ham-megillot hag-genuzot shebiydey ha-universitah ha-ivrit* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute and the Hebrew University, 1954), brought to completion by Nahman Avigad.

2010.<sup>14</sup> Neither the plates nor the transcriptions in Sukenik's editions are of high quality, but they are usable and their condition has not prevented scholarship on these texts from flourishing. The system of text transcription to be used later in the series Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (DJD) had not yet been developed, and these editions are greatly substandard by comparison. The system for presenting the text lacks many details and is quite crude; apparatuses such as notes on readings and comparisons with other texts are non-existent.

It was Sukenik who first called these scrolls *megillot genuzot*, a term still commonly used in Israel today.<sup>15</sup> For many this is the official name of the Scrolls, in reference to scrolls placed in a *genizah* upon falling into disuse because of physical damage or when an unacceptable number of mistakes has been recognized. Sukenik suggested this term in 1948 and justified it with arguments that some scrolls such as 1QIsa<sup>b</sup> were torn, and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> had been handled so much that the last sheet needed re-inking.<sup>16</sup> However, most scholars have long abandoned this term, and with it the understanding that the caves were ancient *genizot*. Still, it lingers on in the perception of the Israeli public, even if the implications of this nomenclature are not generally recognized.

Because Israeli scholars were at first banned from the publication effort, full text editions of biblical scrolls by Israelis were published at a relatively late stage. The first edition, still substandard, was that by Baruch Lifshitz of some fragments of the Greek *Minor Prophets Scroll* found in Naḥal Hever (1962).<sup>17</sup> Subsequent publications were the developed text editions (with commentaries) by Yigael Yadin, of the *tefillin*<sup>18</sup> and fragments of the large *Psalms Scroll* from Qumran cave 11;<sup>19</sup> by Tov, of the Greek *Minor Prophets*

---

<sup>14</sup> Improved photographs of 1QIsa<sup>b</sup> are included in Eugene Ulrich and Peter W. Flint, *Qumran Cave 1.II: The Isaiah Scrolls* (DJD XXXII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2010), and of 1QH<sup>a</sup> in Carol Newsom, Hartmut Stegemann, and Eileen M. Schuller, *Qumran Cave 1.III: 1QHodayot<sup>a</sup>, with Incorporation of 1QHodayot<sup>b</sup> and 4QHodayot<sup>c-f</sup>* (DJD XL; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009).

<sup>15</sup> See the names of the publications quoted in notes 11-12. See also Sukenik's diary as published by Yigael Yadin, "A Biography of E. L. Sukenik," *ErIsr* 8 (1967): 60-85 (Hebrew).

<sup>16</sup> Sukenik, *Megillot Genuzot* (1948), 20-21.

<sup>17</sup> This scroll, at first designated as deriving from Wadi Seiyal in Jordanian territory, was subsequently identified as deriving from Naḥal Hever since little scraps of it were found there in the "Cave of Horror." These fragments were published by Baruch Lifshitz, "The Greek Documents from the Cave of Horror," *IEJ* 12 (1962): 201-7.

<sup>18</sup> Yigael Yadin, *Tefillin from Qumran (X Q Phyl 1-4)* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 1969) = *ErIsr* 9 (1969): 60-85 (Hebrew).

<sup>19</sup> Yigael Yadin, "Another Fragment (E) of the Psalms Scroll from Qumran Cave 11," *Textus* 5 (1966): 1-10.

*Scroll* from Naḥal Hever (8HevXIgr),<sup>20</sup> as well as Hebrew fragments of Leviticus, Joshua, Jeremiah, and Canticles, all published in DJD;<sup>21</sup> by Talmon, of the Masada texts;<sup>22</sup> by Morgenstern-Segal, of a phylactery;<sup>23</sup> by Morgenstern, of 34SeNumbers;<sup>24</sup> miscellaneous fragments by Baruchi;<sup>25</sup> and hitherto unknown fragments by Esther and Hanan Eshel.<sup>26</sup> Emanuel Tov was editor-in-chief of the international Qumran publication project (1990-2009), which produced the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (DJD) series. The introductory volume to that series provides the pertinent information on all the Scrolls, including the biblical scrolls.<sup>27</sup>

*Integration of the Biblical Scrolls in Philological Commentaries  
and Scripture Editions*

The philological approach to Hebrew Scripture involves a meticulous review of all the details in the ancient witnesses to detect in them ancient readings (variants) differing from the Masoretic Text. These variants are

<sup>20</sup> Emanuel Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Hever (8HevXIgr) (The Seiyal Collection I)* (DJD VIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).

<sup>21</sup> Emanuel Tov, "4QLex<sup>c,d,e</sup>," in Eugene Ulrich and Frank M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII: Genesis to Numbers* (DJD XII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 189-204; "4QJosh<sup>b</sup>," in Eugene Ulrich and Frank M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (DJD XIV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 151-8; "4QJer<sup>a,c,d,e</sup>," in Eugene Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4. X: The Prophets* (DJD XV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 145-205; "4QCant<sup>a-c</sup>," in Eugene Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4. XI: Psalms to Chronicles* (DJD XVI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 195-219.

<sup>22</sup> Shemaryahu Talmon in Shemaryahu Talmon and Yigael Yadin, *Masada VI: The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965, Final Reports: Hebrew Fragments from Masada* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1999), 1-149.

<sup>23</sup> Matthew Morgenstern and Michael Segal, "XHev/SePhylactery" in Hannah Cotton et al., in consultation with James VanderKam and Monica Brady, *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert* (DJD XXXVIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 183-91.

<sup>24</sup> Matthew Morgenstern in Cotton, *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert*, 209.

<sup>25</sup> Yosi Baruchi, "Fragmentary Biblical Scrolls from Bar Kochba Revolt Refuge Caves," *Meghillor* 3 (2005): 177-90 (Hebrew).

<sup>26</sup> Hanan Eshel, "A Second Fragment of XJudges," *JJS* 54 (2003): 139-41; Esther and Hanan Eshel, "New Fragments from Qumran: 4QGen<sup>f</sup>, 4QIsa<sup>b</sup>, 4Q226, 8QGen, and XQpapEnoch," *DSD* 12 (2005): 134-57; Hanan Eshel, Yosi Baruchi, and Roi Porat, "Fragments of a Leviticus Scroll (ArugLev) Found in the Judean Desert in 2004," *DSD* 13 (2006): 55-60.

<sup>27</sup> Emanuel Tov, ed., *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (DJD XXXIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002). See further Emanuel Tov, "Some Academic Memoirs," in Nora David and Armin Lange, eds., *Qumran and the Bible: Studying the Jewish and Christian Scriptures in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (CBET 57; Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 1-28; "Some Thoughts at the Close of the DJD Publication Project," forthcoming.

compared with parallel readings in the Masoretic Text, and are often preferred. This procedure was practiced long before the discovery of the Scrolls, for example, in a comparison of details in the Septuagint with those in the Masoretic Text. When the Scrolls were discovered their details were compared with these and all other sources. The first scroll that became known, the *Great Isaiah Scroll* (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>), was submitted to such analysis, and usually was found inferior to the Masoretic Text. The first Israeli scholar to compare systematically any scroll with the Masoretic Text in such a philological analysis was probably Moshe Segal, who in his Hebrew commentary to Samuel (1956) provided the content of the Qumran fragments of 1QSam and parts of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and 4QSam<sup>b</sup>, which had been published a few years earlier.<sup>28</sup> At that early stage in the research, Segal lacked the tools to integrate these data into the textual analysis provided in his commentary. His only remark on these scrolls was that the Qumran and Septuagint versions of Samuel were either not known to the sages “who issued the official version” of the book (the Masoretic Text), or were rejected by them.<sup>29</sup>

In later years, when more material was available and the approach to the Scrolls became more sophisticated, individual readings from them were quoted in the few critical commentaries that were published in Hebrew; in the case of the only existing Hebrew critical series, the complete text of several fragments was included in the introductions to the commentaries, and their readings were often incorporated into the commentary itself.<sup>30</sup>

Readings from the Scrolls are incorporated into the critical Scripture editions,<sup>31</sup> very extensively in the *Hebrew University Bible*, as stated in its

<sup>28</sup> Moshe Z. Segal, *Sifre Shemu'el* (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1956), 48-52, and יד (Hebrew)

<sup>29</sup> Segal, *Sifre Shemu'el*, 52.

<sup>30</sup> See the prefaces and commentaries of the individual volumes of the Hebrew *Mikra leYisra'el* series edited by Shemuel Ahituv and Moshe Greenberg: Shemuel Ahituv, *Joshua, Introduction and Commentary* (Tel Aviv/Jerusalem: Am Oved/Magnes, 1995), 29-35 (text of 4QJosh<sup>a,b</sup> and 4QpaleoParaJoshua) and passim; Shimon Bar-Efrat, *I Samuel, Introduction and Commentary* (Tel Aviv/Jerusalem: Am Oved/Magnes, 1996), 17-18 (lists of the fragments without the readings themselves) and passim; Yair Hoffman, *Jeremiah, Introduction and Commentary* (Tel Aviv/Jerusalem: Am Oved/Magnes, 2001), 1:4-8 (lists of the fragments without the readings themselves) and passim; Rimon Kasher, *Ezekiel, Introduction and Commentary* (Tel Aviv/Jerusalem: Am Oved/Magnes, 2004), 1:30-35 (including the text of all the known fragments of Ezekiel from Qumran) and passim.

<sup>31</sup> See the analysis by Emanuel Tov, “Recording the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Text Editions of Hebrew Scripture,” in Morgens Müller and Thomas L. Thompson, eds., *Historie og konstruktion, Festskrift til Niels Peter Lemche I anledning af 60 års fødselsdagen den 6. September 2005* (FBE 14; Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanums Forlag, Københavns Universitet, 2005), 387-95.

sample edition.<sup>32</sup> This coverage was described as “practically complete,”<sup>33</sup> encompassing not only the Isaiah scrolls from cave 1, but also the *pesharim* and quotations in non-biblical compositions, excluding most of the cave 4 scrolls.

The coverage of the Scrolls is more comprehensive and improves with each subsequent edition of the *Hebrew University Bible*.<sup>34</sup> As soon as text editions or photographs of the Scrolls were published they were included in these editions. Thus, coverage of the Scrolls is exhaustive in the *Hebrew University Bible* editions of Jeremiah and Ezekiel,<sup>35</sup> but not in the earlier edition of Isaiah (see above).<sup>36</sup> Following the description in the introduction to each volume,<sup>37</sup> all the details of the manuscripts are presented, including all scribal and most orthographic features; however, “reflections of a completely different orthographical and morphological system,” as in the case of 2QJer (spellings such as כׁיא and כׁיה and forms such as הוואה), are not recorded.<sup>38</sup>

Differences in the indication of sense units (open/closed sections) between the Scrolls and the Masoretic Text are recorded in the second apparatus of the *Hebrew University Bible*, such as the addition of a section break in 4QJer<sup>a</sup> after Jer 7:29. On the other hand, differences in the length of these intervals (open/closed sections) are not denoted in Isaiah and Jeremiah, while in Ezekiel they appear in great detail (xlix-lxi).

Agreements between the Scrolls and readings in the Septuagint as against the Masoretic Text are recorded in the Computer Assisted Tools for Sep-

<sup>32</sup> Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, *The Book of Isaiah, Sample Edition with Introduction* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1965).

<sup>33</sup> Goshen-Gottstein, *The Book of Isaiah, Sample Edition*, 33. According to Goshen-Gottstein, the *Sample Edition* (covering Isaiah 2, 5, 11, 51) represented the first complete collation of the Scrolls, being more complete than the third edition of the *Biblia Hebraica*.

<sup>34</sup> Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, *The Hebrew University Bible, The Book of Isaiah* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1995); Chaim Rabin, Shemaryahu Talmon and Emanuel Tov, *The Hebrew University Bible, The Book of Jeremiah* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1997); Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein and Shemaryahu Talmon, *The Hebrew University Bible, The Book of Ezekiel* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2004).

<sup>35</sup> See Rabin, Talmon and Tov, “Introduction,” *The Book of Jeremiah*, xxviii; Goshen-Gottstein and Talmon, “Introduction,” *The Book of Ezekiel*, xxix.

<sup>36</sup> Goshen-Gottstein, *The Hebrew University Bible, The Book of Isaiah*, “Introduction,” § 57 (xxxvii). Donald W. Parry and Elisha Qimron, *The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>): A New Edition* (STDJ 32; Leiden: Brill, 1999) was not yet available at that time.

<sup>37</sup> See the volumes of the *Hebrew University Bible, Isaiah*, xxxvi; Jeremiah, xxix; Ezekiel, xxviii.

<sup>38</sup> See Rabin, Talmon and Tov, “Introduction,” *The Book of Jeremiah*, n. 75: “1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> were treated similarly in the Isaiah volume.”

tuagint Studies (CATSS) database,<sup>39</sup> accessible through the Accordance, Logos, and Bible Words programs. The CATSS project is co-directed by two scholars: an Israeli, Emanuel Tov, and an American, Robert Kraft.

### *Use of the Scrolls in Textual Criticism*

The most natural area for extensive use of the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls is in textual criticism, a discipline extensively developed in Israel. Initial textual work by Isaac Seeligmann laid the foundations for this method.<sup>40</sup> In one case he dealt extensively with a variant in 1QIsa<sup>a,b</sup> and the Septuagint, describing it as sectarian, while ultimately preferring the reading of the Masoretic Text.<sup>41</sup> However, the scholar who first developed an overall textual approach to the Scrolls was Shemaryahu Talmon, in a long series of studies. He used all the available scrolls, and recognized in them textual as well as exegetical<sup>42</sup> patterns. More than other scholars before him, Talmon developed the understanding that textual and exegetical developments go hand in hand, establishing the basis for this kind of approach with theoretical arguments and manifold examples.<sup>43</sup> Earlier Talmon had initiated the view that in the course of the creation and transmission of Hebrew Scripture synonymous words were interchangeable at all levels by authors and scribes, and that such words also appear as variant readings in different manuscripts of the same text, the Qumran Scrolls included.<sup>44</sup> Talmon also developed this understanding for other types of textual variation:

<sup>39</sup> Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies, directed by Robert A. Kraft and Emanuel Tov (Philadelphia-Jerusalem).

<sup>40</sup> Isaac L. Seeligmann, "Indications of Editorial Alteration and Adaptation in the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint," *VT* 11 (1961): 201-21 (Hebrew trans. in *Studies in Biblical Literature*, edited by Avi Hurvitz et al.; 2d rev. ed.; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1996), 319-26.

<sup>41</sup> "ΔΕΙΞΑΙ ΑΥΤΩΙ ΦΩΣ," *Tarbiz* 27 (1958): 127-41 (Hebrew with English summ.) (= *Studies in Biblical Literature*, 411-26).

<sup>42</sup> Shemaryahu Talmon, "DSIa as a Witness to Ancient Exegesis of the Book of Isaiah," *ASTI* 1 (1962): 62-72 (= *The World of Qumran from Within* [Jerusalem: Magnes, 1989], 131-41 and in Frank M. Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon, eds., *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* [Cambridge, Mass.-London: Harvard University Press, 1976], 116-26); "Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of the Qumran Manuscripts," *Textus* 4 (1964): 95-132 (= Cross and Talmon, *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, 226-63).

<sup>43</sup> See especially Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible—A New Outlook," in Cross and Talmon, *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, 321-400.

<sup>44</sup> Shemaryahu Talmon, *Conflate Readings—A Basic Phenomenon in the Transmission of the Old Testament Text*, (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1956); "Double Readings in the Massoretic Text," *Textus* 1 (1960): 144-84; "Synonymous Readings in the Textual Traditions of the Old Testament," *ScrHier* 8 (1961): 335-83. These and other studies were



identical features and variations occurred in *all* the textual sources, the Masoretic Text (parallel books in the Masoretic Text, *Ketiv/Qere* readings), all the Judean Desert texts, and the ancient versions. The same feature may occur in different sources, and therefore the direction of the interchange is usually irrelevant (for example, the interchange between the Masoretic Text *בית* and a parallel word *בני* in another source appears alongside the reverse feature of *בני* in the Masoretic Text and *בית* in other sources as in the phrase *בני ישראל*).<sup>45</sup> Likewise, the interchange between *ידע* in the Masoretic Text of Isa 47:8 and *ראה* in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> is paralleled by similar and reverse changes in other sources.<sup>46</sup>

Additional studies on individual Qumran texts and passages were published by other Israeli scholars: relatively early studies by Raphael Weiss (1940-1974) on the Scrolls, often in relation to the Samaritan Pentateuch,<sup>47</sup> as well as on the *Targum of Job* from cave 11,<sup>48</sup> illustrate the breadth of the textual variation in these sources, more especially its linguistic background; Esther Eshel (1958-) wrote the first detailed study of the harmonizing texts in the Torah<sup>49</sup> as well as a general introduction to the biblical Scrolls.<sup>50</sup> David Nakhman wrote an extensive study of the variants in the *tefillin*.<sup>51</sup> Emanuel Tov (1941-) and Frank Polak (1943-)<sup>52</sup> devoted detailed studies to

---

included in Shemaryahu Talmon, *Text and Canon of the Hebrew Bible: Collected Studies* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2010).

<sup>45</sup> Talmon, "Synonymous Readings," 346-8.

<sup>46</sup> Talmon, "Synonymous Readings," 341-2.

<sup>47</sup> These studies were posthumously assembled in *Mishvat ba-miqra', Sugiyot miqra'iyot, ha-miqra' be-Qumran. ha-humash hashomroni* (Jerusalem: Rubinstein, [1976]). This collection contains the following studies: "The Bible of the Qumran Sect" (221-37), "The Biblical Scrolls from the Judean Desert and the Masoretic Text" (238-77), "The Evidence of the Biblical Text in the Pesharim and other Sectarian Writings among the Qumran Scrolls" (277-300); "Psalm 91 from Qumran" (301-3).

<sup>48</sup> Raphael Weiss, *The Aramaic Targum of Job* (Tel Aviv: The Chaim Rosenberg School for Jewish Studies, Tel Aviv University, 1979) (Hebrew).

<sup>49</sup> Esther Eshel, *'arikhah harmonistit be-hamisha humshe torah bitequfhat bayit sheni* (unpubl. M.A. thesis, Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1990); "4QDeut<sup>a</sup>—A Text That Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing," *HUCA* 62 (1991): 117-54; "4QLev<sup>d</sup>: A Possible Source for the Temple Scroll and Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah," *DSD* 2 (1995): 1-13.

<sup>50</sup> Esther Eshel, "The Bible in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Adele Berlin and Marc Z. Brettler, eds., *The Jewish Study Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 1920-28.

<sup>51</sup> David Nakhman, "The Contents and Order of the Biblical Sections in the *Tefillin* from Qumran and Rabbinic Halakhah: Similarity, Difference, and Some Historical Conclusions," *Cathedra* 112 (2004): 19-44 (Hebrew).

<sup>52</sup> Emanuel Tov, "The Textual Affiliations of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>," *JSOT* 14 (1979): 37-53; repr. in Emanuel Tov, ed., *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel, 1980 Proceedings IOSCS, Vienna* (Jerusalem: Academ, 1980), 189-205. Rev. in Emanuel Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 71; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 273-83; Frank H. Polak, "Statistics and Textual Filiation: The Case of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>/LXX (With a Note on the Text of



the status of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> vis-à-vis the Septuagint, and Leor Gottlieb showed how a scribal feature is elucidated by an analysis of several scroll passages.<sup>53</sup>

Alexander Rofé (1932-) paid much attention to theologically motivated readings in the Scrolls and elsewhere,<sup>54</sup> especially readings influenced by religious thought (nomistic readings).<sup>55</sup> His special contribution to the study of the biblical Scrolls is his attempt to understand the theological background of these readings, while aware that such tendencies may occur in any source, including the Masoretic Text. These readings are indicative of the development of ideas in ancient Israel, sometimes pointing to differences between streams in Judaism.<sup>56</sup> Likewise, Michael Segal illustrated the theological aspects of the transmission in 1 Samuel.<sup>57</sup>

In line with the approach of Shemaryahu Talmon, Tov continued to integrate the study of the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls into the praxis of textual criticism, into general descriptions,<sup>58</sup> into his handbook on the textual crit-

---

the Pentateuch),” in George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars, eds., *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester, 1990)* (SCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 215-76.

<sup>53</sup> Leor Gottlieb, “Repetition Due to Homoeoteleuton,” *Textus* 21 (2002): 21-44.

<sup>54</sup> Alexander Rofé, “The Piety of the Torah-Disciples at the Winding-up of the Hebrew Bible: Josh. 1:8; Ps. 1:2; Isa. 59:21,” in Helmut Merklein, Karlheinz Müller and Günter Stemberger, eds., *Bibel in jüdischer und christlicher Tradition—Festschrift Johann Maier* (Frankfurt a.M.: Anton Hain, 1993), 78-85; “The Israelite Religion and the Qumran Texts,” in Lea Mazar, ed., *On a Scroll of a Book: Articles on The Dead Sea Scrolls: Lectures from Meetings on The Dead Sea Scrolls, The Hebrew University in Jerusalem, The Institute of Jewish Studies, November-December 1995* (Jerusalem: Mount Scopus Publications, Magnes, 1997), 66-72 (Hebrew); “The Acts of Nahash according to 4QSam<sup>a</sup>,” *IEJ* 32 (1982): 129-33; “4QMidrash Samuel? Observations Concerning the Character of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>,” *Textus* 19 (1998): 63-74; “Historico-Literary Aspects of the Qumran Biblical Scrolls,” in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years*, 30-39; “Phases in the Creation of Biblical Books in the Light of Qumran Biblical Scrolls,” in Gershon Brin and Bilhah Nitzan, eds., *Fifty Years of Dead Sea Scrolls Research: Studies in Memory of Jacob Licht* (Jerusalem: Ben Zvi Institute, 2001), 127-39 (Hebrew); “Moses’ Mother and Her Slave-Girl according to 4QExod<sup>b</sup>,” *DSD* 9 (2002): 38-43; “Wave Breads for King Saul: 1 Sam. 10:4 in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and in the Septuagint,” *Meghillot* 3 (2002): 245-50 (Hebrew).

<sup>55</sup> Alexander Rofé, “The Nomistic Correction in Biblical Manuscripts and Its Occurrence in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>,” *RevQ* 14 (1989): 247-54.

<sup>56</sup> Alexander Rofé, “The Onset of Sects in Postexilic Judaism,” in Jacob Neusner, ed., *Essays in Tribute of H. C. Kee* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 39-49; “The History of Israelite Religion and the Biblical Text: Corrections due to the Unification of Worship,” in Paul et al., *Emanuel*, 759-93.

<sup>57</sup> Michael Segal, “1 Samuel 2:3: Text, Exegesis, and Theology,” *Shnaton* 13 (2002): 83-89 (Hebrew).

<sup>58</sup> Emanuel Tov, “Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism,” *JJS* 39 (1988): 1-37; “The Significance of the Texts from the Judean Desert for the History of the Text of the Hebrew Bible: A New Synthesis,” in Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thompson, eds., *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*

icism of the Hebrew Bible, and into additional studies.<sup>59</sup> Tov claimed that in their biblical exegesis, most scholars focused too much on the Masoretic Text, even those who were well aware of other texts and versions.<sup>60</sup> In his opinion, from the outset scholars should have an open mind toward all sources, and not turn to extra-Masoretic evidence only where the Masoretic Text is considered “corrupt.” This approach has practical implications in the case of such an important scroll as 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, which is at least equally as valid as the Masoretic Text. In his handbook, Tov subdivides the Qumran biblical scrolls into five different groups of unequal proportion: the most frequent groups are the proto-Masoretic and independent scrolls. Other groups are pre-Samaritan and Septuagint-like scrolls. The scrolls written by the Qumran scribal school are not included in the statistics.<sup>61</sup>

Tov also devoted a monograph to the scribal practices of non-biblical and biblical scrolls.<sup>62</sup> This study has many practical implications for the understanding of several individual scrolls. The distinction between scrolls written by the Qumran scribal school and the other scrolls is basic to this description, and among other things the features of this scribal school are discussed at length.

Tov also devoted a study to the Qumran scrolls of Isaiah,<sup>63</sup> and to the relevance of the Scrolls to the *Ketiv/Qere* practice, the only Masoretic scribal

---

(Copenhagen International Seminar 6; JSOTSup 290; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 277-309; “The Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert,” in Mazar, *On a Scroll of a Book*, 40-65 (Hebrew); “The Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert—An Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts,” in Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov, eds., *The Bible as Book—The Hebrew Bible and the Judean Desert Discoveries* (London: British Library & Oak Knoll Press in association with The Scriptorium: Center for Christian Antiquities, 2002), 139-66, revised version: Emanuel Tov, *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays* (TSAJ 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 128-54.

<sup>59</sup> Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2d rev. ed.; Minneapolis/Assen: Fortress Press/Royal Van Gorcum, 2001), previously published in Hebrew (1989), German (1997), and Russian (2001).

<sup>60</sup> See especially Emanuel Tov, “The Place of the Masoretic Text in Modern Text Editions of the Hebrew Bible: The Relevance of Canon,” in Lee M. McDonald and James A. Sanders, eds., *The Canon Debate* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 234-51.

<sup>61</sup> Updated statistics are provided in “The Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert” and in Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 277-88, 337-43.

<sup>62</sup> Tov, *Scribal Practices*, updating and rewriting a long series of preliminary studies. See the reviews by Donald W. Parry; Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar in *DSD* 14 (2007): 365-72; Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, “Assessing Emanuel Tov’s ‘Qumran Scribal Practice’,” in Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen Schuller, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts* (STDJ 92; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 173-207.

<sup>63</sup> Emanuel Tov, “The Text of Isaiah at Qumran,” in Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans, eds., *Writing & Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition* (VTSup 70; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 2:491-511.

feature that is not paralleled by the Scrolls.<sup>64</sup> For more studies on the Hebrew scrolls by Tov, see below.

By far the longest Greek text, the *Minor Prophets Scroll* from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXII gr) was published by Emanuel Tov (see n. 20). This DJD edition includes a detailed analysis of the scroll's translation technique, distinguishing the substratum of the original translation from the possibly revisional elements. In other studies, Tov analyzed the other Greek Judean Desert scrolls similarly.<sup>65</sup> He thinks that the status of the latter manuscripts is equal to that of the Hebrew manuscripts from the same area. The Hebrew biblical Qumran manuscripts reflect a variety of textual forms, among them proto-Masoretic texts, while those of the later sites of Naḥal Ḥever, Wadi Sdeir, Murabba'at, and Naḥal Ṣe'elim, as well as the earlier site of Masada, reflect the Masoretic Text exclusively. Similarly, at least some of the Greek Qumran texts probably reflect an earlier form of Greek Scripture, while 8ḤevXIIgr reflects a later proto-rabbinic revision. So both the Hebrew and Greek texts from Qumran reflect a community that practiced openness at the textual level, without being tied down to the Masoretic Text, while the other sites represent Jewish nationalistic circles, which adhered only to the proto-rabbinic text in Hebrew and a Septuagint revision approximating that Hebrew text.

Worthy of note is the first journal devoted solely to textual criticism that includes many papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls: *Textus, Studies of the Hebrew University Bible Project*, vols. 1-25 (edited by Chaim Rabin, Shemaryahu Talmon, Emanuel Tov, Alexander Rofé, and Michael Segal in chronological order). Likewise, the Hebrew annual *Meghillot, Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, I-IX (2003-), edited by Moshe Bar-Asher and Devorah Dimant, contains several studies on the biblical scrolls, mainly by Israeli scholars. Israeli scholars also participated extensively in Schiffman and VanderKam,

<sup>64</sup> "The *Ketiv-Qere* Variations in Light of the Manuscript Finds in the Judean Desert," in Simon Crisp and Manuel M. Jinbachian, eds., *Text, Theology & Translation: Essays in Honour of Jan de Waard* (United Bible Societies, 2004), 199-207.

<sup>65</sup> Emanuel Tov, "The Nature of the Greek Texts from the Judean Desert," *NovT* 43 (2001): 1-11; "The Greek Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert," in Scot McKendrick and Orlaith A. O'Sullivan, eds., *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text* (London: British Library and Oak Knoll Press in association with The Scriptorium: Center for Christian Antiquities, 2003), 97-122; "Determining the Relationship between the Qumran Scrolls and the LXX: Some Methodological Issues," in Tov, *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel*, 45-67; "The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the LXX," in Brooke and Lindars, *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*, 11-47; rev. version: Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 285-300.

*Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. An updated summary of the textual status of the scrolls was provided by Emanuel Tov.<sup>66</sup>

### *The Biblical Scrolls and Literary Criticism*

It is generally assumed that the biblical books passed through two main stages of development: the stage of their literary growth up to a form that was final in respect to their content, and the copying and textual transmission stage of the completed compositions. Although the distinction between these two areas is largely open to doubt, research into these subjects is divided accordingly: literary criticism deals with the first area, the development stage of the biblical books, whereas textual criticism is applied to the second stage, their copying and transmission. In recent studies, however, the relevance of textual sources (especially the Septuagint and the Qumran Scrolls) to the *literary* study of the Bible is often stressed. In Israel these aspects are studied especially by Emanuel Tov, Alexander Rofé, and others. Within the framework of this analysis, various scroll fragments have been described as reflecting early recensional stages in the development of Scripture books. The following relevant studies are listed in the sequence of the biblical books. According to Michael Segal, 4QReworked Pentateuch reflects an exegetical biblical manuscript deviating greatly from the Masoretic Text, rather than a reworked biblical composition.<sup>67</sup> Tov takes this view, too, albeit with different arguments.<sup>68</sup> Rofé suggests that three Qumran phylacteries (Deuteronomy 5)<sup>69</sup> and 4QDeut<sup>q</sup> (the end of the Song of

<sup>66</sup> For Tov, see the articles cited in n. 58 and “The Qumran Hebrew Texts and the Septuagint: An Overview,” in Siegfried Kreuzer et al., eds., *Die Septuaginta: Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte* (WUNT; Mohr Siebeck; Tübingen, 2011), forthcoming; “A Didactic Approach towards the Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Canadian Collection*, forthcoming.

<sup>67</sup> Michael Segal, “Biblical Exegesis in 4Q158: Techniques and Genre,” *Textus* 19 (1998): 45-62; “4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch?” in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years*, 391-9.

<sup>68</sup> Emanuel Tov, “The Many Forms of Scripture: Reflections in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch,” in Armin Lange, Matthias Weigold, and József Zsengeller, eds., *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of his 65th Birthday* (FRLANT 230; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 11-28; “From 4QReworked Pentateuch to 4QPentateuch (?),” in Mladen Popović, ed., *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (JSJSup 141; Leiden, 2010), 73-91.

<sup>69</sup> Alexander Rofé, “Deuteronomy 5.28-6.1: Composition and Text in the Light of Deuteronomic Style and Three *Tefillin* from Qumran (4Q128, 129, 137),” *Deuteronomy-Issues and Interpretation* (OOTS; London: T&T Clark, 2002), 25-36.

Moses)<sup>70</sup> reflect early stages of that book. Mazor considers 4QJosh<sup>a</sup> an early stage in the development of the Hebrew book,<sup>71</sup> while according to Rofé this scroll displays a later, nomistic stage of the Masoretic Text sequence in the first chapters; Tov considers it a late rewriting.<sup>72</sup> Rofé denies that 4QJudg<sup>a</sup> is relevant to literary criticism.<sup>73</sup> Tov suggests that 4QSam<sup>a</sup> reflects a different edition of the Song of Hannah from those underlying the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint.<sup>74</sup> Rofé asserts that the added paragraph at the beginning of 1 Samuel 11 in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, providing the background to the siege of Jabesh Gilead by Nahash the Ammonite, is not relevant to literary criticism but represents a late midrash.<sup>75</sup> Talmon and Zakovitch posit

<sup>70</sup> Alexander Rofé, "The End of the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32.43)," *Deuteronomy-Issues*, 47-54.

<sup>71</sup> Lea Mazor, *The Septuagint Translation of the Book of Joshua—Its Contribution to the Understanding of the Textual Transmission of the Book and Its Literary and Ideological Development* (Ph.D. diss.; Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1994), 54-56 (Hebrew with English summ.); "A Textual and Literary Study of the Fall of Ai in Joshua 8," in Sara Japhet, ed., *The Bible in the Light of Its Interpreters, Sarah Kamin Memorial Volume* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1994), 73-108 (Hebrew). According to Mazor, fragments 15-16 of this scroll present a re-essentially shorter text than the Masoretic Text that runs parallel to the shorter text of the Septuagint, although the two are not identical.

<sup>72</sup> Alexander Rofé, "The Editing of the Book of Joshua in the Light of 4QJosh<sup>a</sup>," in George J. Brooke and Florentino García Martínez, eds., *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 73-80; Emanuel Tov, "Literary Development of the Book of Joshua as Reflected in the Masoretic Text, the LXX, and 4QJosh<sup>a</sup>," in Edward Noort, ed., *The Book of Joshua and the Land of Israel* (BETL; Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming).

<sup>73</sup> Alexander Rofé, "The Biblical Text in Light of Historico-Literary Criticism—The Reproach of the Prophet-Man in Judg 6:7-10 and 4QJudg<sup>a</sup>," in Ziporah Talshir and Dalia Amara, eds., *On the Border Line—Textual Meets Literary Criticism—Proceedings of a Conference in Honor of Alexander Rofé on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday* (Beer-Sheva 18; Beer-Sheva: Ben Gurion University of the Negev Press, 2005), 33-44 (Hebrew); "Studying the Biblical Text in the Light of Historico-Literary Criticism: The Reproach of the Prophet in Judg 6:7-10 and 4QJudg<sup>a</sup>," in Armin Lange, Emanuel Tov and Matthias Weigold, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures* (VTSup 140; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 111-23. The absence of this paragraph had been explained earlier as pointing to a pre-Deuteronomy text by Julio Trebolle Barrera, "Textual Variants in 4QJudg<sup>a</sup> and the Textual and Editorial History of the Book of Judges," *RevQ* 14 (1989): 229-45; "49. 4QJudg<sup>a</sup>," in Eugene Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (DJD XIV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 161-9.

<sup>74</sup> Emanuel Tov, "Different Editions of the Song of Hannah," in Mordechai Cogan, Barry L. Eichler and Jeffrey H. Tigay, eds., *Tehillah le-Moshe, Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 149-70. Revised version in Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 433-55.

<sup>75</sup> Rofé, "The Acts of Nahash"; "4QMidrash Samuel? Observations Concerning the Character of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>," *Textus* 19 (1988): 63-74; "A Scroll of Samuel or Midrash Samuel? The Transfer of the Ark to Jerusalem According to 4Q51," in Moshe Bar-Asher and Emanuel Tov, eds., *A Festschrift for Devorah Dimant, Meghillot* 5-6 (Haifa-Jerusalem: University of Haifa-Bialik Institute, 2007), 237-43 (Hebrew).

that the different hands in chapter 38 in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> reflect different stages of the development of 2 Kgs 20:1-11.<sup>76</sup> Tov believes that 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup>, together with the Septuagint, reflect an early redactional stage of Jeremiah.<sup>77</sup> Adopting this view, Jonathan Ben-Dov analyzes the relevance of Jeremiah chapter 10.<sup>78</sup>

Tov summarized the Qumran evidence relating to literary criticism, together with that relevant to the Septuagint.<sup>79</sup> Talshir authored a methodological study on textual and literary criticism,<sup>80</sup> and the Rofé Jubilee Volume contains several studies devoted to this area.<sup>81</sup>

Studying the extensive literary changes that scholars often surmise in the Masoretic Text, Tov concludes that the realia of the Qumran Scrolls do not allow us to presume that scribes inserted, omitted, or changed large sections in existing scrolls.<sup>82</sup> According to Tov, these changes were not inserted in the form of alterations to a previous manuscript but as part of the ongoing writing by scribes.

<sup>76</sup> Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible," 328-32; Yair Zakovitch, "Assimilation in Biblical Narratives," in Jeffrey H. Tigay, ed., *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 175-96. See also Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 346-8.

<sup>77</sup> Emanuel Tov, "The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Its Textual History," in Tigay, *Empirical Models*, 211-37. Revised version in Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 363-84; "The Characterization of the Additional Layer of the Masoretic Text of Jeremiah," *Erlsr* 26 (1999): 55-63 (Hebrew).

<sup>78</sup> Jonathan Ben-Dov, "A Textual Problem and Its Form-Critical Solution: Jeremiah 10:1-16," *Textus* 20 (2000): 97-128.

<sup>79</sup> Emanuel Tov, "The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources," in Adrian Schenker, ed., *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible. The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (SCS 52; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2003), 121-44; Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, chapter 7.

<sup>80</sup> Ziporah Talshir, "Textual and Literary Criticism of the Bible in Post-Modern Times: The Untimely Demise of Classical Biblical Philology," *Hen* 21 (1999): 235-52. See also her paper "Are the Biblical Texts from Qumran Biblical? 4QTestimonia and the Minimalists," in Bar-Asher and Tov, *A Festschrift for Devorah Dimant*, 119-40 (Hebrew).

<sup>81</sup> See Talshir and Amara, *On the Border Line*.

<sup>82</sup> Emanuel Tov, "The Writing of Early Scrolls. Implications for the Literary Analysis of Hebrew Scripture," in Dieter Böhler, Innocent Himbaza and Philip Hugo, eds., *L'Écrit et l'Esprit. Études d'histoire du texte et de théologie biblique en hommage à Adrian Schenker* (OBO 214; Fribourg-Göttingen: Academic Press-Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005), 355-71; Hebrew version in *Meghillot* 3 (2005): 191-204.



*Textual Theories*

From the early introductions to Hebrew Scripture onward (for example, that by Johann Eichhorn),<sup>83</sup> the development of the biblical text has been outlined in broad terms; since 1947 it has included increasing reference to the Dead Sea Scrolls. The first overall theory to involve the Scrolls was the so-called “local recensions/text-types/families,”<sup>84</sup> which reduces the multiplicity of textual witnesses to three text-types: one current in Palestine (mainly the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Masoretic Text of Chronicles, and several Qumran Scrolls), one in Babylonia (the Masoretic Text), and one in Egypt (the Septuagint). Talmon<sup>85</sup> and Tov<sup>86</sup> pointed out the weaknesses of this theory. Developing his own views, Talmon described the collection of Qumran Scrolls as an “open-ended biblical canon.”<sup>87</sup>

Esther and Hanan Eshel elucidated the origin of the Samaritan sect and Samaritan Pentateuch on the basis of the pre-Samaritan texts.<sup>88</sup>

Several Israeli scholars view the Qumran Psalters, especially 11QPs<sup>a</sup>, as liturgical collections that are irrelevant to our understanding of the development of the canonical shape of that book.<sup>89</sup>

<sup>83</sup> Johann G. Eichhorn, *Einleitung ins Alten Testament* (Leipzig, 1780-1783; 2d ed.: Leipzig, 1787 and Reutlingen, 1790; 3d ed.: Leipzig, 1803; 4th ed.: Göttingen, 1823).

<sup>84</sup> William F. Albright, “New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible,” *BASOR* 140 (1955): 27-33; Frank M. Cross, “The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text,” in Cross and Talmon, *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, 278-92; “The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts,” in Cross and Talmon, *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, 306-20.

<sup>85</sup> Talmon in Cross and Talmon, *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, 193-8.

<sup>86</sup> Emanuel Tov, “A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls,” *HUCA* 53 (1982): 11-27; *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 185-7.

<sup>87</sup> Shemaryahu Talmon, “The *Old Testament* Text,” in Peter R. Ackroyd and Christopher F. Evans, eds., *The Cambridge History of the Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 1:159-99 = Cross and Talmon, *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, 1-41; “Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible,” in Cross and Talmon, *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, 226-63; “The Transmission History of the Text of the Hebrew Bible in the Light of Biblical Manuscripts from Qumran and Other Sites in the Judean Desert,” in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years*, 40-50. The quotation is from Shemaryahu Talmon, “The Crystallization of the ‘Canon of Hebrew Scriptures’ in the Light of Biblical Scrolls from Qumran,” in McKendrick and O’Sullivan, *The Bible as Book*, 5-20 (11).

<sup>88</sup> Esther and Hanan Eshel, “Dating the Samaritan Pentateuch’s Compilation in Light of the Qumran Biblical Scrolls,” in Paul et al., *Emanuel*, 215-40.

<sup>89</sup> Shemaryahu Talmon, “Pisqah Be’emša’ Pasuq and 11QPs<sup>a</sup>,” *Textus* 5 (1966): 11-21; Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, “The Psalms Scroll (11QPs<sup>a</sup>): A Problem of Canon and Text,” *Textus* 5 (1966): 22-33; Menahem Haran, “11QPs<sup>a</sup> and the Canonical Book of Psalms,” in Marc Z. Brettler and Michael A. Fishbane, eds., *Minhab le-Nabum—Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nabum M. Sarna in Honour of His 70th Birthday* (JSOTSup 154; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1993), 193-201.

*The Qumran Biblical Scrolls at Israeli Schools, Universities, and on Websites*

The Qumran biblical scrolls are probably taught more widely at Israeli universities than those elsewhere.<sup>90</sup> Since 2003, the study of some biblical scrolls and Psalm 151 in the 11QPs<sup>a</sup> version have been integrated into the official curriculum for general high schools,<sup>91</sup> which is rather innovative for a country in which the Masoretic Text is the official text, so to speak. Much material on the biblical scrolls is available on the websites of the Orion Center (see n. 9) and of the Shrine of the Book at the Israel Museum,<sup>92</sup> and on that of Bible teachers at elementary and high schools.<sup>93</sup>

---

<sup>90</sup> Among other things, see the internal Hebrew University publication by Emanuel Tov and Michael Segal, *Textual Criticism: A Sourcebook* (Jerusalem: Academon, 2002).

<sup>91</sup> See *tochnit hal-limmudim be-miqra' le-ma'arekhet ha-chinnukh ham-mamlakhtit* (ham-zkirut hap-pedagogit, misrad ha-chinnukh; Jerusalem, 2003), 62, 84; *peraqim mis-sepher yesha'yahu le-limmud u-le-ha'asarah* (Tel Aviv: ha-merkaz le-technologiah chinnukhit, 1997), 10-11; Yaira Amit, "Biblical Criticism in the Teaching of the Hebrew Bible," in Maria L. Frankel and Howard Deitcher, eds., *Understanding the Bible in Our Times—Implications for Education* (Studies in Jewish Education 9; Jerusalem: Magnes, 2003), 101-13 (112) (Hebrew). Thanks are due to Lea Mazor for providing these references.

<sup>92</sup> <http://www.imj.org.il/eng/shrine>.

<sup>93</sup> <http://mikranet.cet.ac.il>. See further Emanuel Tov, "Electronic Resources Relevant to the Textual Criticism of Hebrew Scripture," *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 8 (2003) [<http://purl.org/TC>].





## QUMRAN RESEARCH IN ISRAEL: REWRITTEN BIBLE AND BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION\*

MICHAEL SEGAL

The Dead Sea Scrolls have contributed to the study of biblical interpretation in two major ways. First, numerous new compositions, unknown until their discovery in the Judean Desert, were unearthed, offering fresh material for analysis and comparison. New genres and exegetical traditions have been introduced into the scholarly discourse, and contributed greatly to furthering our understanding of the history of biblical interpretation. Second, the Scrolls reinvigorated the study of exegesis in Second Temple compositions that were previously known primarily, but not exclusively, in translations preserved by various churches. Copies of these works in their original languages, even if they were fragmentary, have allowed for a glimpse into the original textual milieu of these compositions, spurring on renewed interest in their analysis. Thus, for example, the books of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, each preserved in its entirety only in Ethiopic (Ge'ez), were discovered at Qumran in fragmentary Aramaic and Hebrew versions respectively.

### *The First Phase (1948-1970)*

The beginning of Israeli scholarly interest in Rewritten Bible and biblical interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls goes back to the original discovery

---

\* I have distinguished between the two categories in this discussion, since although all Rewritten Bible texts reflect some form of biblical interpretation, not all interpretation in Jewish literature of the Second Temple period is formulated as Rewritten Bible. Furthermore, Rewritten Bible is not only exegetical in character, but was often composed for an entirely different purpose, such as to promote a specific religious idea or notion. I use the term Rewritten Bible to describe compositions that closely follow a text of a biblical book, both in language and order, but which differ from this source in a significant enough way to indicate that the revised version is a new composition, and not a new edition of the older work. For a discussion of possible criteria by which one can distinguish between these two genres, see Michael Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," in Matthias Henze, ed., *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 10-28.

of cave 1 in 1946-1947. Among the first group of seven scrolls uncovered were two compositions that reflect two of the primary genres of biblical interpretation represented in the Qumran corpus: the *Genesis Apocryphon*, an exemplar of Rewritten Bible (although this category was not yet referred to by this name) in Aramaic, which retells various biblical episodes. The *Pesher of Habakkuk*, the longest and best-preserved *pesher* text from Qumran, presents a peculiar commentary of the biblical Habakkuk, of a previously unknown type. In 1956, Nahman Avigad (1905-1992) and Yigael Yadin (1917-1984), both professors of archeology at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, published the former, accompanied by translations into Hebrew and English of columns II and XIX-XXII, the best-preserved columns in the scroll.<sup>1</sup> In addition to their translations, the authors provided introductory material, including a survey of the contents of the text that they published, comparisons with parallel material (primarily *Jubilees*), some brief, insightful analysis of the contents of these columns, and a description of the nature of the scroll:

All that has been said above about the contents, structure and style of the scroll, leads to the definite conclusion that it is actually a sort of apocryphal version of stories from Genesis, faithful, for the most part, to the order of the chapters in Scripture. Some chapters of the scroll begin and end precisely as the comparable chapters of Genesis do, though the narrative in this scroll is in large part couched in the first person (38).

The editors of this composition thus recognized the crucial characteristics of this composition,<sup>2</sup> which resemble the features of the later-termed Rewritten Bible texts.<sup>3</sup> This edition served as the basis for study of the *Genesis Apocryphon* for at least a decade, until the publication of Joseph Fitzmyer's edition and commentary in 1966. In an oft-quoted linguistic analysis of the scroll, Yechezkel Kutscher (1909-1971; Professor of Hebrew Linguistics, Hebrew University of Jerusalem) dated the Aramaic of the scroll to the first century BCE. If this date is accepted as the time of its composition, then it has implications for the issue of the literary relationship of the *Apocryphon* to other Jewish works of the Second Temple period (see below).<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (Jerusalem: Magnes and Heikhal Ha-Sefer, 1956).

<sup>2</sup> The pseudepigraphic, rewritten nature of the scroll was also emphasized by David Flusser, "Review of *A Genesis Apocryphon*," *Kirjath Sepher* 32 (1956-1957): 379-83 (Hebrew).

<sup>3</sup> This term was first coined by Geza Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (StPB 4; Leiden: Brill, 1961).

<sup>4</sup> Yechezkel Kutscher, "The Aramaic of the Genesis Apocryphon," in Chaim Rabin and

The *Pesher of Habakkuk* was published soon after its discovery, and was therefore available to Israeli scholars rather quickly.<sup>5</sup> In the early stages of Israeli Qumran studies it was mostly addressed for its calendrical implications and for the identification of its possible historical allusions,<sup>6</sup> while the exegetical aspects of the *pesher* texts were not the focus of initial investigations. The contributions of Israeli scholars in this early period were limited by their lack of access to almost all of the other scrolls subsequently discovered, since they were not members of the original editorial team. They were therefore constrained by the pace of the publication process, which in this early period included the initial scrolls discovered in cave 1, in addition to the first five volumes of the DJD series. Most of the remaining, more fragmentary *pesher* scrolls from cave 4, on the books of the Later Prophets and the Psalms, were published in 1968 in DJD V (by John Allegro).<sup>7</sup> Most of the *pesher*-type texts contain running commentaries on a single biblical book or passage, but some compositions which are organized thematically, were also included in this volume (e.g. 4Q180). Finally, texts that could be classified as Rewritten Bible, especially 4Q158 (published as “Biblical Paraphrase: Genesis, Exodus”), were introduced there for the first time. The commentary on all of these fragments was sparse, and left much room for further refinement and discussion by subsequent scholars.

The *Psalms Scroll* from cave 11, published in 1965 by James Sanders,<sup>8</sup> contains mostly biblical Psalms, but presents many differences from the Masoretic version of the Psalter, including specific textual variants, the order of the psalms, and the presence of eight additional psalms in the

---

Yigael Yadin, eds., *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ScrHier 4; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1958), 1-35.

<sup>5</sup> The Habakkuk commentary was first published in 1950 by Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, with the assistance of John C. Trever and William H. Brownlee (New Haven: ASOR, 1950).

<sup>6</sup> Shemaryahu Talmon, “Yom Hakippurim in the Habakkuk Scroll,” *Bib* 32 (1951): 549-63; repr. in Shemaryahu Talmon, *The World of Qumran from Within* (Jerusalem-Leiden: Magnes-Brill, 1989), 186-99; “The Calendar of the Covenanters of the Judean Desert,” in Rabin and Yadin, *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 162-99; repr. in *The World of Qumran from Within*, 147-85; Yitzhak Baer, “Pesher Habakkuk and its Period,” *Zion* 34 (1969): 1-42 (Hebrew).

<sup>7</sup> See the important study of David Flusser, “Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes in Pesher Nahum,” in Menahem Dorman, Shemuel Safrai and Menahem Stern, eds., *Essays in Jewish History and Philology in Memory of Gedaliahu Alon* (Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 1970), 133-68 (Hebrew); English trans. in David Flusser, *Qumran and Apocalypticism* (vol. 1 of *Judaism of the Second Temple Period*; Grand Rapids-Jerusalem: Eerdmans-Magnes, 2007), 214-57.

<sup>8</sup> James A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPsa)* (DJD IV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965).

Qumran version. This scroll was classified as a biblical scroll by Sanders, and therefore assigned the siglum 11QPsalms<sup>a</sup>. However, a number of Israeli scholars, including Moshe Goshen-Gottstein (1925-1991; Professor of Semitic Languages, Hebrew University of Jerusalem)<sup>9</sup> and Shemaryahu Talmon (1920-2010; Professor of Bible, Hebrew University of Jerusalem),<sup>10</sup> suggested that this scroll does not reflect an independent version of the book of Psalms, but rather a liturgical collection based primarily upon the book of Psalms. This discussion reflects one of the earliest scholarly debates regarding the distinction between multiple literary editions of biblical books on the one hand, and rewritten forms of these scriptural texts on the other. The *Psalms Scroll* was also significant for presenting apocryphal psalms that were either unknown prior to its publication, or were known only in translation, some of which reflect biblical interpretation. Perhaps the most important example is Psalms 151A and B, preserved as one poem in a different form in the Septuagint, which relates to the story of David's election by God.<sup>11</sup>

Typical of the literary products put out by the Qumran community is their biblicalized style. Therefore many of the Qumran non-biblical compositions, though not explicitly exegetical, present a wealth of biblical interpretation. Thus, for example, the *Hodayot* (1QH<sup>a</sup>) employ biblical imagery and language throughout, in order to create new poetic compositions. In his masterful edition of the cave 1 version of this work, Jacob Licht (1922-1993; Professor of Bible at Tel Aviv University), who worked as an assistant to Sukenik and Avigad in their preparation of publications of Dead Sea scrolls,<sup>12</sup> repeatedly pointed to various biblical allusions found in this collection of poems.<sup>13</sup> A similar approach is found in Licht's edition and

<sup>9</sup> Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Psalms Scroll (11QP<sup>a</sup>): A Problem of Canon and Text," *Textus* 5 (1966): 22-33.

<sup>10</sup> Shemaryahu Talmon, "Pisqah Be'emša' Pasuq and 11QP<sup>a</sup>," *Textus* 5 (1966): 11-21 (11-13).

<sup>11</sup> Shemaryahu Talmon, "Hebrew Apocryphal Psalms from Qumran," *Tarbiz* 35 (1966): 214-34 (Hebrew), subsequently translated into English: "Extra-canonical Hebrew Psalms from Qumran – Psalm 151," in *The World of Qumran from Within*, 244-72; cf. also the subsequent studies of Avi Hurvitz, "The Language and Date of Psalm 151 from Qumran," *ErIsr* 8 (1967): 82-87 (Hebrew); Menahem Haran, "The Two Text-Forms of Psalm 151," *JJS* 39 (1988): 171-82; Yair Zakovitch, "David's First Words: Studies in Psalm 151 from Qumran," in Lea Mazor, ed., *On a Scroll of a Book: Articles on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1997), 73-84 (Hebrew); Dalia Amara, "Psalm 151 from Qumran and its Relation to Psalm 151 LXX," *Textus* 19 (1998): 1\*-35\* (Hebrew); Michael Segal, "The Literary Development of Psalm 151: A New Look at the Septuagint Version," *Textus* 21 (2002): 139-58.

<sup>12</sup> As related in Frank H. Polak, "Jacob Shalom Licht—The Man and the Scholar," in Yair Hoffman and Frank Polak, eds., *A Light for Jacob: Studies in the Bible and the Dead Sea*

commentary on the *Community Rule*,<sup>14</sup> although due to the nature of that composition, especially its legal sections, this aspect is less prominent in his analysis.

### *The Second Phase (1970 to present)*

During the second phase of Qumran studies, biblical interpretation blossomed into a fully developed field in its own right. Many of the scholars from the first generation continued to flourish, publishing the fruits of the culmination of many years of their labor. At the same time, the next generation, comprised both of their students in Israel, and also those who immigrated there following study in academic centers abroad, undertook the study of various Qumran texts that relate to the field of biblical interpretation. The following survey has been arranged both topically and according to specific compositions. It is not exhaustive, but is intended to reflect some of the approaches to the major exegetical works of this period, and the contribution of Israeli scholars to their analysis.

#### *Bible or Rewritten Bible?*

The so-called *Reworked Pentateuch* scrolls (4Q158, 4Q364-4Q367) were also included by scholars as Rewritten Bible or parabiblical texts. The first of these scrolls was originally published by John Allegro in DJD V under the name "Biblical Paraphrase: Genesis, Exodus".<sup>15</sup> In 1994, Emanuel Tov (1941-; Professor of Bible, Hebrew University, and Editor-in-Chief of the Dead Sea Scrolls Publication Project) and Sidnie White Crawford published four additional scrolls (4Q364-4Q367) in DJD XIII, and suggested that all five of these scrolls actually reflect one composition, to which they assigned the title *Reworked Pentateuch*. In their opinion, this work reflects a parabiblical composition (note the subtitle of the DJD volume – "Parabiblical Texts, Part 1"), and not a copy of the Pentateuch itself. In contrast,

---

*Scrolls in Memory of Jacob Shalom Licht* (Jerusalem-Tel Aviv: Bialik Institute and Tel Aviv University), 1-5 (1) (Hebrew).

<sup>13</sup> Jacob Licht, *The Thanksgiving Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judea* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1957) (Hebrew).

<sup>14</sup> Jacob Licht, *The Rule Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judea* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965) (Hebrew).

<sup>15</sup> John M. Allegro, "158. Biblical Paraphrase: Genesis, Exodus," in *Qumrân Cave 4.1 (4Q158-4Q186)* (DJD V; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 1-6.

Michael Segal (1972-; Department of Bible, Hebrew University) raised two counter-claims. First, the scrolls do not all preserve the same composition, based upon their differing approaches to the biblical text and their divergent exegetical techniques. Second, some of the scrolls (most likely 4Q364 and 4Q365) do not reflect parabiblical compositions, but should rather be viewed as textual versions of the Pentateuch itself.<sup>16</sup> In subsequent publications, Tov has accepted this position as well.<sup>17</sup>

A similar discussion of the border between “biblical” and “rewritten” texts, but in the opposite direction, has emerged in recent years surrounding 4Q51, referred to from its earliest publications as 4QSamuel<sup>a</sup>,<sup>18</sup> a siglum that indicates the editors’ view of this scroll as a copy of the biblical book of Samuel. This textual witness preserves many unique readings of the text of the book of Samuel, which is represented in the Masoretic text by a notoriously problematic version. In a series of studies, Alexander Rofé (1932-; Professor of Bible, Hebrew University of Jerusalem) has noted the “midrashic” nature of many of these *lectio*, in the realms of both aggadic and halakhic (“nomistic”) exegesis.<sup>19</sup> He therefore suggests the name “4QMidrash Samuel” for this scroll, locating it one step removed from the biblical text, similar in nature to the title “Reworked Pentateuch” for the scrolls mentioned above.

---

<sup>16</sup> Michael Segal, “Biblical Exegesis in 4Q158: Techniques and Genre,” *Textus* 19 (1998): 45-62; “4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch?,” in Schiffman, Tov and Vanderkam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years*, 391-9. The second claim was simultaneously put forth by Eugene Ulrich, “The Qumran Scrolls and the Biblical Text,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years*, 51-59.

<sup>17</sup> See Emanuel Tov, “The Many Forms of Hebrew Scripture: Reflections in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch,” in Armin Lange, Matthias Weigold, and József Zsengellér, eds., *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of his 65th Birthday* (FRLANT 230; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 11-28; “From 4QReworked Pentateuch to 4QPentateuch(?),” in Mladen Popović, ed., *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (JSJSup 141; Leiden-Boston, 2010), 73-91.

<sup>18</sup> See the official publication of the entire scroll in Frank M. Cross, et al., “51. 4QSam<sup>a</sup>,” *Qumran Cave 4.XII: 1-2 Samuel* (DJD XVII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005), 1-216.

<sup>19</sup> Alexander Rofé, “The Acts of Nahash according to 4QSam<sup>a</sup>,” *IEJ* 32 (1982): 129-33; “The Nomistic Correction in Biblical Manuscripts and its Occurrence in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>,” *RevQ* 14 (1989): 247-54; “4QMidrash Samuel – Observations Concerning the Character of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>,” *Textus* 19 (1998): 63-74; “A Scroll of Samuel or Midrash Samuel? The Transfer of the Ark to Jerusalem according to 4Q51,” *Meghillot* 5-6 (2007): 237-43 (Hebrew).

### *The Temple Scroll*

Yigael Yadin's monumental edition of the *Temple Scroll* from cave 11 stands out as one of the most comprehensive editions, introductions, and commentaries of a Qumran text.<sup>20</sup> Subsequently, a new critical edition of the scroll with many new, corrected readings, was prepared by Elisha Qimron (1943-; Professor of Hebrew Language, Ben-Gurion University),<sup>21</sup> but Yadin's introduction and commentary still remain the basis for all future inquiries into this scroll. This composition should be viewed as an exemplar of the Rewritten Bible genre,<sup>22</sup> especially in its final section, which presents a rewritten version of many of the laws of Deuteronomy (cols. LI-LXVI). Yadin prepared an extensive line-by-line interpretation of the entire scroll, demonstrating the relationship between this work and the biblical passages that served as source material for this rewriting. The techniques of rewriting were also analyzed in shorter studies by Gershon Brin, Emanuel Tov and Moshe Weinfeld.<sup>23</sup> Yadin's extensive introduction on the many halakhic issues in the *Temple Scroll* laid important foundations for the field of legal interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Yadin compared the halakhah of the *Temple Scroll* to that found in contemporaneous sources (Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and the legal material in the Dead Sea Scrolls that was already known), rabbinic literature, and later sources, including both Karaite and Rabbanite works. Further studies on the *Temple Scroll* have included new interpretations of passages with implications for legal exegesis;<sup>24</sup> in-

<sup>20</sup> The Hebrew edition was published in 1977: Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977), followed by a revised English introduction and commentary in 1983.

<sup>21</sup> Elisha Qimron, *The Temple Scroll: A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions* (bibliography by Florentino García Martínez; Beer Sheva-Jerusalem: Ben Gurion University of the Negev-Israel Exploration Society, 1996); and recently *The Dead Sea Scrolls; Volume One: The Hebrew Writings* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2010), 137-207 (Hebrew).

<sup>22</sup> Some scholars limit the use of the term Rewritten Bible to narrative compositions, but as can be seen in the cases of the *Temple Scroll*, *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, and the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah*, the process of reuse and rewriting of earlier biblical material cuts across generic lines.

<sup>23</sup> See Gershon Brin, "The Bible as Reflected in the Temple Scroll," *Shnaton* 4 (1980): 182-209 (Hebrew); "Concerning Some of the Uses of the Bible in the Temple Scroll," *RevQ* 12 (1987): 519-28; Emanuel Tov, "Deut. 12 and 11QTemple LII-LIII," *RevQ* 15 (1991): 169-73; Moshe Weinfeld, "God versus Moses in the Temple Scroll: 'I do not speak on my own but on God's Authority' (Sifrei Deut §5; John 12,48f)," *RevQ* 15 (1991): 175-80.

<sup>24</sup> See, e.g., the new interpretation offered by Aharon Shemesh, "A New Reading of 11QT<sup>a</sup> 52:13-16," in Schiffman, Tov and Vanderkam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years*, 400-410.



sights from newly published Qumran texts;<sup>25</sup> and the identification of parallels (or disagreements) with positions expressed in later rabbinic literature, also frequently the result of different exegetical approaches to legal texts.<sup>26</sup>

### *Jubilees*

*Jubilees*, another prime example of Rewritten Bible, reflects the richest collection of biblical interpretation in any work from the Second Temple period, and therefore its value for the history of biblical interpretation cannot be overestimated. Fifteen fragmentary copies were discovered at Qumran. While the amount of Hebrew text preserved is actually but a small percentage of the total of the text, the little that we do have generally confirms the accuracy of the Ge'ez translation, the only complete version of the book.<sup>27</sup> Israeli scholarship on this important composition can be traced back to Chanoch Albeck (1890-1972; Professor of Talmud, Hebrew University of Jerusalem), whose comprehensive study of the halakhah in *Jubilees* addressed issues of legal interpretation in the book.<sup>28</sup> However, research on *Jubilees* has accelerated in recent decades, as its importance for both the history of biblical interpretation and Second Temple Judaism has been recognized. Perhaps the studies of *Jubilees* most exegetical in nature are those of James Kugel (1945-; Professor, Department of Bible, Bar-Ilan University; formerly of Harvard University), who has attempted to identify interpre-

<sup>25</sup> Chief among these are the scrolls of 4QMMT (4Q394-4Q399), which offer a window into legal polemics of the period based upon differing approaches to biblical interpretation. See the extensive discussion in the *editio princeps* of this scroll by Elisha Qimron, "5. Halakha," in Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, in consultation with Yaakov Sussmann, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (DJD X; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 123-77.

<sup>26</sup> See, e.g., David Henshke, "On the History of Exegesis of the Pericopes Concerning Tithes: From the Temple Scroll to the Sages," *Tarbiz* 72 (2002-2003): 85-111 (Hebrew); Yeshayahu Maori, "Lev 17:3-4 vs. Deut. 12:15, 20-21: From Qumran to Traditional Jewish Exegesis," *Meghillot* 5-6 (2007): 149-65 (Hebrew).

<sup>27</sup> See James C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 1-95.

<sup>28</sup> Chanoch Albeck, *Das Buch der Jubiläen und die Halakha* (Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums 27; Berlin: Siegfried Scholem, 1930), 3-60. Albeck only moved to Israel in 1935, and this work was composed before then. However, his work is included in this review because of his subsequent contributions to Israeli scholarship once he arrived at the Hebrew University. In his monumental commentary on the Mishnah, Albeck repeatedly refers back to his monograph on *Jubilees* in the introductions to the various tractates; cf. Michael Segal, "'מזברתו על ספר היובלות': A Jubilee and a Half after the Publication of Prof. Chanokh Albeck's Study," *Jewish Studies* 45 (2009): 49-65 (52, n. 7) (Hebrew) for a list of such references. Albeck's monograph was recently translated into Hebrew, an indication of the growing interest in *Jubilees* and early halakhah in Israeli scholarship; see Chanoch Albeck, "The *Book of Jubilees* and the *Halakhah*," *Jewish Studies* 45 (2009): 3-48 (Hebrew).

tive motifs that were generated in Jewish texts from antiquity in response to cues in the biblical text. *Jubilees* is frequently adduced by Kugel as a repository of such motifs.<sup>29</sup> It has been analyzed by scholars, including Devorah Dimant (1939-; Professor for Ancient Jewish Literature at the University of Haifa) and Cana Werman (1957-; Professor at Ben-Gurion University), as a paradigmatic example of Rewritten Bible, in which the revision was performed in order to express a specific ideology and theology.<sup>30</sup> Most recently, the book has been subject to a number of studies that have identified secondary passages within the book, or even a more extensive process of literary development according to which the author-editor of the book adopted extant sources and adapted them to a new literary context.<sup>31</sup> The question of the literary milieu in which *Jubilees* was composed has been the matter of scholarly debate. While there is general agreement today that it was composed during the second century BCE, there is still no consensus whether it was written as a polemic against external, Hellenistic influences during the reign of Antiochus IV, or against internal, Jewish opponents during the rise of sectarianism later in the same century.<sup>32</sup> Following the

<sup>29</sup> This approach is found in much of Kugel's writings, but is concentrated in James L. Kugel, *The Bible as It Was* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997); *Traditions of the Bible* (Cambridge, Mass.-London: Harvard University Press, 1998).

<sup>30</sup> Devorah Dimant, "Sons of Heaven – Angelology in the Book of Jubilees in Light of the Qumran Sectarian Writings," in Moshe Idel, Devorah Dimant and Shalom Rosenberg, eds., *Tribute to Sara: Studies in Jewish Philosophy and Kabbala Presented to Prof. Sara Heller Wilensky* (Jerusalem, Magnes, 1994), 97-118 (Hebrew.); "The Biblical Basis of the Non-Biblical Additions: The Binding of Isaac in Jubilees in Light of the Story of Job," *Connected Vessels: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Literature of the Second Temple Period* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2010), 348-68 (Hebrew); Cana Werman, *The Attitude Towards Gentiles in the Book of Jubilees and Qumran Literature Compared with Early Tanaaic Halakha and Contemporary Pseudepigrapha* (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1995) (Hebrew); "The Story of the Flood in the Book of Jubilees," *Tarbiz* 64 (1995): 183-202 (Hebrew); "Jubilees 30: Building a Paradigm for the Ban on Inter-marriage," *HTR* 90 (1997): 1-22; Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (JSJSup 117; Leiden: Brill, 2007).

<sup>31</sup> See Devorah Dimant, "The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch," *VT* 33 (1983): 14-29 (21 n. 17); Menahem Kister, "Some Aspects of Qumranic Halakha," in Trebolle Barrera and Vegas Montaner, *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 2:571-88; Cana Werman, "Qumran and the Book of Noah," in Esther G. Chazon and Michael E. Stone, eds., *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center, 12-14 January 1997* (STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 171-81; Liora Ravid, "The Relationship of the Sabbath Laws in Jubilees 50:6-13 to the Rest of the Book," *Tarbiz* 69 (2000): 161-6 (Hebrew); Michael Segal, "Law and Narrative in Jubilees: The Story of the Entrance into the Garden of Eden Revisited," *Meghillot* 1 (2003): 111-25 (Hebrew); Menahem Kister, "Syncellus and the Sources of Jubilees 3: A Note on M. Segal's Article," *Meghillot* 1 (2003): 127-33 (Hebrew); Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*; James L. Kugel, "On the Interpolations in the 'Book of Jubilees,'" *RevQ* 24 (2009): 215-72.

<sup>32</sup> For a review of the various dates proposed, see Segal, *Book of Jubilees*, 35-40.

proposal of Menahem Kister, Werman and Segal have also interpreted the book as an inner-Jewish polemic against those groups that reflect different legal and calendrical systems.<sup>33</sup>

Related to *Jubilees*, but not identical to it, are a number of texts that were given the title *Pseudo-Jubilees* (4Q225-4Q227).<sup>34</sup> These works share certain motifs and vocabulary with *Jubilees*, such as the character שר המשטמה, and his presence at the Aqedah (4Q225 2 i; *Jubilees* 17-18); or Enoch's sojourn in heaven as "six jubilees of years" (4Q227 2 2; *Jub.* 4:21). While many scholars (and perhaps the original editors) assume that these works are a sort of "Rewritten *Jubilees*", the precise relationship between these scrolls and *Jubilees* needs to be defined more carefully.<sup>35</sup>

### *Genesis Apocryphon (1QapGen, 1Q20)*

As noted above, the *Genesis Apocryphon* was the first Qumran scroll discovered that can be categorized as Rewritten Bible. The original edition included only five columns (II, XIX-XXII), the best preserved of the manuscript. Subsequently, the "second generation" of Israeli scholars reissued new readings of the previously published material, in addition to editions of the hitherto unpublished material, and they succeeded in significantly expanding the quantity of available material preserved in that scroll.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>33</sup> Menahem Kister, "Concerning the History of the Essenes: A Study of the *Animal Apocalypse*, the *Book of Jubilees*, and the *Damascus Covenant*," *Tarbiz* 56 (1986): 1-18 (5-9) (Hebrew); Werman, *Attitude*, 30-35; "The *Book of Jubilees* and the Qumran Community," *Meghillot* 2 (2004): 37-55 (Hebrew); Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 319-22.

<sup>34</sup> These scrolls were published by VanderKam and Milik in DJD XIII alongside the cave 4 manuscripts of *Jubilees*. See also the single fragment from Masada published by Shemaryahu Talmon, "Fragments of Extra-Biblical Works," in "Hebrew Fragments from Masada," *Masada VI: Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965, Final Reports* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society 1999), 117-19, which he took to be part of *Jubilees* or *Pseudo-Jubilees* (MasJub or MaspsJub), and the subsequent analysis of Esther Eshel, "Mastema's Attempt on Moses' Life in the 'Pseudo-Jubilees' Text from Masada," *DSD* 10 (2003): 359-64.

<sup>35</sup> This question was addressed by Atar Livneh, as part of her doctoral dissertation at the University of Haifa, *The Composition Pseudo-Jubilees from Qumran (4Q225; 4Q226; 4Q227): A New Edition, Introduction, and Commentary* (Hebrew), under the direction of Devorah Dimant. On the basis of differences in content and form, Livneh argued that 4Q227 may not be a copy of the same work copied in 4Q225-4Q226 (203-4). See also my suggestion in "The Chronological Redaction of the Book of Jubilees," in Moshe Bar-Asher et al., eds., *Shai le-Sara Japhet: Studies in the Bible, its Exegesis and its Language* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2007), 372, n. 12 (Hebrew), that perhaps the reference to "six jubilees of years" was borrowed by *Jubilees* from a work such as 4Q227, and not in the reverse direction as is usually assumed. In that case, the title "pseudo-Jubilees" would be inappropriate.

<sup>36</sup> Jonas C. Greenfield, and Elisha Qimron, "The Genesis Apocryphon Column XII," in Takamitsu Muraoka, ed., *Studies in Qumran Aramaic* (AbrNSup 3; Leuven: Peeters, 1992),

Much of the discussion among scholars of the *Apocryphon* relates to the process of its literary development, including its relationship to *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees* and a presumed “Book of Noah”.<sup>37</sup> Three main possibilities for the relationship between these works and the *Apocryphon* have been suggested by scholars (although not necessarily by Israeli scholars): the *Apocryphon* is a source for *Jubilees* or *1 Enoch*; the *Apocryphon* is dependent on these compositions; or they are dependent on a common source (such as the Book of Noah).<sup>38</sup> Avigad and Yadin, in their publication of the text, suggested that the *Apocryphon* is more likely the source for *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* than influence in the opposite direction.<sup>39</sup> This position was criticized by David Flusser (1917-2000; Professor of Judaism in the Second Temple Period and Christianity, Hebrew University of Jerusalem), who questioned whether this position could indeed be offered so definitively given the paucity of preserved material.<sup>40</sup> More recently, Cana Werman has defended the priority of the *Apocryphon* vis-à-vis *Jubilees*, based upon her analysis of a number of parallel passages, including Noah’s sacrifices (1QapGen X; *Jubilees* 6), his planting of the vineyard following the Flood and observance of the laws of fourth-year fruits (1QapGen XII; *Jubilees* 7);<sup>41</sup> and the world map reflected in the division of the land to Noah’s descendants.<sup>42</sup> In the first examples,

---

70-77; Matthew Morgenstern, Elisha Qimron, and Daniel Sivan, “The Hitherto Unpublished Columns of the Genesis Apocryphon,” *AbrN* 33 (1995): 30-54.

<sup>37</sup> This was the title assigned to 1Q19 (“1QLivre de Noé”) by Milik, a Hebrew scroll that contains a story parallel to the miraculous birth story of Noah in 1QapGen I-V and *1 Enoch* 106-107. See further Michael E. Stone, “Noah, Books of,” in *Encyclopedia Judaica* (1972), 12:1198 (this entry was unchanged in the second edition of the *Encyclopedia* released in 2007, as were almost all of those that relate to Jewish literature of the Second Temple period, an inexcusable oversight by the editors in light of the major advances in the field since the first edition). Many smaller fragments, such as those found in 1Q19, rework biblical material in various ways. Ariel Feldman has re-edited and analysed several of them in his Ph.D. dissertation, *The Story of the Flood in the Texts from Qumran* (1Q19, 4Q370, 4Q422, 4Q464, 4Q577) (University of Haifa, 2008).

<sup>38</sup> The scholarship on the *Apocryphon* was recently surveyed by Daniel A. Machiela, *The Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20): A Reevaluation of its Text, Interpretive Character, and Relationship to the Book of Jubilees* (Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame, 2007), 1-63, subsequently published as *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13-17* (STDJ 79; Leiden: Brill, 2009). I am indebted to him in this discussion. As noted by Machiela, *The Genesis Apocryphon*, 20, the direction of influence does not have to be the same in the cases of both *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*.

<sup>39</sup> Avigad and Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon*, 16-19.

<sup>40</sup> Flusser, “Review of *A Genesis Apocryphon*,” 382-3.

<sup>41</sup> See Werman, “Qumran and the Book of Noah”. Regarding the laws of the fourth-year fruits, she was preceded in this argument by Kister, “Some Aspects of Qumranic Halakha,” who is concerned more in this article with the presence of multiple traditions in *Jubilees*.

<sup>42</sup> Cana Werman, “The Book of Jubilees in a Hellenistic Context,” *Zion* 66 (2001): 275-96 (Hebrew).

Werman posits that the differences found in the longer versions of *Jubilees* reflect “priestly” interests, while the latter is evidence of the influence of Hellenistic scientific knowledge. This discussion continues until today.<sup>43</sup>

### *Aramaic Levi Document*

The *Aramaic Levi Document* (ALD), preserved in seven fragmentary manuscripts from Qumran (1Q21, 4Q213, 4Q213a, 4Q213b, 4Q214, 4Q214a, 4Q214b), and in a much more complete copy in the Cairo Genizah, was reconstructed and interpreted in a series of studies by Jonas Greenfield (1926-1995) and Michael Stone (1938-), both Professors at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.<sup>44</sup> Following Greenfield’s death, Stone invited Esther Eshel of Bar Ilan University to collaborate with him in the preparation of a complete edition of the reconstructed text, a translation, and a commentary.<sup>45</sup> This composition presents numerous traditions about the priestly figure Levi, many based upon the biblical descriptions of this character, and therefore of significance for the study of ancient biblical interpretation. In this case too, the composition is literarily related to *Jubilees*, and scholars have debated the direction of this relationship: Stone and Eshel have posited the priority of *ALD*, dating it from the third to late second century BCE,<sup>46</sup> while Kugel has vehemently argued for the reverse relationship, dating *ALD* to the late second century BCE.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>43</sup> At a recent international conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls (July 2008, Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum), James Kugel attempted to demonstrate that *Jubilees* was the earlier of the two works, based upon the absence there of exegetical motifs found in the *Genesis Apocryphon*. However, he did not address the many aspects of *Jubilees* that are lacking from the *Apocryphon*. I have recently attempted to demonstrate the opposite relationship in Michael Segal, “The Literary Relationship between the *Genesis Apocryphon* and *Jubilees*: The Chronology of Abram and Sarai’s Descent to Egypt,” *Aramaic Studies* 8 (2010): 71-88.

<sup>44</sup> Jonas C. Greenfield and Michael E. Stone, “Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi from the Geniza,” *RB* 86 (1979): 214-30; “The Aramaic and Greek Fragment+s of a Levi Document,” in Harm W. Hollander and Marinus de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (SVTP 8; Brill: Leiden, 1985), 457-69; “Two Notes on the Aramaic Levi Document,” in Harold W. Attridge, John J. Collins and Thomas H. Tobin, eds., *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins Presented to John Strugnell on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday* (Lanham: University Press, 1990), 153-61.

<sup>45</sup> Jonas C. Greenfield, Michael E. Stone and Esther Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary* (SVTP 19; Leiden: Brill, 2004).

<sup>46</sup> Greenfield, Stone and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 19-22.

<sup>47</sup> See James Kugel, “How Old is the *Aramaic Levi Document*?” *DSD* 14 (2007): 291-312. Kugel dates *Jubilees* to the early second century BCE, prior to the date assumed by most scholars today; see Kugel, “How Old?” 297.

*Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*

Following the appointment of Emanuel Tov as Editor-in-Chief of the Dead Sea Scrolls publication project, the rate of publication of the Scrolls in the DJD series increased exponentially. Four volumes were published with the title *Parabiblical Texts* (Parts I-IV), each containing compositions that relate to the biblical compositions to some degree: DJD XIII, XIX, XXII, XXX.<sup>48</sup> The final volume is dedicated to compositions that rewrite or interpret books from the Later Prophets, 4QPseudo-Ezekiel (4Q385, 4Q385b, 4Q385c, 4Q386, 4Q388) and 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah (4Q383, 4Q385a, 4Q387, 4Q387a, 4Q388a, 4Q389, 4Q390). Of all of these volumes, this is the only one prepared exclusively by an Israeli scholar, Devorah Dimant of the University of Haifa. The fragments of these two compositions were originally assigned to John Strugnell, who invited Dimant in 1985 to join him in the editorial process. Both scholars originally assumed that all of these scrolls preserved the same composition, *Pseudo-Ezekiel*.<sup>49</sup> In Dimant's subsequent work, however, she distinguished between multiple compositions reflected in the different scrolls, so that in addition to the one related to Ezekiel, she also identified a work pseudepigraphically attributed to Moses and another to Jeremiah.<sup>50</sup> In the final publication in DJD XXX, the manuscripts that relate to Ezekiel kept the title *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, while the others were assigned the title *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*. The former mention Ezekiel by name, and rework many of his prophecies, often of an eschatological nature. The latter composition presents a historical apocalypse, attributed to Jeremiah, which reviews the events from the biblical era until the eschaton. This work draws chiefly from Deuteronomy and Jeremiah (hence the initial confusion between attribution to Moses or Jeremiah), and offers many interesting parallels to other Jewish works of the Second Temple period, such as the Enochic *Animal Apocalypse*, *Jubilees*, and the

<sup>48</sup> Harold W. Attridge et al., in consultation with James C. VanderKam, *Qumran Cave 4. VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (DJD XIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994); Magen Broshi et al., in consultation with James C. VanderKam, *Qumran Cave 4. XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995); George J. Brooke et al., in consultation with James C. Vanderkam, *Qumran Cave 4. XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD XXII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996); Devorah Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4. XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (DJD XXX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001).

<sup>49</sup> John Strugnell and Devorah Dimant, "4Q Second Ezekiel," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 45-58; "The Merkabah Vision in Second Ezekiel (4Q385 4)," *RevQ* 14 (1990): 331-48.

<sup>50</sup> Devorah Dimant, "An Apocryphon of Jeremiah from Cave 4 (4Q385b = 4Q385 16)," in George J. Brooke, ed., *New Qumran Texts and Studies* (STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 11-30; "A Discourse about the Past from the Writing Pseudo-Moses - 4Q389 2," in Hoffman and Polak, *A Light for Jacob*, 220-6 (Hebrew).



*Damascus Document*.<sup>51</sup> Werman adopted Dimant's intermediate position, and argued for the existence of three compositions, including 4QPseudo-Moses (4Q390).<sup>52</sup>

### *1 Enoch*

The Aramaic book *1 Enoch* was preserved in seven fragmentary copies at Qumran (4Q201-4Q202, 4Q204-4Q207, 4Q212), in addition to four copies of the *Astronomical Book* (*1 Enoch* 72-82; 4Q208-4Q211). While much of the composition does not necessarily relate directly to the field of biblical interpretation, certain sections, and in particular the *Book of the Watchers* (Chapters 1-36) recount the brief, enigmatic story in Gen 6:1-4 of divine beings who have intercourse with women, leading to the birth of the giants. In the Genesis account, this passage immediately precedes the Flood narrative, and early exegetical traditions explicitly connect the two, both causally and chronologically. The most comprehensive analysis of the extensive Watchers traditions complex within Ancient Judaism remains Devorah Dimant's doctoral dissertation, which traces these motifs through a number of compositions, with special emphasis on the material in *1 Enoch*.<sup>53</sup> More recently, Dimant has suggested that *1 Enoch* 6-11 is unique among the rest of the Enochic corpus, which consists primarily of apocalyptic visions and parenetic discourses. Instead, these specific chapters are generically similar to rewritten biblical texts from the Second Temple period in their treatment of Gen 6:1-14, following the general order of the biblical text and even citing Gen 6:1-2. Dimant further conjectured that the "source" for this composition was a *Hebrew* parabiblical composition, based upon various plays on words in these chapters that only make sense in Hebrew.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>51</sup> See Dimant's extensive introduction to the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* in *Qumran Cave 4.XXI* (DJD XXX), 91-116.

<sup>52</sup> Cana Werman, "Epochs and End-Time: The 490-Year Scheme in Second Temple Literature," *DSD* 13 (2006): 229-55. See the criticism of Werman's analysis in Devorah Dimant, "Pseudo-Ezekiel and the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* in Perspective," *RevQ* 25 (2011): 17-39.

<sup>53</sup> Devorah Dimant, *"The Fallen Angels" in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic Books Related to Them* (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1974) (Hebrew).

<sup>54</sup> Devorah Dimant, "1 Enoch 6-11: A Fragment of a Parabiblical Work," *JJS* 53 (2002): 223-37.

### *Pesharim*

The study of the *pesharim* as biblical interpretation took a major step forward with the commentary of Bilhah Nitzan (1933-; Professor of Bible, Tel Aviv University) on the best preserved of those texts, the *Pesher of Habakkuk*.<sup>55</sup> In this edition, originally written as an M.A. thesis at Tel Aviv University, under the direction of Jacob Licht, Nitzan presented a fresh reading of that scroll and offered extensive commentary, concerning both its possible historical references and more important in the context of the description here, an analysis of some of the interpretive aspects of the *pesher*. Nitzan's chapter on these aspects is among the best written on the subject.<sup>56</sup> Another important contribution to the study of the *pesher* genre was Menahem Kister's demonstration that the phenomenon of *pesher* interpretation is not limited to those compositions in which it is explicitly marked as such, but can be found implicitly in numerous sectarian compositions.<sup>57</sup>

### *Qumran and Second Temple Biblical Exegesis as a Forerunner of Rabbinic Interpretation*

Despite the growth of the field of early biblical exegesis, for many years it continued to be perceived as fundamentally different from later works that explicitly interpret the Bible, such as rabbinic midrash and medieval exegesis. This approach appears to lie at the root of the omission from the *Encyclopedia Miqrait* entry of "Bible, Interpretation,"<sup>58</sup> of any pre-rabbinic biblical interpretation. The editor of this entry, Moshe Greenberg (1928-

<sup>55</sup> Bilhah Nitzan, *Pesher Habakkuk: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judea (1QpHab)* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1986) (Hebrew). An oft-quoted summary of the *pesher* method of interpretation is Devorah Dimant, "Peshrim, Qumran", *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (1992), 5: 244-51. Many of the studies of *pesher* continue to focus on their value for reconstructing the history of the period; see Hanan Eshel, *The Qumran Scrolls and the Hasmonean State* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben Zvi, 2004) (Hebrew); English trans., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008); "The History of the Qumran Community and Historical Aspects of the *Pesharim*," in Menahem Kister, ed., *The Qumran Scrolls and their World* (2 vols.; Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2009), 1:191-207 (Hebrew).

<sup>56</sup> Nitzan, *Pesher Habakkuk*, 29-79.

<sup>57</sup> Menahem Kister, "Biblical Phrases and Hidden Biblical Interpretation and 'Pesharim'," in Devorah Dimant and Uri Rappaport, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 27-39. Along similar lines Liora Goldman has analyzed explicit and non-explicit *pesharim* embedded in the *Damascus Document*. See her Ph.D dissertation, *Bible Interpretation and Pesher Exegesis in the Damascus Document* (University of Haifa, 2008) (Hebrew).

<sup>58</sup> "תנ"ך, פרשנות", *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (9 vols.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1955-1988), 8:641-737 (Hebrew). The same entry was later published as a monograph: Moshe Green-



2010; Professor of Bible, Hebrew University of Jerusalem), briefly mentions the *pesharim*, but omitted them from his discussion since they do not relate to the biblical text in a sequentially coherent fashion (col. 641). Furthermore, this entry only addresses those works that viewed the biblical text as set and unchangeable (col. 642). This limitation excludes many examples of biblical interpretation in the Second Temple period, perhaps most prominently those under the rubric of Rewritten Bible, which lie on the border of text and interpretation. These limitations, however, reflect a conception that biblical interpretation only truly began in the rabbinic period, while downplaying the significance of the earlier material for the history of biblical interpretation.

In more recent studies of biblical interpretation in the Second Temple period, Israeli (or Jewish) scholars in particular have demonstrated that many of the fundamental exegetical assumptions of these texts are shared, or are the subject of debate, with later, rabbinic literature. These commonalities can relate to specific exegetical traditions, whether they are legal or aggadic,<sup>59</sup> or more subtly, can be the result of more general interpretive suppositions shared by Jews in antiquity.<sup>60</sup> The work of James Kugel, in which he often demonstrates the presence of identical or similar exegetical motifs in Second Temple and rabbinic literature, is an extensive demonstration of this common basis, which cuts across sociological, geographical, and chronological boundaries.<sup>61</sup>

### *Publications in Israel Related to Biblical Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls*

Several Hebrew journals and collections of articles on the Scrolls have been published, with some of the studies related directly to the field of biblical interpretation. For many years the primary outlets in Hebrew for publications relating to the Dead Sea Scrolls were the leading Israeli journals in

---

berg, ed., *Jewish Bible Exegesis: An Introduction* (Biblical Encyclopedia Library; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1983) (Hebrew).

<sup>59</sup> See, e.g., Henshke, "On the History of Exegesis of the Pericopes Concerning Tithes"; Maori, "Lev 17:3-4 vs. Deut. 12:15, 20-21."

<sup>60</sup> See the discussion of Menahem Kister, "A Common Heritage: Biblical Interpretation at Qumran and its Implications," in Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon, eds., *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 May, 1996* (STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 101-11; Paul Mandel, "Midrashic Exegesis and Its Precedents in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 8 (2001): 149-68; Aharon Shemesh, "The Penal Code from Qumran and Early Midrash," *Meghillot* 5-6 (2007): 245-68 (Hebrew).

<sup>61</sup> See Kugel, *The Bible as It Was; Traditions of the Bible*.

Jewish and Biblical studies. These included *Tarbiz*; *Shnaton: An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies*; and *Beth Mikra*. However, since the field of the Dead Sea Scrolls is only a small subset of these larger fields, these articles did not appear in a systematic fashion. *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, an annual journal devoted exclusively to the investigation of the finds from the Judean Desert, was founded in 2003. To date, nine volumes of this work have been published, under the auspices of the University of Haifa and the editorship of Devorah Dimant and Moshe Bar-Asher (1939-; Professor of Hebrew Language at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem; President, Academy of the Hebrew Language). Numerous articles related to biblical interpretation, and specifically in the Dead Sea Scrolls, have appeared there.

A recent collection of essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls published by the Ben-Zvi Institute, which contains articles by leading Israeli scholars in the field, reflects the first full-length introduction written originally in Hebrew.<sup>62</sup> While the aim of the collection is to give an overview of the Scrolls themselves, in addition to the history and current state of scholarship on them, it is only natural that the various articles emphasize the contributions of Israeli scholars more than other introductions. Among the various contributions, one finds chapters on Rewritten Bible, the *peshtarim*, and biblical interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>63</sup>

The Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature convenes annual or biannual international conferences on topics related to the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the proceedings of these meetings have been published by Brill. These volumes offer a window into the state of international scholarship on many central questions in Qumran scholarship, but even more specifically, due to the presence of numerous Israeli scholars at the symposia, into the world of Israeli scholarship. Three of the meetings (and conference volumes) relate directly to the fields of biblical interpretation and Rewritten Bible,<sup>64</sup> while other volumes also contain some relevant studies.

In a project under the auspices of the Institute of Jewish Studies at the Hebrew University, Yair Zakovitch and Avigdor Shinan have jointly pro-

<sup>62</sup> Kister, *The Qumran Scrolls and their World*.

<sup>63</sup> Israel Knohl, "The Bible Reworked at Qumran: The Temple Scroll and 4QReworked Pentateuch," in Kister, *The Qumran Scrolls and their World*, 1:157-68 (Hebrew); Bilhah Nitzan, "The Peshtarim Scrolls from Qumran," in Kister, *The Qumran Scrolls and their World*, 1:169-90 (Hebrew); Ya'akov Kaduri (James Kugel), "Biblical Interpretation at Qumran," in Kister, *The Qumran Scrolls and their World*, 2:387-408 (Hebrew).

<sup>64</sup> Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon, eds., *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the First International*

duced a collection of monograph-length analyses of the history of interpretation of various biblical stories, beginning with inner-biblical exegesis, continuing through postbiblical literature (including the Dead Sea Scrolls) all the way to late rabbinic literature. These volumes contain a treasure trove of ancient sources and explanatory comments on the stories in question, accompanied by the authors' brief analysis of these individual references, in addition to a broader overview of general trends of interpretation of the particular passage.<sup>65</sup>

*Evaluation of the Present State of Qumran Research in Light of its History*

The study of biblical interpretation and Rewritten Bible has made major strides since the discovery of the Scrolls sixty years ago. Many of the compositions previously known to us are now understood more appropriately in their literary and exegetical context. New compositions have been discovered, published, and interpreted, and are now part of the scholarly discussion of biblical exegesis during this period. Hitherto unknown genres of interpretive literature have been revealed, and allow us to appreciate the richness and variety of these works.

Despite all of the advances, there are still areas of inquiry that remain open, and which are worthy of consideration:

(1) More work is necessary on the identification and description of the various exegetical techniques used in the various scrolls.<sup>66</sup> This will allow for a more precise understanding of the nature of these scrolls, including their genre and function. Furthermore, the classification of the exegetical techniques also allows for a comparison of different works to see whether or not they reflect similar (or identical) compositions.

---

*Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 May, 1996* (STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998); *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center, 12-14 January 1997* (STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999); Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant and Ruth A. Clements, eds., *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran. Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran, 15-17 January, 2002* (STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005).

<sup>65</sup> Five volumes appeared in this series (Jerusalem: Institute for Jewish Studies of the Hebrew University, 1983-1992), covering the following biblical passages: Gen 12:10-20; 30:14-18; 33:18-20; 35:21-26; 38.

<sup>66</sup> For an example of such a study, see Michael Segal, "Biblical Exegesis in 4Q158: Techniques and Genre," *Textus* 19 (1998): 45-62.

(2) The border between biblical and parabiblical compositions is still not defined clearly, and perhaps more precision needs to be used in distinguishing between these two groups.<sup>67</sup> This categorization has fundamental implications for how we understand the relationship between the Bible and the various layers of its interpretation. The Qumran discoveries, along with other Rewritten Bible texts known from the Second Temple period, have taught us that this border is less clear than was previously assumed. While it is possible that the nature of the material limits our ability to come to a final conclusion or consensus in this area, the analysis of the question will perhaps lead to greater clarity regarding both the final stages of the development of biblical literature, and the earliest stages of its interpretation.

(3) Many of the original classifications and titles assigned to the exegetical scrolls at Qumran can and should be reevaluated. Oftentimes, the labels assigned to the published scrolls by their DJD editors have determined scholarly interpretive assumptions and inquiries. Examples of such reconsiderations appear above, such as the difference between 4QReworked Pentateuch and 4QPentateuch; 4QSamuel and 4QMidrash Samuel; and *Pseudo-Jubilees* and some alternate possibility. In order to accomplish this, we must let the texts speak for themselves, moving past the confines of the original editors' conclusions regarding the identification and genres of the various compositions.<sup>68</sup>

(4) Specifically in the field of biblical interpretation, there are still many unidentified links between the Dead Sea Scrolls and rabbinic literature. This later corpus far outstrips any other body of biblical interpretation in its varieties of interpretation and their scope. Inroads have already been made in this direction, but it is likely that these two interpretive worlds contain many more common exegetical motifs and techniques. The study of each of these corpora will therefore complement one another, furthering our understanding of each body of literature and its view of the biblical text.

---

<sup>67</sup> Moshe J. Bernstein, "'Rewritten Bible': A Generic Commentary Which has Outlived its Usefulness?," *Textus* 22 (2005): 169-96 called for such precision in terminology.

<sup>68</sup> These comments are in no way intended to criticize the DJD editors for their expert preparation of the Scrolls, but rather to note that they themselves are interpreters of the texts, in the same way as are all other scholars. Their assessments are significant but should not be binding.



# THE LITURGICAL TEXTS FROM QUMRAN IN ISRAELI RESEARCH

BILHAH NITZAN

## *Introduction*

The Torah prescribes worship of God through the sacrificial cult. So prayers that appear in the biblical literature and most of the apocryphal writings are only recited by individuals, in public on specific occasions,<sup>1</sup> or as popular and other accompaniments to the sacrificial cult.<sup>2</sup> The Qumran community, critical of the Second Temple sacrificial cult as polluted, or performed according to an erroneous calendar,<sup>3</sup> replaced the sacrificial cult by prayers recited at the fixed sanctified times (1QS IX, 4-5; X, 1-8; 1QH<sup>a</sup> XX, 7-14 [XII, 4-11]). Extant Qumran texts show that this substitution was actualized in the community's liturgy. The relevant texts include daily benedictions (4Q503), weekly prayers (4Q504, 4Q506), Sabbath songs (4QShir-Shabb = 4Q400-4Q407; 11Q17; MasShirShabb), and festival prayers (4Q507-4Q509; 1Q34bis).

Given the similarities between these Qumranic texts and the institutionalized rabbinic liturgy that replaced the sacrificial cult after the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE, it has been suggested that such a liturgical tradition existed in Israel generally in the Second Temple period, and that the Qumran evidence is related to it. Research on this issue by Israeli scholars is surveyed below.

### *Shemaryahu Talmon (1920-2010)*

Shemaryahu Talmon was the first Israeli scholar to observe the similarity of certain Qumran prayers to Jewish prayers dated to the Second Temple period. Working with the Qumran texts available before the publication of

---

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. Daniel 9; Ezra 9:6-15; Neh 1:5-11; 9:4-37.

<sup>2</sup> The only statutory recitations in the Temple were the Levites' singing of specific psalms (*m. Tamid* 7:4), the recitations of the High Priest on the Day of Atonement (*m. Yoma* 3:8, 4:2), and the priestly blessing (Ben Sira 50:20).

<sup>3</sup> See CD III, 14-15; the *Pesher of Hosea* (4Q166 ii 16); 4QMMT A-C 8.

the manuscripts from caves 4 and 11, he analyzed the psalmodic passage for “the Appointed Times” in the *Community Rule* (1QS X, 1-8) and the *Thanksgiving Scroll* (1QH<sup>a</sup> XX, 7-14[XII, 4-11]).<sup>4</sup> Talmon labeled these sections “The Manual of Benedictions of the Sect of the Judean Desert.” Talmon, as well as other scholars,<sup>5</sup> realized that these passages referred to a sequence of daily, Sabbath, festival, and new-month prayers, identical to the times of the sacrificial cult.<sup>6</sup> In this they accord with the general Jewish tradition. However, the passages from the two scrolls also refer to blessings and a liturgical recitation for the beginning of the seven-year *shemittah* and the Jubilee cycles, and hence are associated with the 364-day calendar; this principle expresses a singular sectarian view.<sup>7</sup>

In the second part of the sectarian “Manual of Benedictions” Talmon distinguishes those prayers recited privately, such as the morning and evening benedictions (1QS X, 10) and the *Shema*’ (1QS X, 13-14), from those recited in public (1QS X, 14-17).<sup>8</sup> In the absence of other Qumran texts, in his first publications Talmon supported his conclusions with biblical allusions and rabbinic prayers.

In a later article<sup>9</sup> Talmon recognizes the difference in Second Temple times between synagogues used by mainstream Jewish society for reading scriptures<sup>10</sup> and the institutions of the Qumran community. According to the *Damascus Document* (CD XI, 21-XII, 1) the Qumranites assembled for public prayer in “the house of prostration” (בית השתחווה). This institu-

<sup>4</sup> Shemaryahu Talmon, “The ‘Manual of Benedictions’ of the Sect of the Judean Desert,” *RevQ* 2 (1959-1960): 475-500.

<sup>5</sup> See Jacob Licht, *The Rule Scroll* (Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 1965), 187-90, 204-11 (Hebrew).

<sup>6</sup> Talmon, “The ‘Manual of Benedictions,’” 481-4 proposes three daily benedictions (cf. Dan 6:11; Ps 55:17-18) as times for prayer, and in addition three night benedictions according to the division of the night into three watches (cf. 1QS X, 1-3; *b. Ber.* 3b; *t. Ber.* 1.3; *y. Ber.* 1.1[2d]). Later Bilhah Nitzan suggested only two daily benedictions, at the transitional points of the appearance of the heavenly luminaries in the morning and the evening (1QS X, 1-3, 10; 1QM XIV, 12-14; 4Q503), which are also the times of the daily sacrifices. See Bilhah Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 52-57.

<sup>7</sup> Talmon, “The ‘Manual of Benedictions,’” 486-8. See also Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 59.

<sup>8</sup> Talmon, “The ‘Manual of Benedictions,’” 488-9, 491-3.

<sup>9</sup> Shemaryahu Talmon, “The Emergence of Institutionalized Prayer in Israel in the Light of the Qumran Literature,” in Delcor, *Qumrân, sa piété*, 266-84. An enlarged version of this article was published in Shemaryahu Talmon, *The World of Qumran from Within* (Jerusalem-Leiden: Magnes-Brill, 1989), 200-43.

<sup>10</sup> See e.g. Jesus’ custom to teach the Scriptures at the synagogues on Sabbath (Matt 9:35; 13:34; Mark 1:21; 6:2; Luke 1:15-21, 31; John 6:59; 18:20); Lee I. Levine, “The Second Temple Synagogue: The Formative Years,” *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia: ASOR, 1987), 7-31; “The Nature and Origin of the Palestinian Synagogue Reconsidered,” *JBL* 115 (1996): 425-48.

tion, Talmon thought, was equivalent to the Greek *proskynese*, rather than a *synagogue*, and appeared to have focused on the prayer service held at that place.<sup>11</sup>

*David Flusser (1917-2000)*

David Flusser showed the similarity, both verbal and ideological, between the Qumranic work *Mysteries* (1Q27 1 i 5-7; 4Q300 3 4-6) and the prayer *Aleinu le-shabeah* recited in the daily *Amidah* prayer and repeatedly in the prayers for *Rosh Hashanah*.<sup>12</sup> Flusser stressed the affinity of the eschatological ideas expressed in the two passages, and suggested that such motifs were already current in Judaism in the Second Temple period. He mentioned Ben Sira 35:22-23, and the Qumranic sectarian apocalyptic theology of the struggle between justice and wickedness (e.g. 1QS IV, 18-19) ending in the absolute annihilation of wickedness, which will prepare the way for establishing the reign of justice forever (cf. Dan 2:44; 7:14; 1QM XII, 16; XIX, 8). Flusser concluded that this motif was current in wide sectors of Jewry in the Land of Israel in the Second Temple period.<sup>13</sup>

*Moshe Weinfeld (1925-2009)*

Moshe Weinfeld also sought the common provenance of the general Jewish prayers and those offered at Qumran.<sup>14</sup> His comparative research has recourse to a wide spectrum of sources: ancient Near Eastern documents, the Hebrew Bible, Ben Sira, liturgical and poetical texts from caves 4 and 11, and the rabbinic liturgy.<sup>15</sup> Within this spectrum, Weinfeld particularly emphasizes the development of the biblical customs and ideology. For in-

<sup>11</sup> Talmon, "The Emergence of Institutionalized Prayer," (1989), 241-2.

<sup>12</sup> David Flusser, "The 'Book of Mysteries' and a Synagogal Prayer," in Shulamit Elizur et al., eds., *Kneset Ezra: Literature and Life in the Synagogue; Studies Presented to Ezra Fleischer* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 1994), 3-20 (Hebrew).

<sup>13</sup> On this point Flusser tried to clarify the issue raised by Ezra Fleischer regarding the place where this motif was inserted into the *Amidah* prayer, in Babylon or in Palestine. See Ezra Fleischer, *Eretz-Israel Prayer and Prayers Rituals* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988), 129-32 (Hebrew).

<sup>14</sup> Moshe Weinfeld, "Prayer and Liturgical Practice in the Qumran Sect," in Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (STDJ 10; Leiden-Jerusalem: Brill-Magnes, 1992), 241-58 (241).

<sup>15</sup> See Moshe Weinfeld, "The Angelic Song over the Luminaries in the Qumran Texts," in Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman, eds., *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilder-*



stance, the reading of the *Shema*, alluded to in 1QS, X 13 by referring to Deut 6:7, reflects, in Weinfeld's opinion, the obligation to observe God's commandments (1QS X, 10). Weinfeld likens this to the rabbinic custom of reading Deut 11:13-21 and Num 15:37-41 as part of the *Shema* (*m. Ber.* 2:2). Another such shared liturgical element is found in the prayer for Sabbath. Weinfeld shows that the Qumran benedictions for Sabbath, preserved in 4Q503, contain formulas similar to those found in the early versions of the rabbinic Sabbath *Amidah* prayer, attested in the Genizah manuscripts. Some of the elements of these prayers are based on Gen 2:3, Exod 20:11, and Isa 58:13, and reappear in *Jubilees* 2:31-32. The appearance of biblical motifs related to the Sabbath in the prayers of different streams of Judaism, Weinfeld concludes, reflects a single basic Jewish tradition.

Weinfeld notes that a cluster of ideas and formulations pertaining to motifs of knowledge, repentance and forgiveness is common to certain prayers. This cluster is observable in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran texts, and rabbinic literature.<sup>16</sup> Although the origin of this nexus of ideas is biblical (e.g. 1 Kgs 8:35-36; Hos 6:1-3; Ezek 11:18-20; Ps 25: 4-10), it was particularly developed in the literature of Second Temple times. In the Qumran literature it is found in poetry and liturgy (e.g. 11QPs<sup>a</sup> XIX, 13-15a; 1QH<sup>a</sup> VIII, 16-21[X, 14-19]), in the 4QCommunal Confession (4Q393), and in the weekly prayer of the *Words of the Luminaries* (e.g. 4Q504 1-2 ii 11-15; v 11-17).<sup>17</sup> In the rabbinic prayer it appears in the first three blessings of the middle section of the *Amidah* prayer, "The Dispenser of Knowledge," "He who delights in repentance," and "He who abundantly forgives."

#### *Esther Chazon (1953-)*

Esther Chazon discusses possible evidence of a pre-sectarian liturgy in light of the *Words of the Luminaries*. This scroll was copied around 150 BCE. Chazon notes that the scroll's early dating is also supported by the use of late Biblical Hebrew, its historical allusions to the post-exilic reality, and the

---

ness (STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 132-57; "The Morning Prayers (*Birkhot Hashabhar*) in Qumran and in the Conventional Jewish Liturgy," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 481-94.

<sup>16</sup> Moshe Weinfeld, "The Prayers for Knowledge, Repentance and Forgiveness in the Eighteen Benedictions – Qumran Parallels, Biblical Antecedents, and Basic Characteristics," *Tarbiz* 48 (1979): 187-200 (Hebrew).

<sup>17</sup> On the *Words of the Luminaries* and rabbinic prayers see Esther G. Chazon, *A Liturgical Document from Qumran and Its Implications: "Words of the Luminaries" (4QDibHam)* (P.H. diss.; Hebrew University in Jerusalem, 1991), 103-9; Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 104-11.

absence of specifically sectarian vocabulary and ideas. She therefore suggests that this text may reflect a pre-sectarian Jewish prayer, adopted by the Qumran community and adapted for its weekly prayer.<sup>18</sup> Chazon concludes that the liturgical patterns and ideas shared by this text with features found in other non-sectarian liturgical Qumranic texts may indicate the existence of a general statutory liturgy practiced by Second Temple Judaism.<sup>19</sup>

*Bilhah Nitzan (1933-)*

Another approach to the statutory prayers from Qumran is taken by Bilhah Nitzan. Nitzan argues that the *Daily Prayers* (4Q503), the weekly prayer of the *Words of the Luminaries*, the prayers for the festivals, the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, and others, were intended to replace the sacrificial cult. Such prayers are calqued chiefly on the biblical ideas and customs common to ancient Judaism. Nevertheless, the Qumran prayers attest to a consistent system of liturgical patterns different from the few opening and concluding formulations found in the Bible and the Apocrypha.<sup>20</sup> In addition, these Qumranic prayers are the earliest evidence of rubrics that define the appointed time of each prayer. In the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* these rubrics indicate the times according to the sectarian 364-day calendar, and possibly this also holds for the *Daily Prayers* in 4Q503.<sup>21</sup> However, there is no concrete evidence of any Jewish liturgical statutory prayers prior to the Qumranic ones.<sup>22</sup> Moreover, the similarity of the Qumranic and rabbinic

<sup>18</sup> Chazon, *A Liturgical Document from Qumran*, 81-90.

<sup>19</sup> Chazon, *A Liturgical Document from Qumran*, 115-16.

<sup>20</sup> In biblical poetry there are just two consecutive psalms, 103 and 104, that open and close with the phrase *ברכי נפשי את ה'* ("Bless the Lord, O my soul!"). The closing doxological pattern of *אמן...אמן...לעולם...ברוך ה'* ("Blessed be the Lord...for ever...Amen. Amen") appears only in the closing phrases of the individual books of Psalms (Ps 41:14; 72:19; 89:53; 106:48), but even these are not identical. The phrase *ה' האל הגדול והנורא שמר הברית וההסד לאהביו* ("O Lord, the great and terrible God, who keeps covenant and steadfast love with those who love him and keep his commandments") opens the confessional prayers of Dan 9:4; Neh 1:5; 9:32, based on Deut 10:17 with 7:9 and 1 Kgs 8:23; the doxological phrases that open Tobit's prayer in Tobit 8:5, and open and close his prayer in Tobit 13:2, 19, are not identical.

<sup>21</sup> The daily prayer for the Sabbath of the 25<sup>th</sup> of the first month in 4Q503 37 is calculated according to the 364-day calendar. David Nakhman's suggestion that the 4Q503 dates were written for the year in which, according to *1 Enoch* 74, the 364-day and 354-day calendars are synchronized, does not invalidate the fact that the sectarian calendar figures in 4Q503. See David Nakhman, "When Were the 'Daily Prayers' (4Q503) Said in Qumran?" *Shmathon* 13 (2002): 177-83 (Hebrew).

<sup>22</sup> See Ezra Fleischer, "On the Beginning of the Obligatory Jewish Prayers," *Tarbiz* 59 (1990): 397-442 (Hebrew); Bilhah Nitzan, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Jewish Liturgy,"

liturgies notwithstanding, they evince differences. The absence at Qumran of an overall unifying liturgical system is striking in comparison with the unity characterizing the rabbinic prayers.<sup>23</sup> Thus, the statutory prayers from Qumran may be viewed as earlier than the rabbinic prayers.

### *The Qedushah*

The investigation of the *Qedushah* sheds brighter light on Jewish prayer and its development. This prayer took its cue from Isa 6:3 and Ezek 3:12, and prescribes the triple repetition of the term *qadosh*. The biblical passages attribute this prayer to heavenly creatures. Perhaps this is why a certain reluctance to include it in the regular prayers is evident in post-Biblical literature and liturgy. Nevertheless, in various later works traces of liturgical use of the formula, albeit in literary contexts, are observable. Ithamar Gruenwald points out that in *1 Enoch* 39:12-13 these verses, presented in altered form, are recited by the heavenly angels.<sup>24</sup> Moshe Weinfeld shows that in the Qumran "Hymn to the Creator" for the luminaries (11QPs<sup>a</sup> XXVI, 9) God's holiness is intimated according to Ps 99:3, 5, 9, while in the liturgy of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* and the *Daily Prayers* these verses are not recited.<sup>25</sup> According to the rabbinic liturgy, they are quoted in the morning *Yosher 'Or* blessing and are recited by the celestial angels. In the *Amidah* prayer they are spoken by the congregation of Israel, but are introduced by the qualifying phrase "We shall sanctify thy name in the world even as they sanctify it in the highest heavens, as it is written by the hands of thy prophets."<sup>26</sup> Such a limitation of the recitation of the *Qedushah*, present in all known Second Temple Jewish streams, raises the question of how Judaism then viewed the communion between earthly and heavenly worshippers.

---

in James R. Davila, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity* (STDJ 46, Leiden: Brill, 2003), 195-219.

<sup>23</sup> Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 69-80.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *Adam and Eve* 43:6. See Ithamar Gruenwald, "The Song of the Angels, the 'Qedushah' and the Composition of the Hekhalot Literature," in Aharon Oppenheimer, Uriel Rappaport and Menahem Stern, eds., *Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period: Abraham Schalit Memorial Volume* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 1981), 459-81 (462-3) (Hebrew).

<sup>25</sup> See Weinfeld, "The Angelic Song," 132-5.

<sup>26</sup> Ezra Fleischer observed that the particular structure of the *Qedushah* inserted in the *Amidah* prayer marks it as a specific cultic item, distinguished from other blessings. It suggests that it was integrated into this prayer at a later date. See Ezra Fleischer, "The *Qedushah* of the *Amidah* (and other *Qedushot*): Historical, Liturgical and Ideological Aspects," *Tarbiz* 67 (1998): 301-50 (304) (Hebrew).

1 *Enoch* 39:10-14 carefully distinguishes Enoch's praise of God from that of the angels, whose praise alone is referred to in the *Qedushah* verses. Even the members of the Qumran community, who aspired to be worthy of reciting the praise of God in communion with the heavenly angels (e.g. 1QH<sup>a</sup> XI, 22-24[III, 21-23]; XIV, 15-16[VI, 12-13]; XIX, 13-17[XI, 10-14]; 1QS XI, 7-8) since they considered themselves chosen for this role,<sup>27</sup> did not include the *Qedushah* in their prayers. The relevant verses of Isa 6:3 and Ezek 3:12-13 are absent from their liturgical texts: those that cite the words of the blessings (*Daily Prayers*) as well as those that define the worshipers—earthly and angelic (*4QBerakhot*)—and the liturgical forms of their praise (*Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*).

Various scholars, Israelis and others, have dealt with this datum.<sup>28</sup> Esther Chazon detects echoes of the *Qedushah* in some of the Qumran liturgy: in the invitation of the worshipers to bless the holiness and glorious name of God in 4QBerakhot (4Q286 2 4; 7 i 7; 4Q287 2 8; 3 1);<sup>29</sup> in the three allusions to “holiness” in *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (4Q403 1 i 31); and in the description of the praise of the *Kheruvim* (כְּרוּבִים) under the glorious seat of God (4Q405 20 ii-21-22 7-8).<sup>30</sup> As these texts are recited in communion by human and angelic worshipers, Chazon attributes the absence of the *Qedushah* verses as such to religious reluctance to let human beings utter the angelic *Qedushah*.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>27</sup> For the concept of holiness in the Qumran writings, see Bilhah Nitzan, “The Idea of Holiness in Qumran Poetry and Liturgy,” in Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez and Eileen M. Schuller, eds., *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 127-45.

<sup>28</sup> See Dale C. Allison, “The Silence of Angels: Reflections on the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 189-97; Moshe Weinfeld, “The Heavenly Praise in Unison,” in Irntraut Seybold, ed., *Meqor Hajjim: Festschrift für Georg Molin zu seinem 75. Geburtstag* (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1983), 427-37; Anna M. Schwemer, “Gott und König und seine Königsherrschaft in den Sabbatlieder aus Qumran,” in Martin Hengel and Anna M. Schwemer, eds., *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult in Judentum, Urchristentum und in der Hellenistischen welt* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991), 45-118; Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 296-307; Daniel K. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 138-46; Philip S. Alexander, *The Mystical Texts: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Related Manuscripts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls Series 7; London: T&T Clark International, 2006), 113-14.

<sup>29</sup> See the Prayer of Azaria, 31.

<sup>30</sup> Esther Chazon, “Human and Angelic Prayers in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in Esther Chazon, ed., *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 48; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 35-47 (41-43); “Liturgical Communion with the Angels at Qumran,” in Falk, García Martínez and Schuller, *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetic Texts from Qumran*, 95-105 (98-105).

<sup>31</sup> A similar restriction also appears in *Constitutiones Apostolorum* 7.35.3, in which the *Qedushah* verses are recited by different groups of angels, but Israel praises God by reciting Ps 68:18. But in 8.12.27 all the people recite the *Qedushah* verses in communion with the

In addition to this religious restriction, Bilhah Nitzan suggests a literary reason.<sup>32</sup> The *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* are written in the poetic structure of invitation, a genre related to the songs praising God in the Hebrew Bible and in the apocryphal literature. It is not meant to repeat the words of the hymns but to describe the liturgical expression of the overall praise of God. Hence the *Qedushah* verses are absent from these songs, and so are other words of praise recited by the heavenly and earthly worshipers.<sup>33</sup> In these songs God's holiness is simply referred to as one of his attributes.<sup>34</sup>

It may be concluded that a strict prohibition against reciting the *Qedushah* verses was observed during the Second Temple period, but was breached later by the rabbinic sages. Ezra Fleischer (1928-2006) suggested that the recitation of the *Qedushah* by the congregation of Israel was a later development of the *Amidah*. As mentioned above, he considered this *Qedushah* a specific cultic piece, different from the style of the *Amidah* blessings, but nevertheless inserted between the second and third of these. He regarded the third benediction ("Thou are holy, and thy name is holy, and holy beings praise thee daily (Selah). Blessed are thou, O Lord, the holy God") as an embryonic *Qedushah*, followed by the verses of Isa 6:3 and Ezek 3:12 recited by the holy angels. Like other *Amidah* benedictions this one was also intoned by the Reader in the public prayer. However, according to *t. Ber.* 1.9, Rabbi Judah the Prince customarily spoke these verses aloud together with the Reader, and his response opened the way for the interpretation of the "holy beings" in the third benediction as the congregation of Israel (cf. Isa 29:22-23), and to the formulation of the introduction indicating that the human congregation of the worshipers praise the Lord like the heavenly angels.<sup>35</sup> According to this introduction, the human worshipers are conscious of the ontological difference between the heavenly and human worshipers, considering their recital of the *Qedushah* as completing that of the angels.<sup>36</sup>

---

angelic hosts. See David A. Fiensy, *Prayers Alleged to be Jewish* (BJS 65; Chico: Scholars Press, 1985), 67-68, 109. Fiensy suggests that the reciting of Isa 6:3 by the angels in communion with all peoples in 8.12.27 reflects a Christian custom (153).

<sup>32</sup> See Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 181-9; 287-311; Newsom, *Songs*, 178-80, 195-7; 207-8; 242.

<sup>33</sup> The only cited words in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* are the apology of the human worshipers in 4Q400 2 6-8, and the blessing of God recited by all the chief angelic princes at the conclusion of the sixth Sabbath: "Blessed be the Lord the K[ing of] all, above all blessing and pr[aise]" (4Q403 1 i 28). See Newsom, *Songs*, 189, 195.

<sup>34</sup> See 4Q400 1 i 8; 4Q403 1 i 6-7 (= 11Q17 [III, 3-4]), 31; 4Q405 23 ii 11.

<sup>35</sup> Fleischer, "The *Qedusha* of the *Amidah*," 303-16.

<sup>36</sup> Fleischer, "The *Qedusha* of the *Amidah*," 339.

Most Israeli scholars agree that the similarity of motifs in the Qumranic liturgical and poetic prayers to those of statutory rabbinic liturgy indicates a common Jewish tradition based on the biblical commandments and customs, as well as the post-exilic Jewish ideological hopes of repentance, forgiveness and knowledge of the Torah, of rehabilitation of the relationship between God and Israel, and of annihilation of wickedness for complete salvation. These traditional and ideological motifs have been common to various streams of Judaism since the Second Temple period, and have acquired parallel formulations in the course of history, albeit in different literary and liturgical patterns.



## TRENDS AND THEMES IN ISRAELI RESEARCH OF THE HALAKHAH IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

AHARON SHEMESH

A survey of the research on the Qumran halakhah is not easy, as it should be conducted from different perspectives. The study of the halakhah in the Scrolls began relatively late. During the first decades of Qumran research scholars focused on the historical background of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the nature of the unusual community which authored them. Since the scrolls first published, namely the *pesharim*, the *War Scroll* and the *Rules Scroll*, were of a particular character, the community's social organization and its distinctive beliefs drew most of the scholarly attention. Real interest in the halakhic material of the Scrolls was aroused only during the second phase of Qumran research, following the publication of several of the important halakhic scrolls. First came the *Temple Scroll* (11QT<sup>a</sup>), published in 1977.<sup>1</sup> It was followed by the copies of the *Damascus Document* from cave 4 (4Q266-4Q273), which appeared in print in 1996,<sup>2</sup> and *Miqṣat Ma'āse ha-Torah* (4QMMT), published in 1994.<sup>3</sup> Several other smaller texts on halakhic matters were published mainly in DJD XXXV, which came out in 1999.<sup>4</sup> These publications prompted a growing realization of the importance attributed by the Qumran community to halakhah and to strict observance of the Torah precepts. By situating the halakhah in its rightful central place in the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls this new awareness corrected the neglect of this important issue that had marked Qumran scholarship in the first decades.

---

<sup>1</sup> Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977) (Hebrew). The English version appeared in 1983 under the same title by the same publisher.

<sup>2</sup> Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266-273)* (DJD XVIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

<sup>3</sup> Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqṣat Ma'āse ha-Torah* (DJD X; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).

<sup>4</sup> The exception, which proves the rule, is represented by a series of Hebrew articles about the "half-shekel" published in *Tarbiz* 31 (1961): Jacob Liver, "The Half-Shekel in the Scrolls of the Judean Desert Sect," 18-22, David Flusser, "Matthew 17: 24-27 and the Dead Sea Sect," 150-56, and Moshe Beer "The Sects and the Half-Shekel," 289-99. The three reacted to the first publication of the scroll 4QOrdinances<sup>a</sup> by John Allegro in the same year. See John M. Allegro, "An Unpublished Fragment of Essene Halakhah (4QOrdinances)," *JSS* 6 (1961): 71-73.



Yet the study of the Qumran halakhah was set in motion almost by a “historical accident,” so to speak, long before the Scrolls themselves came to be known in mid-1950s, so its beginnings were unrelated to their discovery. In the late nineteenth century, two copies of the *Damascus Document* were discovered among the Cairo Genizah manuscripts, and were published by Solomon Schechter in 1910;<sup>5</sup> examination of the halakhah started then. Regardless of the various positions taken by those early scholars about the origin of this work—Sadducean (as judged by Solomon Schechter), Pharisee (as considered by Louis Ginzberg<sup>6</sup> and Chaim Rabin<sup>7</sup>), or Karaite (thus defined by Adolf Büchler, Arthur Marmorstein and Solomon Zeitlin<sup>8</sup>)—the significant fact is that already at the beginning of the twentieth century many important contributions were made to the understanding of the halakhic attitude of the *Damascus Document*. These were later incorporated into the study of the Qumran Scrolls when it became obvious that the *Damascus Document* was one of them.

It is also pertinent to the present survey that study of the ancient halakhah started earlier still. Not only are the pioneering studies of early students of Judaic studies, above all Abraham Geiger<sup>9</sup> and Zacharia Fraenkel,<sup>10</sup> relevant, but also later contributions. Among Israeli scholars who invested much effort in this domain, Gedaliahu Alon (1902-1950),<sup>11</sup> Ephraim Elishimelech Urbach (1912-1991),<sup>12</sup> Shmuel Safrai (1919-2003)<sup>13</sup> and Itzhak

<sup>5</sup> Solomon Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries: vol. 1: Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910).

<sup>6</sup> See Louis Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1976). This is a posthumously published work, which partly appeared in the author's lifetime under the title *Eine unbekante jüdische Sekte: erste Teil* (New York, 1922).

<sup>7</sup> Chaim Rabin, *Qumran Studies* (New York: Schocken Books, 1975).

<sup>8</sup> Adolf Büchler, “Schechter's Jewish Sectaries,” *JQR* 3 (1912-1913): 429-58; Arthur Marmorstein, “Eine unbekante jüdische Sekte,” *ThT* 52 (1918): 92-122; Solomon Zeitlin, *The Zadokite Fragments* (JQRMS 1; Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1952), 385-6.

<sup>9</sup> Abraham Geiger, *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der inner Entwicklung des Judentums* (Breslau: Hainauer, 1857).

<sup>10</sup> Zacharias Frankel, *Darke ha-Mishnah ve-darke ha-sefarim ha-nilvim elehem, To-sefta, Mekhila, Sifra, ve-Sifre* (Leipzig: H. Hunger, 1859).

<sup>11</sup> Most of Alon's discussions regarding halakhic issues are assembled in volume 2 of his *Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple, the Mishna and the Talmud* (Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 1967) (Hebrew).

<sup>12</sup> Ephraim E. Urbach, “The *Derashah* as a basis of Halakhah and the Problem of the *Sofrim*,” *Tarbiz* 27 (1958): 166-82 (Hebrew); reprinted in his collected studies *The Halakhah: Its Sources and Development* (Givatayim: Yad LeTalmud, 1984), 69-78 (Hebrew).

<sup>13</sup> Shmuel Safrai, *Pilgrimage at the Time of the Second Temple* (Tel Aviv: Am Hasefer, 1965) (Hebrew); and many of his articles collected in *In Times of Temple and Mishnah: Studies in Jewish History* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1994) (Hebrew).

Gilat (1919-1997) should be mentioned.<sup>14</sup> However, these scholars made hardly any use of the findings yielded by the Dead Sea Scrolls. When they did consider them it was only randomly and in order to support their own positions based on other sources. The present survey of the research on halakhah is therefore confined to studies devoted to the Scrolls and those that use them as their point of departure.

The first Israeli scholars who published editions of scrolls with halakhic materials were Jacob Licht (1922-1993), Yigael Yadin (1917-1984) and Elisha Qimron (1943-). In 1965 Jacob Licht published Hebrew editions and commentaries of the *Rules Scroll*, including the *Community Rule* (1QS), the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa) and the *Rule of Blessings* (1QSB).<sup>15</sup> Yigael Yadin published the *Temple Scroll* (11QT<sup>a</sup>), first in Hebrew (1977) and subsequently in English translation (1983).<sup>16</sup> In 1994 Elisha Qimron, together with John Stugnell, published the work known by the title *Miqṣat Ma'āse ha-Torah* (4QMMT).<sup>17</sup> None of these three authors was a specialist in halakhah or its modern research. Licht was a Bible scholar, Yadin an archaeologist, and Qimron is a linguist specializing in the Hebrew of the Qumran Scrolls.<sup>18</sup> It is notable that the three did indeed consult specialists in halakhah. Because of the central place accorded by the Qumranites to the regulations of purity and impurity, as expressed in the *Community Rule*, Licht felt the need to add to his commentary an appendix on "Some Rulings Concerning Purity in Tanaaitic Sources."<sup>19</sup> In a note to the appendix, Licht thanks Rabbi Shelomo Goren, and the scholars Efraim Urbach, Abraham Goldberg and Shmuel Safrai, for their help in the matter.<sup>20</sup> Yadin was able to benefit from the vast erudition of Saul Lieberman, one of the great Talmudic scholars of the last century. He thanks Lieberman for his help in his introduction to the publication of the *Temple Scroll*.<sup>21</sup> Qimron enlisted the aid of the well-known Talmudic scholar Yaakov Sussmann (1931-). In this

<sup>14</sup> Yitzhak D. Gilat, *Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrcanus: A Scholar Outcast* (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press 1984); *Studies in the Development of the Halakhah* (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1992), both in Hebrew.

<sup>15</sup> Jacob Licht, *The Rule Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea, 1QS.1QSa.1QSB* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965) (Hebrew).

<sup>16</sup> Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*.

<sup>17</sup> Qimron and Strugnell, *Miqṣat Ma'āse ha-Torah*.

<sup>18</sup> See Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986). This volume is based on Qimron's Hebrew doctoral dissertation, which remains the most detailed work on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls. See *The Grammar of the Hebrew Language of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (unpublished Ph.D.; Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1976) (Hebrew).

<sup>19</sup> Licht, *The Rules Scroll*, 294-303.

<sup>20</sup> Licht, *The Rules Scroll*, 294.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:10.

case the cooperation took the form of an appendix written by Sussmann that was added to the edition of 4QMMT.<sup>22</sup> This appendix is, in fact, an English abbreviation of Sussmann's extensive Hebrew article on the subject, published two years before the DJD edition came out.<sup>23</sup> Note that none of the experts who helped the first editors of Qumran texts returned to the study of the Qumran documents, except for an occasional article or two. Following the publication of the *Temple Scroll* Abraham Goldberg wrote an article on "the ancient Midrash and the late Midrash."<sup>24</sup> Lieberman published only two articles on the Scrolls, and even these appeared in the early 1950s, before the publication of the *Temple Scroll*. In the first, Lieberman suggests identifying the three heterodoxy practices (דרך אהרת) mentioned in the *Tosefta* (t. Ber. 7:6 and Ter. 8:11) with the halakhic rulings of the *Damascus Document*, and in the second he compares the procedure for admitting new members to the Yahad in the *Community Rule* (1QS, which he terms "The So-called Dead Sea Manual of Discipline") with those for the Pharisaic *Haburah*, as reported in rabbinic literature.<sup>25</sup> It is perhaps significant that the two articles appeared in English, unlike Lieberman's other major publications. Lieberman apparently did not consider the probe into the Scrolls to be part of the traditional "Study of the Torah."

Israeli scholars began to write systematically about issues of halakhah in the Scrolls only from the mid-1990s. This interesting fact emerges from the bibliographic list of scholarly contributions on this subject attached by Qimron and Strugnell to their edition of the 4QMMT.<sup>26</sup> In this list, which surveys research published up to 1994, only two scholars produced more than two articles on the Qumran halakhah, namely Joseph Baumgarten (1928-2008) and Lawrence Schiffman (1948-), both American Orthodox Jews. The two were educated in traditional Jewish learning and specialized in academic research of rabbinic literature. Indeed, they place great importance on committing the Qumran halakhah to systematic treatment. Although the present article focuses on the work of Israeli scholars, the dis-

<sup>22</sup> Yaakov Sussmann, "The History of the Halakhah and the Dead Sea Scrolls", in Qimron and Strugnell, *Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah*, 179-200.

<sup>23</sup> Yaakov Sussmann, "The History of *Halakhah* and the Dead Sea Scrolls – Preliminary Observations on *Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah*," *Tarbiz* 59 (1990): 11-76 (Hebrew).

<sup>24</sup> Abraham Goldberg, "The Ancient Midrash and the Late Midrash," *Tarbiz* 50 (1981): 94-106 (Hebrew).

<sup>25</sup> Saul Lieberman, "Light on the Cave Scrolls from Rabbinic Literature," *PAAJR* 20 (1951): 395-404; "The Discipline in the So-Called Dead Sea Manual of Discipline," *JBL* 61 (1951): 199-206 (reprint in his collected studies *Texts and Studies* [New York: Ktav, 1974], 190-99, 200-207).

<sup>26</sup> Qimron and Strugnell, *Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah*, 124-30.

inction between Israelis and non-Israelis is irrelevant as regards halakhic issues. The proper distinction is between scholars trained and not trained in Talmudic studies. In fact, almost all scholars engaged in the study of Qumran halakhah have been educated at traditional Yeshivot with academic training in Talmudic studies. Before turning to the Qumran Scrolls, their research concerned Talmudic matters. This fact partly explains the paucity of women among the students of Qumran halakhah. Two exceptions are the female scholars Vered Noam (1960-) and Cana Werman (1957-). Vered Noam wrote her doctoral dissertation on the Fast Scroll under the supervision of Yaakov Sussmann, and later published it as a book.<sup>27</sup> She now teaches at Tel Aviv University. Cana Werman wrote her doctoral dissertation on *The Attitude to the Gentiles in the Book of Jubilees* under the supervision of the late Shmuel Safrai, a historian of rabbinic literature; presently she teaches at Ben-Gurion University in Beer-Sheva.<sup>28</sup>

The foregoing circumstance, namely the Talmudic background of the students of Qumran halakhah, probably arises from the fact that most scholarly activity in this domain involves the collation of Qumranic texts with rabbinic literature. Clearly, despite the interval of some two centuries between the date of the Scrolls and the creation of the rabbinic literature, in halakhic matters the Talmudic sources are the closest to the Scrolls. The examination of one in light of the other is particularly fruitful. On the basic level of such a study the two corpuses shed light on each other. In some studies, the information yielded by the Scrolls is present in the background, and its examination aims at a better understanding of the Tannaitic midrash and the halakhic tradition it reflects. In many cases the sectarian halakhah clearly facilitates discovery of older layers in the Tannaitic literature and their distinction from later systems. Such, for example, is David Henshke's treatment of the *Temple Scroll* LX, 6-7. The expression "And to the Levites, one tenth of the grain and the wine and the oil which they have first dedicated to me" means (as explained by Joseph Baumgarten<sup>29</sup>) that the tithes

<sup>27</sup> Vered Noam, *Megillat Ta'anit: Versions, Interpretation, History, with Critical Edition* (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2003) (Hebrew).

<sup>28</sup> For Werman's publications see e.g. Cana Werman, "CD XI:17: 'Apart from your Sabbaths'," in Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick, eds., *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery* (STDJ 34; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 201-12; "Levi and Levites in the Second Temple period," *DSD* 4 (1997): 211-25; "The Rules of Consuming and Covering the Blood in Priestly and Rabbinic Law," *RevQ* 16 (1995): 621-36.

<sup>29</sup> Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The First and Second Tithes in the Temple Scroll," in Ann Kort and Scott Morschauser, eds., *Biblical and Related Studies Presented to Samuel Iwri* (Winnona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1985), 7.

first belong to God, and only later does He allocate them to the Levites. This led Henshke to detect a similar stance in rabbinic literature, and at the same time to offer a new explanation for a difficult sentence in midrash *Sifre Numbers*. The midrash refers to Num 18:21, “And to the Levites I hereby give all the tithes in Israel”: “The commandment regarding priesthood was joyfully announced from Mount Sinai, but this is being said *bethila* – the words of Rabbi Joshia.” In light of the *Temple Scroll*, Henshke argues, we can understand this seemingly odd statement of Rabbi Joshia. He too (like the *Temple Scroll*) was of the opinion that this verse (18:21) marks a change. While the gifts to the priests (mentioned earlier in the chapter) were already promised to them on Sinai, the tithes originally belonged to God. Only here (in Numbers) were they given to the Levites “*bethila*” (“at first”) in reward for their devotion to God with the incident of the Golden Calf.<sup>30</sup> Similarly, Vered Noam studied many rulings of the School of Shammai and found that in not a few cases, when sectarian parallels are available, the Shammaites’ opinion matches or at least approximates that of the Qumran sect, while the opinion of their—the School of Hillel—differs.<sup>31</sup>

In other cases the direction of the comparison is the reverse. The halakhic traditions in the rabbinic literature foster understanding of the Qumran Scrolls, and even suggest plausible restorations of fragmentary Qumranic sections. Accordingly, Aharon Shemesh (1953-) could explain why the author of the penal code of the *Community Rule* (1QS) inserted the prohibition of spitting at the Gathering of the Many between two prohibitions regarding nakedness (1QS VII, 13), when its natural place should be in the previous section dealing with the proper conduct of this gathering (1QS VII, 10-12). Interestingly, the midrash *Sifre Deuteronomy* and *m. Ber.* 9, 5 explanation of Deut 23:15b (“so the camp is to be holy, so that He does not see among you anything of ‘nakedness’ and turn away from you”), contains a prohibition against spitting in the holy place (the Temple courtyard). The assumption that this explanation reflects an old exegetical tradition,

<sup>30</sup> David Henshke, “On the History of Exegesis of the Pericopes Concerning Tithes: From Temple Scroll to the Sages,” *Tarbiz* 72 (2002): 85-112 (Hebrew). See also his article: “A Non-Rabbinic Law Rejected by the Tannaim,” *JQR* 92 (2001): 79-103.

<sup>31</sup> Vered Noam, “Divorce in Qumran in Light of Early Halakhah,” *JJS* 56 (2005): 206-23; “Traces of Sectarian Halakhah in the Rabbinic World,” in Steven D. Fraade, Aharon Shemesh, and Ruth A. Clements, eds., *Rabbinic Perspectives: Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 62; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 67-85. For further examples, see Aharon Shemesh, “The History of the Creation of Measurements: Between Qumran and the Mishnah,” in Fraade, Shemesh and Clements, *Rabbinic Perspectives*, 147-73; “The Laws of the Firstborn and the Cattle Tithe in Qumran Literature and Rabbinic Halakhah,” *Meghillot* 3 (2005): 143-64 (Hebrew).

shared by the *Community Rule*, explains well why the *Rule* interweaves the prohibitions against exposing one's nakedness with the prohibition against spitting in the holy place (the Gathering of the Many).<sup>32</sup>

Quite a number of studies analyze the archaeological finds at Qumran, which are also interpreted in connection with rabbinic literature. The numerous water installations unearthed at the site are interpreted as ritual baths (*miqvaot*) in light of both the Scrolls and the rabbinic texts;<sup>33</sup> or the wide dispersal of stone vessels, which were apparently intended to facilitate the practice of purity regulations.<sup>34</sup> The remains of phylacteries discovered in the Qumran caves were also interpreted in light of rabbinic rulings.<sup>35</sup>

Israeli scholars have written very little on general methodological issues, preferring to concentrate on the interpretation of specific halakhic problems. This too may be due to their Talmudic background, and above all to their training in the departments of Talmud at Israeli universities. By contrast, non-Israeli scholars, trained in other scientific disciplines, have made several contributions to relevant methodological issues. For instance, no Israeli scholars have joined in the lively debate on how terms such as "halakhah" or "midrash" should be defined, or whether these terms are applicable to the Qumranic sources.<sup>36</sup> Nor has any Israeli scholar written anything of the kind published by Lutz Doering on the implications and methodology of comparing two different literary corpuses, such as the Qumran Scrolls and the rabbinic literature.<sup>37</sup> Perhaps this is because until very recently the

<sup>32</sup> Aharon Shemesh, "The Scriptural Background of the Penal Code in the *Rule of the Community* and *Damascus Document*," *DSD* 15 (2008): 191-224.

<sup>33</sup> Ronny Reich, "Miqva'ot at Qumran," *Qadmoniot* 30 (1997-1998): 125-8 (Hebrew); "Miqva'ot at Khirbet Qumran and the Jerusalem Connection," in Schiffman, Tov, and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years, 728-73*.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Hanan Eshel, "CD 12:15-17 and the Stone Vessels Found at Qumran," in Baumgarten, Chazon and Pinnick, *The Damascus Document*, 45-52.

<sup>35</sup> David Nachman, "The Content and Order of the Biblical Sections in the *Tefillin* from Qumran and Rabbinic *Halakha*: Similarity, Difference and Some Historical Conclusions," *Cathedra* 112 (2004): 19-44 (Hebrew).

<sup>36</sup> See Philip R. Davies, "Halakhah at Qumran," in Philip R. Davies and Richard T. White, eds., *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (JSOTSup 100; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 37-50; Dennis Green, "Halakhah at Qumran? The Use of 'h.l.k.' in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *RevQ* 22 (2005): 235-51. For the application of the term "midrash" to Qumranic halakhah see Moshe J. Bernstein, "Midrash Halakhah at Qumran?" *Gesher* 7 (1979): 145-66; Steven D. Fraade, "Looking for Legal Midrash at Qumran," in Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon, eds., *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 59-79.

<sup>37</sup> Lutz Doering, "Parallels without 'Parallelomania': Methodological Reflections on Comparative Analysis of Halakhah in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Fraade, Shemesh and Clements, *Rabbinic Perspectives*, 87-112.

results of Israeli studies of the Qumran halakhah were published only as articles. Only very recently have their scholarly efforts yielded book-length monographs on halakhah in the Scrolls and rabbinic literature.<sup>38</sup> Though this research domain is relatively young, as significant publications began to appear only from the mid-1990s, it has nevertheless become the rule to include also surveys of findings from the Qumran Scrolls in Israeli doctoral dissertations on general halakhah.<sup>39</sup>

As noted, Sussmann's article signaled the beginning of Israeli study of the halakhah embedded in the Dead Sea Scrolls. He made several basic assumptions, which some scholars have accepted but others rejected. Examining the halakhic issues discussed in 4QMMT, Sussmann concluded that "in all matters in which the sect's position is clear, the opposing stance it disputes and contests is Pharisaic." Similarly "in cases where the Rabbis explicitly present their opinion as opposing a sectarian one, this sectarian stand agrees with the halakhic regulations of 4QMMT, and the author of this Qumranic document contests the halakhah adopted by the Rabbis."<sup>40</sup> Sussmann agrees with the theory that the members of the Qumran community were Essenes and he also adopts the idea of several earlier scholars that they were the Beitousin mentioned in the rabbinic literature.<sup>41</sup> Considering this, and the fact that the Rabbis attribute many of the halakhic positions of the Scrolls to the Sadduceans, he concludes that although the

---

<sup>38</sup> See Aharon Shemesh, *Halakhah in the Making: The Development of Jewish law from Qumran* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009). The author discusses general issues in the relationship of Qumranic and rabbinic halakhic literature, such as the source of authority of halakhah and human exegesis versus divine revelation. See also the sections relevant to the Qumran halakhah in Shemesh's Hebrew volume *Punishments and Sins: From Scripture to the Rabbis* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2003), 57-98 et passim. Another volume recently published in Hebrew is by Vered Noam, *From Qumran to the Rabbinic Revolution: Conceptions of Impurity* (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2010). This book is written from a diachronic perspective taking the Qumran halakhah as a point of departure for comparison with the rabbinic. Entire chapters are devoted to the halakhah of the Qumranites inasmuch as it is related to the issue treated by the volume, namely the impurity of the dead. Another volume in Hebrew is by Cana Werman and Aharon Shemesh, *Revealing the Hidden: Exegesis and Halakha in the Qumran Scrolls* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2011). It has two parts; the first treats general topics in the halakhic writings from Qumran, the second contains detailed discussions on specific halakhic matters.

<sup>39</sup> See e.g. the doctoral dissertations of Hanan Birenboim, *Observance of the Laws of Bodily Purity in Jewish Society in the Land of Israel during the Second Temple Period* (Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 2006); Yair Furstenberg, *Eating in a State of Purity during the Tannaïtic Period: Tractate Teharot and its Historical and Cultural Contexts* (Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 2011), both in Hebrew. In this connection, mention should be made of the article by Moshe Benovitz, "Blessing before the Meal in Second Temple Period and Tannaïtic Literature," *Meghillot* 8-9 (2010): 81-96 (Hebrew).

<sup>40</sup> Sussmann, "Preliminary Observations," 27-28.

<sup>41</sup> See *m. Menah.* 10:3; *t. Kippurim* 1:8; *Sukkah* 3:1 and elsewhere.



members of the Qumran community were Essenes their halakhic system was Sadducean.

In an article published almost a decade after Sussmann's, Menahem Kister (1957-) challenged the conclusion that the sectarian halakhah was Sadducean.<sup>42</sup> Kister's argument was that only in two halakhic issues is the 4QMMT position identical to the one attributed by the Rabbis to the Sadduceans. On both issues the Pharisaic standpoint is daring and innovative, whereas the Sadducean approach is simpler and more logical. Hence, Kister argues, the two groups may not really have been connected but both adopted a non-Pharisaic position. He asks: "Should we learn about the entire corpus from the similarity of only two halakhic issues identified as Sadducean and Essene? Perhaps such a similarity may be explained not as evidence for a genetic connection between the two groups but as related to several specific cases in which the sect agreed with the Sadducean opinion."<sup>43</sup>

Scholars' adoption of either Sussmann's or Kister's standpoint (sometimes without their being aware of it) had an impact on other areas of Qumran halakhah study, for instance, in the attempt to define the nature of "Priestly" halakhah as priestly. This is relevant inasmuch as one assumes the existence of a basic priestly halakhah shared by all non-Pharisaic groups. Sussmann asserted that the Sadducean halakhah was stringent. Yaakov Elman questioned this statement and argued that in several details the Sadducean position was more lenient than the Pharisaic. For example, the Pharisees posited that bones of both animal carcasses and human corpses transmitted defilement, whereas the Sadducees opined that only human bones did so.<sup>44</sup> However, Aharon Shemesh supported Sussmann's judgment since the Scrolls themselves convey the understanding that they are stricter

<sup>42</sup> Menahem Kister, "Studies in 4QMiḡṣat Ma'āse Ha-Torah and Related Texts: Law, Theology, Language and Calendar," *Tarbiz* 68 (1999): 317-71 (Hebrew). In a lecture delivered on 1 February 1988 at the Collège de France in Paris, Devorah Dimant suggested that the Sadducees and the Qumran sectaries partly subscribed to the same halakhic school, but were not identical sects. She posited that at that time two halakhic schools existed in Eretz Israel, the Pharisaic and the more stringent (partly Sadducean), and that the three sects of Josephus did not correspond to three distinct halakhic schools. In a subsequent article she pointed out that the picture of the Qumran halakhah is more complex than hitherto assessed for it displays links with that of the Sadducees but also with particular halakhic practices of the Essenes, e.g., avoidance of the use of oil, as recorded by Josephus. See Devorah Dimant, "Signification et importance des manuscrits de la mer Morte. L'état actuel des études qoumrâniennes," *Annales* 51 (1996): 975-1003 (994-5).

<sup>43</sup> Kister, "Studies in 4QMiḡṣat Ma'āse Ha-Torah," 329.

<sup>44</sup> Yaakov Elman, "Some Remarks on 4QMMT and the Rabbinic Tradition; Or, When is a Parallel not a Parallel?" in Moshe J. Bernstein and John Kampen, eds., *Reading the 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 99-128.



than the Pharisaic practices. The author of the *Damascus Document* admonishes his opponents by saying that God will deliver them to the sword “For they sought smooth things and chose delusions and sought out loopholes and chose the fair neck...” (CD I, 18-19<sup>45</sup>). The author of the *Pesher of Psalms* identifies the person mentioned in Ps 37:7—“a man who makes evil plans”—with “the Man of the Lie, who led many astray with words of deceit, for they chose easy things” (4Q171[Ps<sup>a</sup>] 1-10 i 25-27).

A more sophisticated proposal for classifying the priestly halakhah has been advanced by Daniel Schwartz.<sup>46</sup> Following Yohanan Silman, Schwartz distinguishes realistic from nominalistic approaches to halakhah.<sup>47</sup> Although Schwartz’s proposal has often been criticized he is certainly right in asserting that the Qumran halakhah has a marked tendency towards a realistic perception of the law, assuming that the Law ensues from and reflects nature.<sup>48</sup> This point of view may be inferred from the *Damascus Document* in two cases. First, criticism of the Pharisaic practice of marrying two wives is explained by the statement “the principle of creation (is single) ‘male and female He created them’ (Gen 1:27)” (CD IV, 21). Secondly, this document justifies the halakhic directive that “all species of locust must be put in fire or water while they are alive” with the explanation “because that is the principle of their creation” (CD XII, 14-15). In both cases the nature of the creature involved is invoked to account for the rule related to it. Schwartz’s thesis has been fruitful and several scholars have used it to explain additional halakhic details in the Scrolls.<sup>49</sup> Later Schwartz added two articles in which he modifies his claim with regard to the nominalistic notion of rabbinic literature. Schwartz now agrees that rabbinic literature too takes a realistic approach along with the nominalistic one. He argues that in early times, when the Pharisees confronted the Sadducees, they tended to express nominalistic stances in order to dissociate themselves from their rivals and

<sup>45</sup> The translation is taken from James H. Charlesworth, ed., *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (The Dead Sea Scrolls 2; Tübingen-Louisville: Mohr Siebeck-John Knox Press, 1995), 13.

<sup>46</sup> Daniel R. Schwartz, “The Law and Truth: On Qumran-Sadducean and Rabbinic Views of Law,” in Devorah Dimant and Uri Rappaport, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 229-40.

<sup>47</sup> Yohanan Silman, “Halakhic Determination of a Nominalistic and Realistic Nature: Legal and Philosophical Considerations,” *Dine Ysrael* 12 (1984-1985): 249-66 (Hebrew).

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Jeffrey F. Rubinstein, “Nominalism and Realism in Qumranic and Rabbinic Law: A Reassessment,” *DSD* 6 (1999): 156-83.

<sup>49</sup> See e.g. Aharon Shemesh, “4Q271,3: A Key to Sectarian Matrimonial Law,” *JJS* 49 (1998): 244-63; Cana Werman, “Consumption of the Blood and Its Covering in the Priestly and Rabbinic Traditions,” *Tarbiz* 63 (1994): 173-84 (Hebrew). See also Werman, “CD XI:17: ‘Apart from your Sabbaths,’” “Levi and Levites,” “The Rules of Consuming and Covering the Blood.”

to emphasize the differences between the two groups. But later, when the Sadducees disappeared (at least as an organized group), the Rabbis allowed themselves to express realistic positions. Furthermore, as the Rabbis found themselves confronted with another group—the Christians, who adopted an extreme anti-realistic approach<sup>50</sup> – they were forced, for the very same reason, to emphasize realistic stances.<sup>51</sup>

Eyal Regev offered another interpretation of the halakhic debate between the priestly Sadducees and the Pharisees.<sup>52</sup> In his opinion they were divided over the concept of sanctity, and from this dispute ensued all, or almost all, of the halakhic debates between the two groups. While the Sadducees held what Regev calls a “dynamic” concept of sanctity, the Pharisees perceived it as a “static” entity. Regev’s idea actually resembles that of Schwartz, in that the particular rigor of the priestly halakhah in matters of sanctity results from viewing it as a vulnerable dynamic entity that requires maximal protection, so it is, in fact, a “realistic” perception of holiness.

The two foregoing approaches, namely the assumption of a “priestly halakhah” and its rejection, influence two opposing tendencies; some scholars detect divergent halakhic positions in Qumranic works, whereas others assess the Qumran literature as a single halakhic tradition and therefore try to reconcile its seemingly contradictory statements. This concerns mainly the Book of *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll* (11QT<sup>a</sup>), which many scholars believe were composed before the founding of the Qumran sect.<sup>53</sup> Several have pointed out apparent contradictions between these two compositions, and between them and several Qumran halakhic details. For example, Lawrence Schiffman points out some discrepancies between the sacrificial systems of *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll*. Similarly, David Henshke argues that the *Temple Scroll* (LX, 6-7) prescribes giving the tithe to the Levites,

<sup>50</sup> See, e.g., Galatians 3:28: “There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female—for all of you are one in Christ Jesus.”

<sup>51</sup> Daniel R. Schwartz, “Arguments *a minore ad majus* (*gal wahomer*) – Sadducean Realism,” *Massekhet* 5 (2006): 145-56 (Hebrew); “From Priests at their Right to Christians at their Left? On the Interpretation of a Mishnaic Story (m. Rosh HaShanah 2:8-9),” *Tarbiz* 74 (2005): 21-41 (Hebrew).

<sup>52</sup> Eyal Regev, “Reconstructing Qumranic and Rabbinic Worldview: Dynamic Holiness vs. Static Holiness,” in Fraade, Shemesh and Clements, *Rabbinic Perspectives*, 87-112.

<sup>53</sup> Many scholars follow James VanderKam in dating *Jubilees* to the mid-second century BCE (see James C. VanderKam, “The Origin and Purposes of the Book of Jubilees,” in Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey and Armin Lange, eds., *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* [TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997], 19-20). As for the *Temple Scroll*, Schiffman believes that it was composed in Sadducean-priestly circles before the emergence of the Yahad community (see Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls; The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* [Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994], 257-71 [257, 271]).

but *Jubilees* (30:17-18; 32:9) grants it to the priests.<sup>54</sup> Martha Himmelfarb holds that the *Temple Scroll* states that impurity resulting from nocturnal emission lasts for three days, whereas cave 4 copies of the *Damascus Document* prescribe seven impure days.<sup>55</sup> In sum, these scholars conclude that the halakhah in the Scrolls is not uniform but reflects various groups and diverse halakhic systems. Others, including Shemesh, maintain that all halakhic works found at Qumran espouse the same basic halakhic system, a "Priestly Halakhah," and that the minor apparent contradictions should be understood as resulting from the different literary context, the rhetorical needs of individual authors, or even a misreading of one of the sources.<sup>56</sup>

Another area of study is the examination of biblical interpretations embedded in the Qumran halakhic texts. The difficulty in uncovering the strategies adopted by the Qumran authors for interpreting the Torah's directives is that they do not divulge their exegetical procedures. Even when a scroll employs the scriptural source for a given halakhah, for instance, with the formula "as it is said" or the like, the interpretative logic behind it is not explained. The *Damascus Document* XVI, 6-9 provides a typical example. The passage reads: "And as for what he said (Deut 23:24), 'Whatever is issued from your mouth, keep it and carry it out.': Every binding oath by which anyone has pledged to fulfill the letter of the law, he should not annul, even at the price of death. (But) anything by which he might pledge to turn away fr[om the la]w, he should not fulfill, not even when the price is death." How does the author derive his ruling from the biblical verse? The *Damascus Document* seems to read the citation from Deuteronomy 23:24 as alluding to two injunctions. We may conjecture that the double halakhah is grounded in the duality of the verse: "you are to keep, and you are to carry out." Still, this is our own reconstruction; no statement explicitly explains that this is the case. Furthermore, and this is the crux of the matter, the legislator nowhere indicates how he derived from the biblical verse

<sup>54</sup> Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Sacrificial System of the Temple Scroll and the Book of Jubilees," *SBLSP* 24 (1985): 217-33; Henshke, "On the History of Exegesis of the Pericopes Concerning Tithes," 83-91.

<sup>55</sup> Martha Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests: Ancestry and Merit in Ancient Judaism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 112-13. She refers to the *Temple Scroll* XLV, 11-12 and 4Q266 6 i 14-16/4Q272 1 ii 3-7.

<sup>56</sup> For Schiffman's argument see the response of James C. VanderKam, "The Temple Scroll and the Book of Jubilees," in George J. Brooke, ed., *Temple Scroll Studies* (JSP-Sup 7; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1989), 211-36; for Henshke's argument see the counter-argument of Baumgarten, "The First and Second Tithes," 7; for Himmelfarb's case see the reply of Shemesh, *Halakhah in the Making*, 156-7.

these severe and absolute obligations, to be adhered to even at the “price of death.”

But in many cases a comparison of the Qumran halakhah with rabbinic midrashim allows reconstruction of the interpretive procedure employed by the Qumranic authors. Furthermore, even Qumran terminological formulas are illuminated through comparison with rabbinic usage. Yaakov Sussmann already noticed the similarity, and even identity, of some terms in 4QMMT and the rabbinic nomenclature, which points to the relative antiquity of certain halakhic notions and terms such as *mutzakot* (מוצקות) and *meorave shemesh* (מעורבי שמש).<sup>57</sup> Similarly Aharon Shemesh has shown that already in the Scrolls the word *trefa* (טרפה) is not restricted to cattle devoured by wild beasts but also covers the halakhic term referring to dying cattle, the eating of the meat of which is not permitted after slaughter.<sup>58</sup> Menahem Kister and Vered Noam noted old “midrashic idioms” which probably underlay several halakhic issues in the Scrolls, whose recognition may clarify enigmatic midrashim in the rabbinic literature.<sup>59</sup> Menahem Kister’s example is especially instructive. It concerns Numbers 19:9, which ordains that the ashes of the red heifer should be collected by “a pure man” (איש טהור). As is well known, the Pharisees and the Sadducees debated the level of purification required of the person who collected these ashes. The Sadducees required that he be in a state of *meorav shemesh* (מעורב שמש), namely after immersion in the ritual bath and waiting until sunset. The Pharisees held that it is sufficient for this person to be in a state of *tevul yom* (טבול יום), namely after immersion but even before sunset. The rabbinic midrash *Sifri* comments on the biblical word “pure” (טהור) as follows: “What does the scripture mean by the word ‘pure’? Purified of any impurity. And who is he? He is the one who is *tevul yom*.”<sup>60</sup> This is a difficult exposition since a person who has just immersed and the sun has not yet finally set is not completely purified: he is considered so only with the setting of the sun. Now two Qumran scrolls employ a similar expression in regard

<sup>57</sup> *mutzakot* is mentioned in 4QMMT B, 55-57 (DJD X, 52), and *meorave shemesh* in 4QMMT B, 15 (DJD X, 48). See Sussmann, “Investigation of the History of the Halakhah.”

<sup>58</sup> Aharon Shemesh, “Common Halakhic and Exegetical Traditions Shared by the Dead Sea Scrolls and Rabbinic Literature,” in Daniel Sivan, David Talshir and Chaim Cohen, eds., *Zaphenat-Paneah; Linguistic Studies Presented to Elisha Qimron on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Beer-Sheva: Ben Gurion University Press, 2009), 384-6 (Hebrew).

<sup>59</sup> Menahem Kister, “Studies in 4QMiqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah,” 333-4; Vered Noam, “‘You Shall Pass Through Fire’ (Numbers 31:23) – An Early Exegetic Transition,” *Shmaton – An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near East Studies*, 19 (2009): 127-36 (Hebrew).

<sup>60</sup> “הא מה תלמוד לומר ‘טהור’? טהור מכל טומאה. ואי זה זה? זה טבול יום” H. Saul Horvitz, ed., *Siphre D’be rab (Sifre Numbers)* (Jerusalem: Wahrmann Books) §124, p. 157.

to the purity of the person who collects the ashes of the red heifer. One text states, “a man purified from any impurity (which lasted until) sundown” (4Q277 1 ii 2<sup>61</sup>), while the other has the formulation “a man purified of any of his impurity, who has waited until th[e sun-]setting” (4Q269 8 ii 5<sup>62</sup>). These two Qumran texts and the midrash use the same idiom “purified of any” (טהור מכול). It appears, then, that a very old exposition of the word “pure” (טהור) existed, in the sense of “purified of any impurity.” The Qumran halakhah understood it in a straightforward way: purified “of all impurity that lasted until sundown,” whereas the Pharisees understood it in a narrower sense of “being immersed during the day.”

From a literary viewpoint the sectarian halakhic writings do not employ the genre of halakhic midrash, known from later Tannaitic literature. The main characteristic of the Tannaitic midrash is the exegetical deliberations, which can encompass various possible readings and even accept differences of opinion about the correct interpretation of a given biblical text. These elements are absent from the Qumranic halakhah. The scrolls concerned with halakhic matters are always uniform and anonymous, whether written in the style of rewritten Bible, like the *Temple Scroll*, or in the style of dense and abstract halakhic rules, as in the *Damascus Document*. However, in several articles published in recent years Aharon Shemesh has observed that the germs of some midrashic features are already present in the Scrolls. For instance, he argues that the scroll labeled 4QHalakhah A (4Q251) is structured according to the sequence of the laws in Exodus 21-23 and therefore proposes to name it *Midrash Mishpatim* (“midrash on ‘ואלה המשפטים’ [These are the laws](Ex. 21:1)”).<sup>63</sup> Moreover, this scroll, like others, contains a fundamental midrashic formula that establishes the relationship between the biblical citation and its interpretation. It occurs in a fixed stylistic format: “because X is Y” (כי X הוא Y). This format parallels the midrashic formula found in the rabbinic literature “X is none but Y” (איך X אלא Y). Saul Lieberman commented, “this is the basic format of the halakhic midrash and it serves the fundamental interpretative role, namely ‘explaining reality’ and rendering rare and difficult expressions into simpler Hebrew, or at times into Aramaic.”<sup>64</sup>

<sup>61</sup> איש טהור מכל טומאת ערב.

<sup>62</sup> [איש טהור מכול טמאתו אשר יעריב את השמש]; the text is a combination of 4Q269 8 ii 5 and its parallel in 4Q271 2 12-13. Both texts are copies of the *Damascus Document*.

<sup>63</sup> Aharon Shemesh, “4Q251: Midrash Mishpatim,” *DSD* 12 (2005): 280-302.

<sup>64</sup> Saul Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine: Studies in the Literary Transmission, Beliefs, and Manners of Palestine in the First Century B.C.E.–Fourth Century C.E.* (Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America 18; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962), 48.

The importance of Qumran halakhah study exceeds the understanding of specific halakhic issues such as clarifying texts and their content, outlining the halakhic system and literary structure of the halakhic texts, unraveling the biblical interpretation embedded in them, and elucidating the underlying theology of the halakhah. The most significant challenge ahead is using the data of the Scrolls to build the history and development of the halakhah from the Second Temple period to the consolidation of the Mishna in the third century CE. In his above-mentioned article on 4QMMT, Yaakov Sussmann describes the efforts of the first scholars of *die Wissenschaft des Judentums* in studying the history of the halakhah. He notes that this project was abandoned by subsequent scholars due to the paucity of authentic sources from the Second Temple period. The original grand aim was replaced by a more modest one, yet on a more solid basis: the study of the halakhic literature. In the conclusion of his article Sussmann re-introduces this challenge for the student of rabbinic literature, namely to return to the original project, and “to take up again the important field of the history of the halakhah, now equipped with means unimagined by the scholars of the previous century.”<sup>65</sup> For all that, despite the significant progress in this direction of research published since the appearance of Sussmann’s address, all the relevant studies concern specific details. As noted above, comprehensive studies on the history of the halakhah have begun to be published only very recently.

A survey of research to date on the history of the halakhah deriving from the Qumran Scrolls evinced two parallel trends. Some scholars follow the model advanced by Abraham Geiger more than a century ago. According to him, the halakhah represented by older sources—the Aramaic Targums, traditions in the New Testament, the writings of Philo from Alexandria and Flavius Josephus, and one may add now the Qumran documents—reflects the “ancient halakhah,” practiced in the Second Temple period. By contrast, the rabbinic halakhah was relatively “new,” the result of developments at the end of the Second Temple period and among the sages living after the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE.<sup>66</sup> This was the orientation of Gedaliahu Alon, Shmuel Safai and Yitzhak Gilat, the Israeli scholars who wrote and published before the discovery of the Scrolls.<sup>67</sup> In current research Vered Noam, for example, follows this trend in some of her stu-

<sup>65</sup> Sussmann, “Investigation of the History of the Halakhah,” 74.

<sup>66</sup> Abraham Geiger. *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel*.

<sup>67</sup> Alon, *Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple*; Safrai, *Pilgrimage at the Time of the Second Temple: In Times of Temple and Mishnah*; Gilat, *Eliezer ben Hyrcanus; Studies*.

dies mentioned above. She has shown that residues of sectarian halakhic concepts may be recognized in older layers of the rabbinic halakhah.<sup>68</sup> The historical picture that emerges from these data is that the halakhah espoused by the Scrolls does not necessarily represent exclusively the practice of the sect, but probably reflects the halakhic tradition upheld during the Second Temple period by larger groups and partly even by the Pharisees. This old tradition is still expressed in the positions of the School of Shammai and of the sage Eliezer ben Hyrcanus, a follower of this school. According to this outline, the Hillelite halakhic positions were the result of a relatively new development, which became dominant among later sages.

Other scholars tend to view the relation of the sectarian to the rabbinic halakhah differently. Their model perceives the rabbinic halakhah as the direct continuation of their precursors, the Pharisees of Second Temple times.<sup>69</sup> Accordingly, the halakhic differences between the Scrolls and the rabbinic sources are assigned to controversies between the priestly halakhic tradition, which includes the Sadducees and the Essene-sectarians, and the Pharisaic halakhah. Israel Knohl has shown that in several cases these controversies go back to the different sources in the Torah itself. While the priestly halakhah adopted the priestly tradition of the Torah, the Pharisees followed the more popular tradition of Deuteronomy.<sup>70</sup> This model is certainly valid for passages in which the Qumranic halakhah is clearly polemical. Such is the case of the halakhic issues listed by 4QMMT. The author of this letter states his position explicitly, and compares it with the contested position of his opponents. Since this contested position is identical to the rabbinic position, it may certainly be concluded that the Rabbis inherited it from the Pharisees of Second Temple times.

The challenge of future research is to map the various aspects of the Qumran halakhah in order to determine which belong to the first model and which to the second. Connected to this is the problematic issue of which of the halakhic domains were more apt to change and which we-

---

<sup>68</sup> Noam Vered, "Divorce in Qumran in Light of Early Halakhah;" "Traces of Sectarian Halakhah in the Rabbinic World."

<sup>69</sup> This assumption underlies many of the discussions of Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Halakhah at Qumran* (SJLA 16; Leiden: Brill, 1975), and Yigael Yadin in his commentary on the *Temple Scroll*. But in my opinion, Yigael Yadin overstated the polemic tendency of the *Temple Scroll* against the contemporary Pharisees.

<sup>70</sup> Israel Knohl, "Post-Biblical Sectarianism and the Priestly Schools of the Pentateuch: The Issue of Popular Participation in the Temple Cult on Festivals," in Barrera and Montaner, *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 2:601-9; "Between Voice and Silence: The Relationship between Prayer and Temple Cult," *JBL* 115 (1996): 17-30. See also Werman, "The Rules of Consuming and Covering the Blood."

re more strictly guarded within the confines of the transmitted halakhah. Be that as it may, the picture of the Qumran halakhic traditions and their place in the reality of the Second Temple period is far more complex than hitherto assumed.





# ISRAELI RESEARCH INTO HEBREW AND ARAMAIC AT QUMRAN

STEVEN E. FASSBERG

In the land where Hebrew has been revived as a spoken and modern literary language, the history of research into the languages of the Scrolls is of particular interest, especially within the larger context of the extensive investigation into Hebrew and Aramaic that has been conducted in Israel.

## *Hebrew*

### *The First Phase (1948-1970)*

Prior to the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the academic study of Hebrew in Israel was limited to a small group of scholars. During the 1940s Henoah Yalon was investigating oral and written traditions of Mishnaic Hebrew, Ze'ev Ben-Hayyim was documenting the oral and written traditions of Samaritan Hebrew and Aramaic, and Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher was writing on lexical items in Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew. These three scholars, who were actively involved in researching Second Temple traditions of Hebrew and Aramaic, were, not surprisingly, among the first to investigate the Scrolls linguistically as soon as they began to be published. A fourth scholar who was active during this period in the field of Biblical Hebrew, Naphtali Herz Tur-Sinai, did not go on to contribute to the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

The linguistic study of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Israel began immediately after the publication in Jerusalem of the first texts in 1948 by Eliezer Lipa Sukenik,<sup>1</sup> and as a result it was only natural that the texts published in

---

<sup>1</sup> Eliezer Lipa Sukenik, *Megillot Genuzot from an Ancient Geniza found in the Judaean Desert: First Report* (Bialik Foundation: Jerusalem, 1948) (Hebrew). There are occasional linguistic comments interspersed in the notes to the texts, e.g., that the third person singular pronouns הוּא and הִיא are written הוּאָה and הִיאָה (26). Sukenik (1889-1953) was born in Bialystok, studied in Berlin, and taught in the Institute of Archaeology at the Hebrew University.

Jerusalem were those initially investigated by Israeli scholars.<sup>2</sup> Articles appeared soon after in the Hebrew press (e.g., *Ha'aretz*) and scientific journals (*Sinai*, *Kiryath Sepher*, *Lěšonenu*, and *Leshonenu La'am*). With one notable exception, the scholars who first discussed the language of the Scrolls taught at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, at the time the only university in Israel, and almost all were immigrants, who had been trained abroad and came to Palestine during the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The most important initial contributions were those of Yalon, who did not hold a university appointment.<sup>3</sup> He immediately pointed out salient grammatical phenomena and lexical items in the manuscripts, e.g., plene orthography, lengthened pronominal elements on nouns, verbs, and prepositions (לך vs. לכה, -ם vs. -כמה, -תם vs. -תמה), pausal-looking forms occurring in context (יעמוד vs. יעמוד), and lengthened cohortative forms where the Masoretic text had regular forms. His discussions included comparisons to traditions of Biblical Hebrew (Tiberian, Babylonian, Samaritan, Greek and Latin transcriptions), oral and written traditions of Tannaitic Hebrew, *piyyutim*, works of medieval Hebrew grammarians, and Aramaic. Yalon's articles determined the basic direction of linguistic investigation that continues to this day. His first essays, written between 1949 and 1952, were collected and appeared in book form in 1962.<sup>4</sup>

Other important contributors to the discussion of the language of the Scrolls during the first decade of research were Moshe Goshen-Gottstein (1925-1991),<sup>5</sup> Ze'ev Ben-Hayyim (1907-),<sup>6</sup> Chaim Rabin (1915-1996),<sup>7</sup>

<sup>2</sup> E.g., Kutscher's work on the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1Q20) and the *Great Isaiah Scroll* (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>).

<sup>3</sup> Born Distenfeld in Trutky (Galicia), Yalon (1886-1970) studied in Lemberg and Vienna, and taught at the Mizrahi Teacher's Seminary in Jerusalem. Among other things, one of his lasting legacies is the vocalization in the edition of the Mishna prepared by Hanoah Albeck, *The Mishna* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1952-1959) (Hebrew).

<sup>4</sup> Henoah Yalon, *Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Philological Essays (1949-1952)* (Jerusalem: Shrine of the Book Fund, America-Israel Cultural Foundation, and Kiryath Sepher, 1967) (Hebrew). See additional notes on the language of the Scrolls in his collected papers, *Studies in the Hebrew Language* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1971), 478-81 (Hebrew).

<sup>5</sup> Born in Berlin, Goshen-Gottstein wrote his doctoral dissertation on the syntax and vocabulary of medieval Hebrew as influenced by Arabic under Hans Jakob Polotsky, David Hirsch Baneth, and Naphtali Herz Tur-Sinai (born Harry Torczyner) at the Hebrew University, and taught in the Department of Ancient Semitic Languages at the Hebrew University.

<sup>6</sup> Born Wolf Goldmann in Mościska (Galicia), he wrote his doctoral dissertation on Palmyrene personal names under Carl Brockelmann in Breslau. He came to Israel (then Palestine) in 1933 and from 1948 he taught in the Department of Hebrew Language at the Hebrew University. He also served as the President of the Academy of the Hebrew Language (1973-1981).

<sup>7</sup> Born in Giessen (son of Israel Rabin, scholar of post-biblical literature), he wrote a doctoral dissertation on ancient West-Arabian under Arthur Tritton in London and a second

Shelomo Morag (1926-1999),<sup>8</sup> and Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher (1909-1971).<sup>9</sup> Goshen-Gottstein published several articles during the 1950s;<sup>10</sup> his English and German articles from this period were collected in a book that appeared in 1960.<sup>11</sup> He wrote the first comprehensive article on the language of the Scrolls, which appeared in the 1958 Hebrew University volume devoted to different aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls and edited by Rabin and Yigael Yadin (1917-1984).<sup>12</sup>

Ben-Hayyim discussed isoglosses of linguistic features shared by the Dead Sea Scrolls and the oral tradition of the Samaritans,<sup>13</sup> e.g., the two-syllable pronunciation of forms such as ראוּשׁ/רוּאשׁ, the contraction of the diphthong *-āw* to *ō*, weakening of the gutturals, and the second masculine plural lengthened pronominal forms כִּמָּה, הֵמָּה, and תִּמָּה. He argued in 1954 that “The linguistic tradition emerging from the Dead Sea Scrolls is on the whole identical with that of the Samaritans,”<sup>14</sup> implying that the Hebrew attested in the Scrolls reflected a vernacular of the period.

---

dissertation on the Hebrew syntax of Jews in southern France and Spain from the 12<sup>th</sup> – 15<sup>th</sup> centuries at Oxford University, where he served as Cowley Lecturer in Post-Biblical Hebrew before coming to Israel in 1956 to teach in the Department of Hebrew Language at the Hebrew University.

<sup>8</sup> Born Mirkin (son of Moshe Aryeh Mirkin, author of the commentary to *Midrash Rabbah* [Tel-Aviv: Yavneh, 1956]) in Petah Tikva, he wrote his doctoral dissertation on the oral Yemenite Hebrew traditions under Polotsky, Shelomo Goitein, and Tur-Sinai at the Hebrew University and taught in the Department of Hebrew Language at the Hebrew University.

<sup>9</sup> He was born in Slovakia and studied at the Hebrew University but never completed his doctorate; he taught in the Department of Hebrew Language at the Hebrew University.

<sup>10</sup> E.g., Moshe Goshen-Gottstein, “What Can We Learn from the Language of the Dead Sea Scrolls?” *Leshonenu La’am* 2/8-9 (1951): 3-18 (Hebrew).

<sup>11</sup> Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, *Text and Language in Bible and Qumran* (Jerusalem: Orient, 1960).

<sup>12</sup> Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, “Linguistic Structure and Tradition in the Qumran Documents,” *ScrHier* 4 (1958): 101-36. Yadin, the son of Sukenik, wrote his doctoral dissertation on the *War Scroll* (1QM) under Benjamin Mazar, Tur-Sinai, and Abraham Shalit at the Hebrew University and taught in the Institute of Archaeology at the Hebrew University. He played an important role in the War of Independence, was the second Chief of Staff of the Israeli army (1949-1959), a Knesset member, and a minister in the government (1977-1981).

<sup>13</sup> Ze’ev Ben-Hayyim, *Studies in the Traditions of the Hebrew Language* (Madrid-Barcelona: Instituto Arias Montano, 1954), chap. 2: “Some Observations on the Pronunciation of Hebrew According to the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 77-92. See also his “Traditions in the Hebrew Language, with Special Reference to the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *ScrHier* 4 (1958): 200-214, which appeared in expanded form in Hebrew as “The Tradition of the Samaritans and its Relationship to the Linguistic Tradition of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Rabbinic Language,” *Leshonenu* 22 (1958): 223-45.

<sup>14</sup> Ben-Hayyim, *Traditions of the Hebrew Language*, 207.

In the same year Morag also reached the conclusion that the Hebrew of the Scrolls reflected the spoken language on the basis of his investigation into one of the most salient linguistic features of the Scrolls, viz., the lengthened pronouns הוֹאָה and הִיאָה.<sup>15</sup> Rabin published on the language of the Dead Sea Scrolls already while still in Oxford; see his 1954 translation and annotated edition to the Genizah manuscripts of the *Damascus Document* (CD).<sup>16</sup> His monograph *Qumran Studies*<sup>17</sup> appeared after his arrival in Israel and included linguistic discussions. In an influential article from the 1958 Hebrew University volume, Rabin proposed that the language of the Dead Sea Scrolls reflected a literary language “in which Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew elements coexisted upon a mainly Mishnaic Hebrew grammatical foundation.”<sup>18</sup>

The year 1959 was a turning point in the linguistic study of the Dead Sea Scrolls: the publication of Kutscher’s *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll*, which was a detailed analysis of the *Great Isaiah Scroll* (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>) with reference to other published Dead Sea Scrolls, both Hebrew and Aramaic, revolutionized the field.<sup>19</sup> Kutscher’s work was a comprehensive treatment of the Hebrew of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> in the light of Classical Biblical Hebrew, Late Biblical Hebrew, Tannaitic Hebrew, and contemporary Aramaic dialects; some features were also analyzed in the light of Aramaic dialectology and Northwest Semitic in general. It remains the cornerstone of all subsequent linguistic study of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Kutscher believed that 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> was a popular version of the book of Isaiah, whose language reflected “the linguistic situation prevailing in Palestine during the last centuries BCE.”<sup>20</sup> Or to be more precise, “the linguistic anomalies of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> reflect the Hebrew and Aramaic currently spoken in Palestine towards the end of the Second Commonwealth.”<sup>21</sup> He argued that the language of the Scrolls was literary with occasional vernacular features that penetrated the text. He thought that the scribes of the Dead Sea Scrolls at-

<sup>15</sup> Shelomo Morag, “The Independent Pronouns of the Third Person Masculine and Feminine in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *ErIsr* 3 (1954): 166-9 (Hebrew).

<sup>16</sup> Chaim Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1954). A revised edition appeared in 1958.

<sup>17</sup> Chaim Rabin, *Qumran Studies* (London: Oxford University Press, 1957; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1975).

<sup>18</sup> Chaim Rabin, “The Historical Background of Qumran Hebrew,” *ScrHier* 4 (1958): 144-61.

<sup>19</sup> Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1959). An English translation appeared as *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>)* (Leiden: Brill, 1974).

<sup>20</sup> Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, ix (Hebrew edition).

<sup>21</sup> Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, 3 (English edition).

tempted to imitate Late Biblical Hebrew as much as possible and their language “should be considered as the last offshoot of Late Biblical Hebrew.”<sup>22</sup> A corollary of his linguistic investigation was that 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> reflected a vulgar substandard text-type as opposed to the standard Masoretic text-type. Subsequent scholarly works have added details unknown to Kutscher at the time he wrote; in the eyes of many scholars, the additional data further buttress his theories on the linguistic modernizing attested in the Scrolls. Kutscher also further elaborated on topics first discussed by Yalon and Ben-Hayyim: the weakening of the pronunciation of the gutturals and the considerable influence of Aramaic on the language of the scribes.

Other noteworthy works on the language of the Scrolls during the 1950s and the 1960s include the 1952 edition by Abraham Meir Habermann of vocalized texts of the *Manual of Discipline* (1QS), with 1QSa, 1QSB, “the *Habakkuk Midrash Documents*” (1QpHab), and “Documents of the *Damascus Covenanters*” (CD),<sup>23</sup> of which an expanded second edition appeared in 1959, which included a concordance.<sup>24</sup> Abba Bendavid (1911-1994)<sup>25</sup> added a chapter on the language of the Dead Sea Scrolls in the second edition of his important *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew*.<sup>26</sup> Jacob Licht (1922-1993)<sup>27</sup> devoted a chapter to language in his editions of the *Hodayot Scroll* (1QH<sup>a</sup>)<sup>28</sup> and the *Rules Scroll* (1QS, 1QSa, 1QSB),<sup>29</sup> as well as occasional linguistic notes. The Hebrew edition of the *War Scroll*

<sup>22</sup> So he wrote in his survey, “The Dead Sea Scrolls, Hebrew Language,” *EncJud* (1972), 16:1584.

<sup>23</sup> Abraham M. Habermann, *‘Edah we-‘Eduth: Three Scrolls from the Judaean Desert, the Legacy of a Community* (Maḥbaroth LeSifrut: Jerusalem, 1952) (Hebrew). The vocalization reflects Habermann’s grammatical interpretation of the texts. Habermann (1901-1981) was born in Galicia, worked as a librarian in the Schocken Institute in Jerusalem, and was a scholar of medieval Hebrew literature and a poet.

<sup>24</sup> Abraham M. Habermann, *Megilloth Midbar Yehuda: The Scrolls from the Judean Desert* (Jerusalem: Maḥbaroth LeSifrut, 1959) (Hebrew).

<sup>25</sup> Born Feierstein in Galicia, he studied in Warsaw and worked at the Israel Broadcasting Authority and *Yad va-Shem*.

<sup>26</sup> Abba Bendavid, *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew* (Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1967), 80-94 (Hebrew). In the first edition, *Biblical Hebrew or Mishnaic Hebrew?* (Tel Aviv: Maḥbaroth LeSifrut, 1951) (Hebrew), Bendavid managed to insert a few scattered references to the newly discovered Scrolls.

<sup>27</sup> Jacob LichtHe was born in Vienna, wrote a doctorate on *Hodayot* (1QH<sup>a</sup>) under Isaac Seeligmann at the Hebrew University where he served as an assistant to Sukenik and Nahman Avigad. Later he taught in the Department of Bible at Tel Aviv University. For other aspects of Licht’s research of the Scrolls, see the surveys by Devorah Dimant and Bilhah Nitzan in this volume.

<sup>28</sup> Jacob Licht, *The Thanksgiving Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (Bialik Institute: Jerusalem, 1957), 8-10 (Hebrew).

<sup>29</sup> Jacob Licht, *The Rule Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea-1QS, 1QSa, 1QSB* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965), 39-50 (Hebrew).

(1QM) by Yadin also contained notes discussing language,<sup>30</sup> as did the English edition.<sup>31</sup> Ben-Tsiyon Lurya<sup>32</sup> produced an edition of the *Copper Scroll* (3Q15),<sup>33</sup> which included a commentary with linguistic notes. Avi Hurvitz (1936-)<sup>34</sup> wrote on the language of the apocryphal Psalms from Qumran.<sup>35</sup> Menahem Zevi Kaddari<sup>36</sup> published the first extensive semantic treatment of the language of the Dead Sea Scrolls, focusing on the semantic fields of obligation.<sup>37</sup> Gad Ben-Ami Sarfatti<sup>38</sup> wrote on the expression of impersonal subjects in the *Rules Scroll* (1QS, 1QSa, and 1QSB).<sup>39</sup> Samuel Loewinger published an article in which he viewed the long forms of words in the *Great Isaiah Scroll* (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>) as traces of a non-Masoretic dialect.<sup>40</sup>

The first comprehensive paleographic analysis of the Scrolls was undertaken by Nahman Avigad (1905-1992).<sup>41</sup>

The language of later Hebrew documents found at other sites in the Judean Desert also were described by Israeli scholars. Kutscher presented

<sup>30</sup> Yigael Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1955) (Hebrew).

<sup>31</sup> Yigael Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness* (trans. by Batya and Chaim Rabin; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962).

<sup>32</sup> He was born in Bialystok and worked in the Israeli Ministry of Education.

<sup>33</sup> Ben-Tsiyon Lurya, *The Copper Scroll from the Judean Desert* (Jerusalem: Kiryath Sepher, 1963) (Hebrew).

<sup>34</sup> He was born in Tel Aviv, wrote a doctoral dissertation on Late Biblical Hebrew and the dating of Psalms under Rabin at the Hebrew University, and taught in the Departments of Bible and Hebrew Language at the Hebrew University.

<sup>35</sup> "When Was the Expression 'שְׁלוֹם עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל' Created in Hebrew?" *Lěšonenu* 27-28 (1964): 297-302 (Hebrew); "Observations on the Language of the Third Apocryphal Psalm from Qumran," *RevQ* 5 (1965): 225-32; "Adon Hakkol (אֲדוֹן-הַכּוֹל)," *Tarbiz* 34 (1965): 224-7 (Hebrew); "The Language and Date of Psalm 151," *Erlsr* 8 (1967): 82-87 (Hebrew).

<sup>36</sup> Born Schwartz in Hungary, he wrote a doctorate on the Aramaic of the Zohar under Tur-Sinai at the Hebrew University, and taught in the Department of Hebrew at Bar-Ilan University.

<sup>37</sup> Menahem Zevi Kaddari, *Semantic Fields in the Language of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Kiryath Sepher and the Shrine of the Book: Jerusalem, 1968) (Hebrew).

<sup>38</sup> Born Giorgio Sarfatti in Pisa, he wrote a doctoral dissertation on mathematics in Florence and a second dissertation on Hebrew terms in the scientific literature of the Middle Ages under Rabin at the Hebrew University; he taught in the Department of Hebrew Language at Bar-Ilan University.

<sup>39</sup> Gad Ben-Ami Sarfatti, "The Forms פְּעֻלָּהּ, פְּעֻלָּהוּ and the Expression of Impersonal Subject in the Manual of Discipline (1QS, 1QSa, 1QSB)," *Lěšonenu* 32 (1968): 63-66 (Hebrew).

<sup>40</sup> David Samuel Loewinger, "Remnants of Hebrew Dialect in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>," in Chaim Rabin and Yigael Yadin, eds., *Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of E. L. Sukenik* (Jerusalem: Hekhal ha-Sefer, 1961), 141-62 (Hebrew).

<sup>41</sup> Nahman Avigad, "The Palaeography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents," *ScrHier* 4 (1958): 56-87. Born Reiss in Seidenberg (Germany), he wrote his doctoral dissertation on the tombs in the Kidron Valley under Sukenik and taught in the Institute of Archaeology at the Hebrew University.

a detailed analysis of the Hebrew of the Bar Kosiba letters from Naḥal Hever and Wadi Murabba'āt, stressing the similarities to Tannaitic Hebrew.<sup>42</sup> Yadin's commentary on the *Ben Sira Scroll* found at Masada contained many discussions of linguistic points.<sup>43</sup>

*The Second Phase (1970 to present)*

The period following the publication of the documents from caves 4 and 11 at Qumran is marked by attempts to synthesize the data from all the published scrolls with the goal of defining more precisely the nature of Qumran Hebrew. The most prolific and prominent Israeli scholar writing on the language of the Scrolls during this period is Elisha Qimron (1943-).<sup>44</sup> His 1976 dissertation at the Hebrew University written under the direction of Kutscher and, after his death, Hurvitz,<sup>45</sup> was the first attempt to write a grammar (excluding syntax) of all published texts. Qimron published a second grammar of the Dead Sea Scrolls in English in 1986,<sup>46</sup> which supplemented his doctoral dissertation and included some syntactic discussions. He has published scores of articles with improved textual readings and with linguistic discussions in English and Hebrew journals, and has also presented new readings of the *Damascus Document* (CD)<sup>47</sup> and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>.<sup>48</sup> He is the leading spokesman for those who believe that the Hebrew in the Dead Sea Scrolls reflects *in toto* a vernacular Hebrew of the

<sup>42</sup> Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher, "The Language of the Hebrew and Aramaic Letters of Bar Koseba and His Contemporaries. B. The Hebrew Letters," *Lěšonenu* 25 (1960-1961): 7-23 (Hebrew).

<sup>43</sup> Yigael Yadin, *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 1965) (Hebrew). The text has been republished in Elisha Qimron, "A Revised Edition of Y. Yadin's 'The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada' (1965)," in *Masada: The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965; Final Reports* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1999), 6:151-252.

<sup>44</sup> Born Kimelman in Tel Aviv, he studied at the Hebrew University and taught in the Department of Hebrew Language at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev.

<sup>45</sup> Elisha Qimron, "A Grammar of the Hebrew Language of the Dead Sea Scrolls" (Ph.D. diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1976) (Hebrew).

<sup>46</sup> Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS 29; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).

<sup>47</sup> Elisha Qimron, "The Text of CDC," in Magen Broshi, ed., *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 1992), 9-49. Qimron provided a new edition to this text, together with copies from other Qumran caves, in Elisha Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings, Vol. 1* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2010) (Hebrew).

<sup>48</sup> Donald W. Parry and Elisha Qimron, *The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>): A New Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1999). This scroll was recently republished by Peter W. Flint and Eugene C. Ulrich, *Qumran Cave 1.II: The Isaiah Scrolls* (DJD XXXII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2010).



Second Temple Period,<sup>49</sup> a view intimated by Ben-Ḥayyim and Morag in the 1950s. In a 1988 article, Morag distinguished between three types of language at Qumran: (1) “General Qumran Hebrew”, which reflected the spoken language; (2) the Hebrew of the *Copper Scroll* (3Q15); and (3) the Hebrew of *Miqṣat Ma’ase ha-Torah* (4QMMT), which was similar to Mishnaic Hebrew.<sup>50</sup>

Not all scholars in Israel have been convinced of the essential vernacular nature of the Hebrew attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Many still hold to the view articulated by Kutscher of a literary Hebrew, which was influenced at times by the vernaculars of the period (Mishnaic Hebrew and Aramaic). See, e.g., Joshua Blau (1919-),<sup>51</sup> who has stressed the literary nature of Qumran Hebrew and adduced the creation of literary, non-vernacular features in Middle Arabic texts as a parallel phenomenon to the creation of new features in Qumran Hebrew,<sup>52</sup> features that Morag and Qimron, on the other hand, believe prove the spoken and living nature of the language. Hurvitz has also argued for a basically literary language,<sup>53</sup> as has Steven E.

---

<sup>49</sup> See, e.g., Elisha Qimron, “Observations on the History of Early Hebrew (1000 B.C.E.-200 C.E.) in the Light of the Dead Sea Documents,” in Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 349-62; “The Nature of DSS Hebrew and Its Relation to BH and MH,” in Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde, eds., *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls & Ben Sira* (STDJ 36; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 232-44; “The Language and Linguistic Background of the Qumran Compositions,” in Menahem Kister, ed., *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World* (2 vols.; Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2009), 2:551-60 (Hebrew).

<sup>50</sup> Shelomo Morag, “Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations,” *VT* 38 (1988): 148-64. See also his posthumously published “Some Concepts in the World of Qumran: Polysemy and Semantic Development,” in Muraoka and Elwolde, *Diggers at the Well*, 178-92, particularly p. 192: “In conclusion: the lexemes of טרר as well as of the other terms of the Qumran lexicon that we have reviewed, and the meaning of which disclose specific semantic developments, definitely evidence a living language. They show that QH is an entity in itself, not an interim stage between Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew. QH plausibly goes back to the dialectal spread of the language in the period of the First Temple, or to an early stage of the emergence of the Hebrew dialects in the post-biblical period.”

<sup>51</sup> Born in Cluj (Transylvania), he wrote a doctoral dissertation on Judeo-Arabic under Baneth at the Hebrew University. He taught in the Department of Arabic Language and Literature at the Hebrew University and as an Adjunct Professor in the Department of Hebrew Language in Tel Aviv University. He also served as President of the Academy of the Hebrew Language (1981-1993).

<sup>52</sup> Joshua Blau, “The Structure of Biblical and Dead Sea Scrolls Hebrew in Light of Arabic Diglossia and Middle Arabic,” *Léšonenu* 60 (1997): 21-32 (Hebrew); “A Conservative View of the Language of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in Muraoka and Elwolde, *Diggers at the Well*, 20-25.

<sup>53</sup> Avi Hurvitz, “Was QH a ‘Spoken’ Language? On Some Recent Views and Positions: Comments,” in Muraoka and Elwolde, *Diggers at the Well*, 110-14.

Fassberg (1956-),<sup>54</sup> who considers the general tendency to lengthen forms to be an indicator of the artificial and literary nature of Qumran Hebrew.<sup>55</sup> The argument today among scholars is one of extent: do all the features found in the texts reflect vernacular influence or only some of them, and if so, which?

Israeli scholars have continued to explore the relationship of the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls to Classical Biblical Hebrew and to the language of more contemporaneous corpora in particular: late Biblical Hebrew texts, Ben-Sira, and Tannaitic Hebrew documents. This linguistic approach marks the many works of Qimron<sup>56</sup> and of Hurvitz,<sup>57</sup> Israel Yeivin,<sup>58</sup> Jonas C. Greenfield,<sup>59</sup> Moshe Bar-Asher,<sup>60</sup> David Talshir,<sup>61</sup> Menahem Kister,<sup>62</sup>

<sup>54</sup> Born in Washington, D.C. (1956-), he wrote a doctorate on the *Palestinian Targum* fragments from the Cairo Genizah under Thomas Lambdin at Harvard University and teaches in the Department of Hebrew Language at the Hebrew University.

<sup>55</sup> Steven E. Fassberg, "The Preference for Lengthened Forms in Qumran Hebrew," *Meghillot* 1 (2003): 227-40 (Hebrew).

<sup>56</sup> See Elisha Qimron, *Grammar of the Hebrew Language of the Dead Sea Scrolls; Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*; "The Text of CDC," *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings*; (with Donald W. Parry) *The Great Isaiah Scroll*; "Observations on the History of Early Hebrew;" "The Nature of DSS Hebrew."

<sup>57</sup> E.g., Avi Hurvitz, *The Transition Period in Biblical Hebrew: A Study in Post-Exilic Hebrew and Its Implications for the Dating of Psalms* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1972) (Hebrew); "The Linguistic Status of Ben Sira as a Link between Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew: Lexicographical Aspects," in Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde, eds., *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium held at Leiden University, 11-14 December 1995* (STDJ 26; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 72-86; "Further Comments on the Linguistic Profile of Ben Sira: Syntactic Affinities with Late Biblical Hebrew," in Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde, eds., *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages: Proceedings of a Second International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, and the Mishnah, held at Leiden University, 15-17 December 1997* (STDJ 33; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 132-45.

<sup>58</sup> Born in Berlin (1923-2008), he wrote a doctorate on the Babylonian vocalization system under Ben-Hayyim at the Hebrew University, taught in the Department of Hebrew Language at the Hebrew University, and also worked in the Academy of the Hebrew Language. See Israel Yeivin, "The Verbal Forms יקוטלו, יקוטלו in Comparison to the Babylonian Vocalization," in Benjamin Uffenheimer, ed., *Bible and Jewish History: Studies in Bible and Jewish History Dedicated to the Memory of Jacob Liver* (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1972), 256-76 (Hebrew).

<sup>59</sup> Born in New York City (1926-1995), he studied at Yale University, where he also assisted Millar Burrows. He came to Israel in 1971 and taught in the Department of Ancient Semitic Languages at the Hebrew University. See Jonas C. Greenfield, "Two Notes on the Apocryphal Psalms," in Michael A. Fishbane and Emanuel Tov, eds., with the assistance of Weston W. Fields, *Sha'arei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran and the Ancient Near Eastern Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 309-14.

<sup>60</sup> Born Ben-Harush (1939-) in Ksar es-Souk (today Rashidiya, Morocco), he wrote a doctoral dissertation on Palestinian Syriac under Kutscher and, after his death, under Ben-Hayyim, and taught in the Department of Hebrew Language at the Hebrew University. He also serves as President of the Academy of Hebrew Language (1993-). See Moshe Bar-Asher, "A Few Remarks on Mishnaic Hebrew and Aramaic in Qumran Hebrew," in Muraoka and Elwolde, *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages*, 12-19; "Two Phenomena in Qumran He-

Steven Fassberg,<sup>63</sup> Tamar Zewi,<sup>64</sup> Matthew Morgenstern,<sup>65</sup> Alexey (Eliyahu)

brew: Synchronic and Diachronic Aspects," *Meghillot* 1 (2003): 167-84 (Hebrew); "On Several Linguistic Features of Qumran Hebrew," in Martin F. J. Baasten and Wido Th. van Peursen, eds., *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (OLA 118; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 73-93; "The Language of Qumran: Between Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew (A Study in Morphology)," *Meghillot* 2 (2004): 137-50 (Hebrew); "Some Unusual Spellings in Qumran Scrolls," *Meghillot* 3 (2005): 165-76 (Hebrew); "Grammatical and Lexical Phenomena in the Dead Sea Scrolls (4Q374)," *Meghillot* 4 (2006): 153-68 (Hebrew); "Un groupe de mots en hébreu biblique et Qoumrannique: étude sémantique," in Jan Joosten and Jean-Sébastien Rey, eds., *Conservatism and Innovation in the Hebrew Language of the Hellenistic Period: Proceedings of a Fourth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls & Ben Sira* (STDJ 73; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 1-14; "Qumran Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew," *Meghillot* 8-9 (2010): 287-317 (Hebrew).

<sup>61</sup> Born in Jerusalem (1944-), he wrote a doctoral dissertation on the terms for fauna in the Samaritan Targum under Ben-Hayyim at the Hebrew University and teaches in the Department of Hebrew Language at Ben-Gurion University. See David Talshir, "Review: Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, eds., *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah* (DJD 10)," *DSD* 2 (1995): 365-77; "תקל מתקל," *Meghillot* 1 (2003): 203-12 (Hebrew); "On the Use of אָנָה in Aramaic and in Hebrew," *Meghillot* 3 (2005): 205-29 (Hebrew).

<sup>62</sup> Born in Jerusalem (1957-), he wrote a doctoral dissertation on *Avot de-Rabbi Nathan* under Yaacov Sussmann and teaches in the Departments of Bible and Talmud at the Hebrew University. See Menahem Kister, "Some Notes on Biblical Expressions and Allusions and the Lexicography of Ben Sira," in Muraoka and Elwolde, *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages*, 160-87; "Studies in 4QMiqsat Ma'ase HaTorah and Related Texts: Law, Theology, Language and Calendar," *Tarbiz* 68 (1999): 317-71 (Hebrew); "Some Observations on Vocabulary and Style in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Muraoka and Elwolde, *Diggers at the Well*, 137-65; "Three Unknown Hebrew Words in Newly Published Text from Qumran," *Lšonenu* 63 (2001): 35-40 (Hebrew); "Lexical and Linguistic Gleanings from the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Lšonenu* 67 (2004-2005): 27-44 (Hebrew); "Some Lexical Features of the Writings from Qumran," in Kister, *Qumran Scrolls and Their World*, 2:561-9 (Hebrew).

<sup>63</sup> Steven E. Fassberg, *Studies in the Syntax of Biblical Hebrew* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1994) (Hebrew); "The Orthography of the Relative Pronoun -הוּ in the Second Temple and Mishnaic Periods," *Scripta Classica Israelica* 15 (1996): 240-50; "The Syntax of the Biblical Documents from the Judean Desert as Reflected in a Comparison of Multiple Copies of Biblical Texts," in Muraoka and Elwolde, *Diggers at the Well*, 94-109; "The Linguistic Study of the Damascus Document: A Historical Perspective," in Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon and Avital Pinnick, eds., *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center, 4-8 February 1998* (STDJ 34; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 53-68; "The Infinitive Absolute as Finite Verb and Standard Literary Hebrew of the Second Temple Period," in Joosten and Rey, *Conservatism and Innovation*, 47-60.

<sup>64</sup> Born in Haifa (1960-), she wrote a doctoral dissertation on syntactical modifications reflecting the functional structure of the sentence in Biblical Hebrew under Gideon Goldenberg at the Hebrew University and teaches in the Department of Hebrew Language at the University of Haifa. See Tamar Zewi, "Nominal Clause Patterns in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Aharon Maman, Steven E. Fassberg and Yohanan Breuer, eds., *Sha'arei Lashon: Studies in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Jewish Languages Presented to Moshe Bar-Asher* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2007), 1:64-80 (Hebrew); "Nominal Clauses in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *JJS* 59 (2008): 273-91.

<sup>65</sup> Born in London (1968-), he wrote a doctoral dissertation on Geonic Aramaic under Bar-Asher at the Hebrew University and teaches at the University of Haifa. See Matthew

Yuditsky,<sup>66</sup> and Noam Mizrahi.<sup>67</sup>

Mention should also be made of linguistics notes in the commentary to the *Temple Scroll* (11QT) by Yadin,<sup>68</sup> the lengthy chapter on the language of *Pesher of Habakkuk* (1QpHab) that appears in the edition prepared by Bilhah Nitzan,<sup>69</sup> as well as the work of Emanuel Tov<sup>70</sup> on orthographic practices of scribes.<sup>71</sup>

The study of the language of documents from sites other than Qumran has progressed considerably since 1970. Joseph Naveh<sup>72</sup> and Ada Yardeni<sup>73</sup>

Morgenstern, "Language and Literature in the Second Temple Period," *JJS* 48 (1997): 130-45; "The Meaning of בֵּית מוֹלָדִים in the Qumran Wisdom Texts," *JJS* 51 (2000): 141-4; "Notes on the Language of the Qumran Scrolls," *Meghillot* 2 (2004): 157-68 (Hebrew); "The Apostrophe to Zion – A Philological and Structural Analysis," *DSD* 14 (2007): 178-98; "The System of Independent Pronouns at Qumran and the History of Hebrew in the Second Temple Period," in Maman, Fassberg, and Breuer, *Sha'arei Lashon*, 1:44-63 (Hebrew).

<sup>66</sup> Born in Kiev (1978-), he wrote a doctoral dissertation on the transcription of Hebrew in the *Secunda* of the Hexapla under Qimron at Ben-Gurion University. See Alexey (Eliyahu) Yuditsky, "The Weak Consonants in the Language of the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Hexapla Transliterations," in Joosten and Rey, *Conservatism and Innovation*, 233-9; Hanan Ariel and Alexey (Eliyahu) Yuditsky, "Three New Readings in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *L'šonenu* 72 (2010): 337-41 (Hebrew).

<sup>67</sup> Born in Jerusalem (1975-), he wrote a doctoral dissertation under Hurvitz at the Hebrew University, "The Lexicon and Phraseology of the Song of the Sabbath Sacrifice" (Ph.D. diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2008). See also Noam Mizrahi, "The Number of David's Psalms (11QPsa<sup>a</sup> 27:4-5): A New Proposal," *Language Studies* 11-12 (2008): 199-212 (Hebrew).

<sup>68</sup> Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, the Hebrew University, Shrine of the Book, 1977) (Hebrew); the expanded English edition was published in 1983.

<sup>69</sup> Bilhah Nitzan, *Pesher Habakkuk: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (1QpHab) (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1986), 88-122 (Hebrew). She was born in Israel (1933-), wrote a doctorate under Licht at Tel Aviv University, and taught in the Department of Bible at Tel Aviv University.

<sup>70</sup> Born Toff in Amsterdam (1941-), he wrote a doctoral dissertation on the Septuagint translation of Jeremiah and Baruch at the Hebrew University under Shemaryahu Talmon and Frank Moore Cross (Harvard University) and taught in the Department of Bible at the Hebrew University. In the years 1990-2003 he served as the Editor-in-Chief of the DJD Scrolls publication project.

<sup>71</sup> E.g., Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004); "The Spelling and Language of the Qumran Scrolls: New Findings," in Moshe Bar-Asher et al., eds., *Shai le-Sara Japhet: Studies in the Bible, Its Exegesis and Its Language* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2007), 333-52 (Hebrew).

<sup>72</sup> Born Löwy in Mukačevo (Czechoslovakia), he wrote a doctoral dissertation on the development of the Aramaic script under Avigad at the Hebrew University and taught in the Institute of Archaeology and the Department of Ancient Semitic Languages at the Hebrew University.

<sup>73</sup> Born Zulay (daughter of Menahem Zulay, scholar of *piyyut*) in Jerusalem, she wrote a doctoral dissertation on the Hebrew and Aramaic documents from Wadi Murabba'at and Naḥal Ḥever written in cursive script under Naveh and Greenfield at the Hebrew University. She is an independent scholar and graphic artist.

have investigated the language of Judean Desert documents, the former in articles<sup>74</sup> and a book,<sup>75</sup> and the latter in articles and her comprehensive *Textbook of Aramaic, Hebrew and Nabatean Documentary Texts*, which presents the reader with transliteration, translation, facsimiles, paleographic analysis, and a concordance.<sup>76</sup> The final reports of the Yadin excavations from 1963-1965 at Masada have finally been published and contain texts (biblical fragments, Bible-related compositions, extra-biblical works, and Ben Sira) and a commentary, which includes remarks on language.<sup>77</sup> Similarly, all the Hebrew letters of Bar Kosiba have now been published with commentary and grammatical description.<sup>78</sup> Recently, a grammar of the epigraphic Hebrew documents from between the First and Second Revolts has been written by Uri Mor.<sup>79</sup> The “Vision of Gabriel” inscription, which is of unknown provenance from the Judean Desert, has been studied by Yardeni and Binyamin Elitsur,<sup>80</sup> Bar-Asher,<sup>81</sup> and Yuditsky and Qimron.<sup>82</sup>

### *Summary of Research and Directions for the Future*

Research by Israeli scholars into the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls has been marked by an intensive synchronic description of the language, which has served as a basis for attempts to define precisely its nature and genetic

<sup>74</sup> E.g., Joseph Naveh, “Hebrew versus Aramaic in the Epigraphic Finds of the Second Temple – Bar-Kokhba Period,” *Lěšonenu* 56 (1992): 301-16 (Hebrew).

<sup>75</sup> See, e.g., Joseph Naveh, *On Sherd and Papyrus: Aramaic and Hebrew Inscriptions from the Second Temple, Mishnaic and Talmudic Periods* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1992) (Hebrew).

<sup>76</sup> Ada Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic, Hebrew and Nabataean Documentary Texts from the Judaeen Desert and Related Material* (2 vols.; Jerusalem: Ben-Zion Dinur Center for Research in Jewish History, 2000).

<sup>77</sup> *Masada VI: Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965. Final Reports. Hebrew Fragments from Masada by Shemaryahu Talmon with Contributions by Carol Newsom and Yigael Yadin, and the Ben Sira Scroll from Masada by Yigael Yadin with Notes on the Reading by Elisha Qimron and Bibliography by Florentino García Martínez* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1999).

<sup>78</sup> Yigael Yadin et al., *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters: Hebrew, Aramaic and Nabatean-Aramaic Papyri* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2002).

<sup>79</sup> Born in Israel (1974-), he wrote his doctoral dissertation under Qimron at Ben-Gurion University: *The Grammar of the Epigraphic Hebrew Documents from Judaea between the First and Second Revolts* (Ph.D. diss., Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, 2009) (Hebrew). See also Uri Mor, “Word Order in the Epigraphic Hebrew Documents and Letters from the Judean Desert,” *Meghillot* 7 (2009): 237-61 (Hebrew).

<sup>80</sup> Ada Yardeni and Binyamin Elitsur, “A First-Century BCE Prophetic Text Written on Stone: First Publication,” *Cathedra* 123 (2007): 155-66 (Hebrew).

<sup>81</sup> Moshe Bar-Asher, “On the Language of ‘The Vision of Gabriel,’” *RevQ* 23 (2008): 491-524.

<sup>82</sup> Alexey (Eliyahu) Yuditsky and Elisha Qimron, “Notes on the So-called ‘Vision of Gabriel’ Inscription,” *Cathedra* 133 (2009): 133-44 (Hebrew).

relationship to other varieties of Hebrew. Research has focused on the question of whether the language was literary or vernacular, Biblical (classical and late) or Tannaitic, or an altogether independent dialect. From the beginning Israeli scholars have also studied the linguistic data in the light of all contemporaneous Hebrew evidence: the different vocalization systems of Biblical Hebrew (Tiberian, Babylonian, Palestinian, and that reflected in Greek and Latin transcriptions), the language reflected in post-exilic books of the Hebrew Bible (Late Biblical Hebrew), Ben-Sira, Samaritan Hebrew, and traditions of Tannaitic Hebrew. In contrast, scholarship outside of Israel has tended to exploit fewer of these sources and has focused primarily on Tiberian Biblical Hebrew.

Today, sixty years after the discovery of the first scrolls, the extent to which the language of the Dead Sea Scrolls reflects a spoken language still remains debated, as does its exact position with regard to Classical Biblical Hebrew, Late Biblical Hebrew, and Tannaitic Hebrew. Of the different linguistic fields, semantics has yet to be fully explored; to date only Kaddari and Morag have dealt with specific semantic fields in a systematic manner. A desideratum is a new and complete grammar based on all the published Dead Sea Scrolls. Qimron is working on such a project and he intends to bring into the discussion all the relevant phenomena from the different ancient Hebrew traditions.

### *Aramaic*

#### *The First Phase (1955-1970)*

Before the publication of the first Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls documents, two Israeli scholars stood out for their contributions to Aramaic in general. The first, Ben-Hayyim, had investigated the Palmyrene onomasticon (before coming to Palestine) and Samaritan Aramaic. The second, Kutscher, had contributed to the study of Elephantine Aramaic, Biblical Aramaic, and lexical items found in the Talmudim and Geonic literature; moreover, he had revolutionized the study of Galilean Aramaic.<sup>83</sup>

The study of the Aramaic found in the documents from Qumran began in Israel after the publication in Jerusalem by Avigad and Yadin of the first

---

<sup>83</sup> In a series of four installments: Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher, "Studies in Galilean Aramaic," *Tarbiz* 21 (1950): 192-205; 22 (1951): 53-63, 185-92; 23 (1952): 36-60 (Hebrew). The series of articles were translated into English by Michael Sokoloff and appeared as a monograph, *Studies in Galilean Aramaic* (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 1976).



lengthy Aramaic manuscript, the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1Q20), in 1956.<sup>84</sup> The edition by Avigad and Yadin did not contain any linguistic analysis: that task fell to Kutscher, whose seminal article on the language of the *Genesis Apocryphon* in the 1958 Hebrew University volume has left a lasting imprint on the study of Aramaic dialectology.<sup>85</sup> Among other things, Kutscher dated the Aramaic reflected in the *Genesis Apocryphon* to between 100 BCE-100 CE, and used the data from this work to prove the Palestinian origin of *Targum Onqelos*. Though written long before the publication of most other Aramaic documents from Qumran, it remains to this day an indispensable analysis of the language that places it within the larger picture of the development of Aramaic. He also contributed an important review article of the first edition of Joseph Fitzmyer's edition of the *Genesis Apocryphon*.<sup>86</sup>

Ben-Hayyim dealt with Qumran Aramaic tangentially during this period in his studies on Samaritan Aramaic, in particular, his publication of Samaritan prayers and hymns.<sup>87</sup> He pointed out isoglosses between Qumran Aramaic and Samaritan Aramaic, similar to the isoglosses shared by Qumran Hebrew and Samaritan Hebrew.

The language of the Aramaic Bar Kosiba letters from Naḥal Ḥever known at the time was carefully examined by Kutscher.<sup>88</sup>

### *The Second Phase (1970 to present)*

The investigation of the Aramaic of the Dead Sea Scrolls increased dramatically after 1970. Israeli scholars have tended to integrate the data from Qumran Aramaic into the larger picture of Palestinian Aramaic in general, i.e., Jewish Palestinian Aramaic (also known as Galilean Aramaic), Christian Palestinian Aramaic (also known as Palestinian Syriac), and Samaritan

<sup>84</sup> Nahum Avigad and Yigael Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea: Description and Contents of the Scroll, Facsimiles, Transcription and Translation of Columns II, XIX-XXI* (Jerusalem: Magnes and Heikhal ha-Sefer, 1956). The first Aramaic fragments of the Dead Sea Scrolls were published one year earlier in 1955 in DJD I, RB 62, and *Semitica* 5.

<sup>85</sup> Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher, "The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon: A Preliminary Study, *ScrHier* 4 (1958): 1-35.

<sup>86</sup> Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher, *Or* 39 (1970): 178-83.

<sup>87</sup> Ze'ev Ben-Hayyim, *The Recitation of Prayers and Hymns* (vol. 3, part II of *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic Amongst the Samaritans*; Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1967) (Hebrew).

<sup>88</sup> Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher, "The Language of the Hebrew and Aramaic Letters of Bar-Kosiba and His Contemporaries. A. The Aramaic Letters," *Lěšonenu* 25 (1960-1961): 117-33 (Hebrew).

Aramaic. Representatives of this integrative approach are Ben-Ḥayyim and Abraham Tal.<sup>89</sup> Ben-Ḥayyim continued to examine Samaritan Aramaic in the light of its Palestinian Aramaic affinities, including Qumran Aramaic; see, e.g., his 1988 edition and commentary on the Samaritan work *Tibat Marqe*.<sup>90</sup> Tal has written several important articles on the salient dialect features of Palestinian Aramaic, tracing the development of phenomena found in the Qumran texts up through Western Neo-Aramaic: the suffixed *nun* on verbal and non-verbal forms,<sup>91</sup> demonstrative pronouns,<sup>92</sup> and infinitival forms.<sup>93</sup> Mention should also be made of his 1976 work on the language of *Targum Jonathan* to the Former Prophets, in which he makes use of the Qumran material, as well as other corpora, in discussing the relationship of the language of *Targum Jonathan* to the language of other Aramaic dialects.<sup>94</sup>

Greenfield was a prolific scholar who contributed more than a dozen articles<sup>95</sup> on the language of Qumran, often in wide-ranging descriptions of Aramaic dialectological studies, and at times in collaboration with other scholars (Qimron,<sup>96</sup> Shaul Shaked,<sup>97</sup> Michael Sokoloff,<sup>98</sup> and Michael

<sup>89</sup> Born Rosenthal in Romania (1931-), he wrote his doctoral dissertation on the language of *Targum Jonathan* to the Former Prophets under Ben-Ḥayyim at the Hebrew University and taught in the Department of Hebrew Language at Tel Aviv University. See Abraham Tal (Rosenthal), *The Language of the Targum of the Former Prophets and its Position within the Aramaic Dialects* (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1975) (Hebrew).

<sup>90</sup> Ze'ev Ben-Ḥayyim, מרקה תיבת [Tibāt Mārqe] *A Collection of Samaritan Midrashim* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1988) (Hebrew).

<sup>91</sup> Abraham Tal, "Layers in the Jewish Aramaic of Palestine: The Appended Nun as a Criterion," *Lěšōnénu* 43 (1979): 165-84 (Hebrew).

<sup>92</sup> Abraham Tal, "Studies in Palestinian Aramaic: The Demonstrative Pronouns," *Lěšōnénu* 44 (1980): 43-65 (Hebrew).

<sup>93</sup> Abraham Tal, "The Forms of the Infinitive in Jewish Aramaic," in Moshe Bar-Asher et al. eds., *Hebrew Language Studies Presented to Professor Zeev Ben-Ḥayyim* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1983), 201-18 (Hebrew).

<sup>94</sup> Tal, *The Language of the Targum of the Former Prophets*. See also his article "From Qumran to Shekhem on Hidden Paths," *Meghillot* 7 (2009): 227-35 (Hebrew).

<sup>95</sup> Most of them appear in Shalom M. Paul et al., eds., *Al Kanfei Yonah: Collected Studies of Jonas C. Greenfield on Semitic Philology* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2001).

<sup>96</sup> Jonas C. Greenfield and Elisha Qimron, "The Genesis Apocryphon Col. XII," in Takamitsu Muraoka, ed., *Studies in Qumran Aramaic* (AbrNSup 3; Leuven: Peeters, 1992), 70-77.

<sup>97</sup> Jonas C. Greenfield and Shaul Shaked, "Three Iranian Words in the Targum of Job from Qumran," *ZDMG* 122 (1972): 37-45. Born in Debrecen (Hungary, 1933-), Shaked studied at the Hebrew University and wrote his doctoral dissertation on Iranian languages at the School for Oriental and African Studies (London). He taught in the Department of Indian, Iranian and Armenian Studies and the Department of Comparative Religion at the Hebrew University.

<sup>98</sup> Jonas C. Greenfield and Michael Sokoloff, "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Aramaic Vocabulary," in Muraoka, *Studies in Qumran Aramaic*, 78-98; "An Astrological Text from Qumran (4Q318) and Reflections on Some Zodiacal Names," *RevQ* 16 (1995):



Stone<sup>99</sup>). Lexicology and stylistics were two aspects of Qumran Aramaic that interested him in particular.<sup>100</sup> Before moving to Jerusalem, Greenfield had coined the term “Standard Literary Aramaic” to describe the language of the Aramaic Qumran documents as well as other literary corpora;<sup>101</sup> it has been widely adopted in Aramaic dialectology.

In 1974 Sokoloff presented a new edition of *Targum of Job* (11QtgJob-11Q10) with a lengthy linguistic introduction and accompanying linguistic notes.<sup>102</sup> He also contributed a detailed review article of Milik’s edition of the Qumran Aramaic copies of *1 Enoch*,<sup>103</sup> co-authored two articles with Jonas Greenfield,<sup>104</sup> and presented a state-of-the art survey on Qumran Aramaic.<sup>105</sup> In addition, he published a dictionary of the Judean Desert Aramaic texts that are not from Qumran.<sup>106</sup>

Other scholars who have investigated Qumran Aramaic include Qimron,<sup>107</sup> Fassberg,<sup>108</sup> Morgenstern,<sup>109</sup> and Talshir.<sup>110</sup> Qimron and Fassberg

---

507-17. Born in the United States, Sokoloff wrote his doctoral dissertation on the Hebrew of *Genesis Rabba* as reflected in Ms. Vatican 30 under Kutscher at the Hebrew University. He taught in the Department of Hebrew Language at Bar-Ilan University.

<sup>99</sup> E.g., Jonas C. Greenfield, Michael E. Stone, and Esther Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary* (SVTP 19; Leiden: Brill, 2004). Stone was born in Leeds, raised in Australia, wrote his doctoral dissertation on the eschatology of *4 Ezra* under Cross at Harvard University, served as an editorial assistant to *Scrolls from the Wilderness of the Dead Sea* (ASOR, 1965), and taught in the Department of Indian, Iranian and Armenian Studies and the Department of Comparative Religion at the Hebrew University. Eshel was born in Israel, wrote her doctoral dissertation on demons in the Second Temple Period under Stone at the Hebrew University and teaches in the Department of Bible at Bar-Ilan University.

<sup>100</sup> E.g., Jonas C. Greenfield, “The Genesis Apocryphon – Observations on Some Words and Phrases,” in Gad B. Sarfatti et al., eds., *Studies in Hebrew and Semitic Languages Dedicated to the Memory of Prof. Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher* (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1980), 32-39 (Hebrew).

<sup>101</sup> Jonas C. Greenfield, “Standard Literary Aramaic,” in André Caquot and David Cohen, eds., *Actes du premier congrès international de linguistique sémitique et chamito-sémitique. Paris, 16-19 juillet 1969* (The Hague: Mouton, 1974), 281-9.

<sup>102</sup> Michael Sokoloff, *The Targum to Job from Qumran Cave XI* (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 1974).

<sup>103</sup> Michael Sokoloff, “Notes on the Aramaic Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 4,” *Maarav* 1 (1979): 197-224.

<sup>104</sup> Greenfield and Sokoloff, “The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic”; “An Astrological Text from Qumran.”

<sup>105</sup> Michael Sokoloff, “Qumran Aramaic in Relation to the Aramaic Dialects,” in Schiffman, Tov, and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years, 746-54*.

<sup>106</sup> Michael Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Judean Aramaic* (Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 2003).

<sup>107</sup> Elisha Qimron, “The Pronominal Suffix  $\text{כֵּן}$  in Qumran Aramaic,” in Muraoka, *Studies in Qumran Aramaic*, 119-23. His grammar *Biblical Aramaic* (Biblical Encyclopaedia Library; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2002) (Hebrew) makes occasional reference to Qumran Aramaic; it also includes an appendix with fragments of the book of Daniel from Qumran.

have differed over the nature of the lengthened second masculine singular pronominal suffix *-kh* found in Aramaic texts. In line with their respective views as to the nature of the Hebrew texts (spoken versus literary), Qimron believes the suffixal form *-kh* was native to Aramaic and realized in speech whereas Fassberg believes it is a literary artifice and borrowed from the Hebrew texts.

The language of documents from elsewhere in the Judean Desert has been intensively studied since the long-awaited publication of additional Aramaic documents from Naḥal Ḥever and “Naḥal Ṣe’elim.” Prominent in the study of the language of these documents are Greenfield,<sup>111</sup> Naveh,<sup>112</sup> and especially Yardeni, who has published texts, presented paleographical analyses, and prepared a concordance.<sup>113</sup> Qimron has also contributed to the linguistic analysis of documents.<sup>114</sup>

---

Qimron has also collaborated with Greenfield (see Greenfield and Qimron, “The Genesis Apocryphon Col. XII”) and Morgenstern (see n. 109 below).

<sup>108</sup> Steven E. Fassberg, “Hebraisms in the Aramaic Documents from Qumran,” in Muraoka, *Studies in Qumran Aramaic*, 48-69; “The Pronominal Suffix of the Second Feminine Singular in the Aramaic Texts from the Judean Desert,” *DSD* 3 (1996): 10-19; “Qumran Aramaic,” *Maarav* 9 (2002): 19-31; “Salient Features of the Verbal System in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls,” in Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, eds., *Aramaic Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June – 2 July 2008* (STDJ 94; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 65-78.

<sup>109</sup> Matthew Morgenstern, *The Unpublished Columns from the Genesis Apocryphon* (M.A. diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1996; written under Fassberg) (Hebrew). Parts of the dissertation were published in Matthew Morgenstern, Elisha Qimron, and Daniel Sivan, “The Hitherto Unpublished Columns of the Genesis Apocryphon,” *AbrN* 33 (1995): 30-54; Matthew Morgenstern, “Language and Literature in the Second Temple Period,” *JJS* 48 (1997): 130-45; “The History of the Aramaic Dialects in the Light of Discoveries from the Judaeae Desert: The Case of Nabataean,” *ErIsr* 26 (1999): 134-42.

<sup>110</sup> David Talshir, “On the Relationship between הַנִּס and אִנִּס in Aramaic,” in Maman, Fassberg, and Breuer, *Shā’arei Lashon*, 2:408-16 (Hebrew); “On the Use of אִנִּס in Aramaic and in Hebrew.”

<sup>111</sup> Jonas C. Greenfield, “The Infinitive in the Aramaic Documents from the Judean Desert,” in Moshe Goshen-Gottstein, Shelomo Morag, and Simha Kogut, eds., שִׁי לְחַיִּים רַבִּין: *Studies on Hebrew and Other Semitic Languages Presented to Professor Chaim Rabin on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (Jerusalem: Academ, 1990), 77-81 (Hebrew). See also “The ‘Defense Clause’ in Some Documents from Nahal Hever and Nahal Se’elim,” *RevQ* 15 (1992): 467-71; “Some Arabic Loanwords in the Aramaic and Nabataean Texts from Nahal Hever,” *JSAI* 15 (1992): 10-21.

<sup>112</sup> See Naveh, “Hebrew versus Aramaic in the Epigraphic Finds”; *On Sherd and Papyrus*.

<sup>113</sup> See e.g., Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic, Hebrew and Nabataean Documentary Texts; ‘Nahal Se’elim’ Documents* (Jerusalem: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press and the Israel Exploration Society, 1995).

<sup>114</sup> Magen Broshi and Elisha Qimron, “A House Sale Deed from Kefar Baru from the Time of Bar Kokhba,” *IEJ* 36 (1986): 210-14; Hannah M. Cotton and Elisha Qimron, “XHev/Se ar 13 of 134 or 135 C.E.: A Wife’s Renunciation of Claims,” *JJS* 49 (1998): 108-

*Summary of Research and Directions for the Future*

By and large, Israeli scholars have concentrated on placing the Aramaic of the Dead Sea Scrolls in the larger framework of Aramaic dialectology, particularly Palestinian Aramaic dialects. This approach continues to characterize linguistic investigations to this day. As is the case with the Hebrew documents, the extent of the vernacular in the Aramaic texts is a moot point and further research on Qumran Aramaic as well as that of other contemporary dialects is needed. The provenance of the texts also is a subject of debate – were all written at Qumran or were they brought to Qumran from elsewhere? One desideratum for the future is a comprehensive Aramaic grammar based on all the published texts.<sup>115</sup> Another is a detailed description of Greenfield's term "Standard Literary Aramaic" and its relationship to the language of the Aramaic scrolls.

---

18. Broshi (1929-) served as the curator of the Shrine of the Book (1964-1994). Cotton teaches in the Departments of Classics and History at the Hebrew University.

<sup>115</sup> There are two grammars, both of which appeared before the publication of all the texts: Klaus Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984; Band 2, 2004); Ursula Schattner-Rieser, *L'araméen des manuscrits de la mer Morte, 1. Grammaire* (Instruments pour l'étude des langues de l'Orient ancien 5; Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2004). Takamitsu Muraoka is at work on a new, comprehensive grammar.

# EXCAVATIONS IN THE JUDEAN DESERT AND AT QUMRAN UNDER ISRAELI JURISDICTION

HANAN ESHEL ה"ח

## *Prologue*

The Judean Desert was surrounded by Jewish settlements in the late Second Temple and early Roman periods (150 BCE-136 CE). Its dry climate makes it the only area in the Land of Israel in which scrolls and documents can survive. The first scrolls were found in cave 1 at Qumran in 1947. Prior to this discovery, caves were excavated in the Judean Desert solely for the purpose of learning about prehistoric periods. The first scrolls became known to the scholarly world only at the very end of the British Mandate in Palestine. After the 1948 War of Independence most of the Judean Desert, including Qumran, was part of the Kingdom of Jordan. Only the southern part, including Masada and En Gedi, was under Israeli jurisdiction; the situation changed in 1967. The present review, which surveys archaeological research in the Judean Desert by Israeli scholars, is divided into three sections. The first surveys this research conducted in the areas under Israeli jurisdiction before 1967,<sup>1</sup> chiefly large excavation projects at Masada and in the Bar Kokhba refuge caves in the southern part of the desert. The second summarizes archaeological work at Qumran after 1967, when the areas of the desert west of the Dead Sea became part of Israel. The last section discusses the discoveries during the last four decades of documents and inscriptions from the time of the Bar Kokhba revolt (132-135 CE) in caves in the Judean Desert.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For a useful description of the history of the archaeological research of the Judean Desert caves, see Stephen J. Pfann, "History of the Judean Desert Discoveries," in Emanuel Tov, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: Companion Volume* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 97-108.

<sup>2</sup> On the refuge caves, i.e., the natural caves to which the Jewish refugees fled in the summer of 135 CE, at the end of the Bar Kokhba Revolt, see Hanan Eshel, "The Contribution of Documents and Other Remains Found in the Judean Desert Between 1979 and 1993 to the Understanding of the Bar Kokhba Revolt," *BALAS* 15 (1997): 108-10; "A Survey of the Refuge Caves and Their Legal Documents," in Albert I. Baumgarten et al., eds., *Halakhah in Light of Epigraphy* (Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck

*Excavation in the Southern Part of the Judean Desert before 1967*

In March 1956 Michael Avi-Yonah (1904-1974) and his colleagues conducted an archaeological survey of Masada. They proved that Herod's royal palace described by Josephus (*J. W.* 7.3) was built on the northern slope of the fortress. They also discovered a papyrus fragment written in Hebrew or Aramaic, an ostrakon that mentioned "Hanani son of Shim'on," and a Greek inscription.<sup>3</sup>

In Jordan other events took place. In August 1952 and July 1953 the curators of the Rockefeller Museum in east Jerusalem purchased from Khalil Iskander Shahin (Kando) an important group of Scroll fragments and economic documents from the time of the Bar Kokhba Revolt. The Bedouin claimed they had discovered them in Wadi Seiyal, that is, in caves located in Israeli territory (meaning that they had not violated the Jordanian antiquities law when they explored these caves).<sup>4</sup> The southern part of the Judean Desert, the only section under Israeli control between 1948 and 1967, is triangular in shape, with its vertices at Sodom, Arad and En Gedi. The international border crossed the wadis south of En Gedi, leaving their western stretches in Jordanian territory and their eastern parts in Israel. The border was demarcated in such a way that Wadi Seiyal, which runs from Arad to the area north of Masada, fell entirely in Israeli territory, whereas Naḥal David (Wadi Sdeir), which runs to En Gedi, was in Jordanian hands except for its easternmost section. By stating that they had found the documents in the caves of Wadi Seiyal the Bedouin made sure to assert that they came from caves definitely in Israel and not in Jordan. Today it is clear that most of these documents came from the Naḥal Ḥever caves; nevertheless, they have been designated the "Wadi Seiyal collection." Along with the fragments that the Bedouin claimed to have found in Wadi Seiyal, four scroll fragments from the book of Genesis, and a document written in Adar

---

& Ruprecht, 2011), 103-53; Hanan Eshel and David Amit, *Refuge Caves of the Bar Kokhba Revolt* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1998) (Hebrew).

<sup>3</sup> See Michael Avi-Yonah et al., "The Archaeological Survey of Masada, 1955-1956," *IEJ* 7 (1957): 1-162.

<sup>4</sup> For the full publication of most of the documents of the Wadi Seiyal collection, see Hannah M. Cotton and Ada Yardeni, *Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek Documentary Texts from Naḥal Ḥever and Other Sites, with an Appendix Containing Alleged Qumran Texts (The Seiyal Collection II)* (DJD XXVII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997). On the acquisition of the documents in this collection, see pages 1-4.

of the third year of Shim'on son of Kosiba, which the Bedouin said they had found in Naḥal David, were acquired by the Rockefeller Museum.<sup>5</sup>

No additional scrolls were found in caves near Khirbet Qumran after the discovery of cave 11 in January or February 1956; consequently the Bedouin continued to look for scrolls and documents in caves in the southern part of the Judean Desert, which was part of Israel before the 1967 war. In 1959, Israeli scholars heard rumors that Bedouin had found documents at Wadi Seiyal. This led Yohanan Aharoni to conduct an archaeological survey of the caves of Wadi Seiyal in the last week of January 1960. He found three caves that contained artifacts from the period of the Bar Kokhba Revolt. In one of the caves he discovered two parchments from a head phylactery and a small fragment of a scroll; in another cave he uncovered a large group of arrows.<sup>6</sup> In light of these finds it was decided to launch the Judean Desert Operation—a systematic survey of the caves in Israeli territory. The campaign was conducted during the last week of March and first week of April 1960. It involved four separate teams, headed by Nahman Avigad (1905-1992), Yohanan Aharoni (1919-1976), Pessah Bar-Adon (1907-1985) and Yigael Yadin (1917-1984). They split up the survey area as follows: Avigad's team began with the southern slope of Wadi Seiyal, followed by the eastern section of Naḥal David; Aharoni's group worked on the northern slope of Wadi Seiyal and in Naḥal Harduf; Bar-Adon's team surveyed Naḥal Mishmar; and Yadin's group went to Naḥal Arugot and the northern slope of Naḥal Hever.<sup>7</sup> A torn Greek papyrus was found in the Scouts' Cave (renamed a year later the "Cave of Treasure") in Naḥal Mishmar.<sup>8</sup> The most important finds of this campaign were found in the large cave on the northern slope of Naḥal Hever, where Yadin's team found a small fragment of the book of Psalms (another 12 fragments of the same scroll had been found by Bedouin and are part of the Wadi Seiyal collection),<sup>9</sup> along with 15 letters (one on a wood tablet, the rest on papyrus) dispatched from Shim'on son of Kosiba's headquarters to the three com-

<sup>5</sup> These fragments were probably discovered in the Cave of the Pool in Naḥal David. On these fragments, see James H. Charlesworth et al., *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert* (DJD XXXVIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 117-24; Yossi Baruchi and Hanan Eshel, "Another Fragment of Sdeir Genesis," *JJS* 57 (2006): 136-8.

<sup>6</sup> On an earlier survey conducted by Aharoni in 1953 in the caves of Naḥal Hever, see Yohanan Aharoni, "The Caves of Naḥal Hever," *Atiqot* 3 (1961): 148-62.

<sup>7</sup> Joseph Aviram, "Introduction," *IEJ* 11 (1961): 3-5.

<sup>8</sup> On this document see Baruch Lifshitz, "The Greek Documents from Naḥal Seelim and Naḥal Mishmar," *IEJ* 11 (1961): 53-62; Hannah M. Cotton, "1Mish pap List of Names and Account gr," in Charlesworth, *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert*, 203-4.

<sup>9</sup> Hence there is no doubt that this scroll originated in the Cave of Letters, even though the Bedouin claimed to have found it in Wadi Seiyal. For the publication of the frag-

manders of En Gedi.<sup>10</sup> As a result, this cave was designated the “Cave of Letters”.

The second stage of the Judean Desert Operation was conducted a year later, in March 1961. Avigad continued his survey of Naḥal David; Aharoni moved to the southern slope of Naḥal Hever and excavated in the “Cave of Horror,” located opposite to the “Cave of Letters.” Bar-Adon and Yadin went back to the caves they had surveyed the previous year, Bar-Adon in Naḥal Mishmar and Yadin in the Cave of Letters.<sup>11</sup> In a cave in Naḥal Mishmar Bar-Adon unearthed a hoard of 429 Chalcolithic vessels.<sup>12</sup> The private archive of Babatha, daughter of Shim'on, comprising 35 documents in Nabatean, Aramaic and Greek, written on papyrus and dated to between 93 and 132 CE, was found in the Cave of Letters.<sup>13</sup> It was discovered with a smaller archive of a farmer from En Gedi, Eleazar son of Shmu'el, consisting of six Aramaic and Hebrew documents written during the Bar Kokhba Revolt.<sup>14</sup> Also found in this cave were the marriage contract of Salome Komaise, daughter of Levi, whose other documents had been found by Bedouin and are now part of the Wadi Seiyal collection.<sup>15</sup>

---

ments of the *Psalms Scroll* from the Cave of Letters, see Peter W. Flint, “5/6HevPsalms,” in Charlesworth, *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert*, 141-66.

<sup>10</sup> On the artifacts found in the Cave of Letters in 1960, see Yigael Yadin, “Expedition D,” *IEJ* 11 (1961): 36-52; *The Finds from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1963); *Bar-Kokhba* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971), 124-39. For the official publication of the letters, see Yigael Yadin et al., *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2002), 278-366.

<sup>11</sup> Joseph Aviram, “Introduction,” *IEJ* 12 (1962): 167-8.

<sup>12</sup> See Pessah Bar-Adon, “Expedition C,” *IEJ* 12 (19662): 215-26; *The Cave of the Treasure: The Finds from the Caves in Nahal Mishmar* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1980).

<sup>13</sup> On Babatha's archive, see Yigael Yadin, “Expedition D – The Cave of the Letters,” *IEJ* 12 (1962): 227-57; *Bar-Kokhba*, 222-53; Hans J. Polotzky, “The Greek Papyri from the Cave of Letters,” *IEJ* 12 (1962): 258-62. For the publication of the Greek documents from Babatha's archive, see Naphtali Lewis, “Greek Papyri,” in Yadin et al., *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1989). The Nabatean and Aramaic documents were published by Yigael Yadin and Jonas C. Greenfield in the same volume, 73-141, 170-276.

<sup>14</sup> On Eleazar son of Shmu'el's archive see, Yadin, “Expedition D,” 248-57; *Bar-Kokhba*, 172-83. The archive was published in full in Yadin, *Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period*, 37-70, 142-68.

<sup>15</sup> The marriage contract of Salome Komaise, the daughter of Levi, was found by Yadin's team in a narrow passage between the inner chamber, Hall C, and Hall B in the Cave of Letters. See Yadin, “Expedition D,” 231. Accordingly it was designated Papyrus Yadin 37. Thus, there is no doubt that the archive of Salome daughter of Levi, along with those of Yehonathan son of Be'ayan, Babatha daughter of Shimon, and Eleazar son of Shmu'el, was secreted away in the innermost chamber of the Cave of Letters, where it was discovered by the Bedouin, who dropped the marriage contract when they crawled back out of Hall C.



A small fragment of a scroll of the book of Numbers was found near the cave's entrance,<sup>16</sup> along with fragments of a Nabatean document published by Jean Starcky (it too is part of the Wadi Seiyal collection).<sup>17</sup> In light of these findings, there is no doubt that most of the documents included in the Wadi Seiyal collection actually came from the Cave of Letters in Naḥal Hever.

During the second season of the Judean Desert Operation, Yohanan Aharoni's group dug in the Cave of Horror, on the southern bank of Naḥal Hever.<sup>18</sup> They found nine small fragments of a scroll bearing a Greek translation of the Twelve Minor Prophets, three fragments of a scroll with a Hebrew prayer, a papyrus fragment with a text in Greek, and four ostraca with names. These artifacts lay beside the remains of persons buried in the cave.<sup>19</sup> Many other fragments of the scroll of the Greek translation of the Twelve Minor Prophets are now part of the Wadi Seiyal collection.<sup>20</sup> This indicates that some of these documents came in fact from the Cave of Horror in Naḥal Hever.<sup>21</sup>

---

When it became apparent that the marriage contract was part of the archive of Salome Komaise, daughter of Levi, whose documents are part of the Wadi Seiyal collection, it received the supplementary designation "XHev/Se papMarriage Contract 65". The document was published by Lewis, "Greek Papyri," 130-33, and later by Cotton, in Cotton and Yardeni, *Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek Documentary Texts from Naḥal Hever*, 224-37. On the archive of Salome Komaise, daughter of Levi, see Hannah M. Cotton, "The Archive of Salome Komaise Daughter of Levi; Another Archive from the Cave of Letters," *ZPE* 105 (1995): 171-208; Hanan Eshel, "Another Document from the Archive of Salome Komise Daughter of Levi," *Scripta Classica Israelica* 21 (2002): 169-71.

<sup>16</sup> These fragments were found at the eastern entrance of the Cave of Letters; see Yadin, "Expedition D," 228-9. The Bedouin dropped this small fragment at the mouth of the cave. Three other fragments of this scroll made their way to the Wadi Seiyal collection at the Rockefeller Museum. See Peter W. Flint, "5/6Hev Numbers<sup>a</sup>," in Charlesworth, *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert*, 137-40.

<sup>17</sup> On this document, see Jean Starcky, "Un Contrat nabatéen sur papyrus," *RB* 61 (1954): 161-81; Yadin, "Expedition D," 226; Ada Yardeni, "The Decipherment and Restoration of Legal Texts from the Judaean Desert: A Reexamination of Papyrus Starcky (P. Yadin 36)," *Scripta Classica Israelica* 20 (2001): 121-37.

<sup>18</sup> The designation "Cave of Horror" was given to this cave because it contained more than 40 skeletons of Jewish refugees who fled to it at the end of the Bar Kokhba Revolt.

<sup>19</sup> See Yohanan Aharoni, "Expedition B – The Cave of Horror," *IEJ* 12 (1962): 186-99. For the publication of the hymn and the Greek papyrus, see Charlesworth, *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert*, 167-72, and Elisha Qimron, "Improving the Editions of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Benedictions," *Meghillot* 4 (2006): 195-200 (Hebrew).

<sup>20</sup> For the official publication of the Greek Minor Prophets from the Cave of Horror, see Emanuel Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Hever (8HevXIIgr)*, *The Seiyal Collection I* (DJD VIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).

<sup>21</sup> Nevertheless, we cannot accept the premise that all of the documents in the Wadi Seiyal collection come from the Cave of Letters and the Cave of Horror. At least two documents seem to be from a cave in the upper stretch of Naḥal Hever; see David Amit and Hanan Eshel, "The Bar Kokhba Revolt in the Southern Hebron Mountains," *ErIsr* 25 (1995-



Masada was another focus of intense digging. The excavations at the site were conducted from October 1963 through April 1965.<sup>22</sup> Fifteen Hebrew scrolls were unearthed in the fortress (one written on papyrus, the rest on parchment).<sup>23</sup> There were also eighteen papyri in Latin, nine papyri in Greek, and two bilingual (Greek and Latin) papyri. In addition, 701 ostraca were found with texts in Aramaic and Hebrew, most of them vouchers for provisions.<sup>24</sup> One hundred and fifty ostraca are inscribed in Latin and Greek.<sup>25</sup>

The scrolls found at Masada can be divided into three groups: seven biblical scrolls, four scrolls with parts of apocryphal texts, and four other scrolls. The biblical scrolls include a fragment of Genesis, two of Leviticus, and a parchment of which three fragments of Deuteronomy survive. Fifty fragments of Ezekiel survive from another scroll. Two other scrolls contain Psalms. The apocryphal scrolls include the most substantial text found at Masada: seven columns from the proverbs of Ben Sira, chapters 39-44.<sup>26</sup> Another apocryphal text is based on Genesis. The third scroll is an apocryphon based on the book of Joshua. The last scroll in this category contains a fragment closely related to the *Book of Jubilees*. The most important of the

---

1996): 463-70 (Hebrew). Two other documents evidently originated in Wadi Hammamat, on the eastern side of the Dead Sea. See Hanan Eshel, "The History of the Research and Survey of the Finds," in Eshel and Amit, *Refuge Caves*, 52-54. For the possibility that some other documents in the Wadi Seiyal collection were not found in Naḥal Ḥever, see Eshel, "History of the Research," 61.

<sup>22</sup> On the first season of excavations at Masada, see Yigael Yadin, "The Excavation of Masada—1963/64, Preliminary Report," *IEJ* 15 (1965): 1-120. On the scrolls and inscriptions, see 103-14. For a popular summary of the Masada excavations, see Yigael Yadin, *Masada: Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966), and on the scrolls see 168-91.

<sup>23</sup> For the publication of the scrolls found at Masada, see Shemaryahu Talmon and Yigael Yadin, *Masada VI: Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965, Final Report* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1999).

<sup>24</sup> The Aramaic and Hebrew ostraca found at Masada were published by Yigael Yadin and Joseph Naveh, "The Aramaic and Hebrew Ostraca and Jar Inscription," *Masada I: Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965, Final Report* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1989), 1-68.

<sup>25</sup> The Latin papyri found at Masada include the salary slips of a Roman legionnaire and a document about the distribution of medical supplies. The most significant of these papyri contains a quotation from Virgil's *Aeneid* 4.9. The Latin and Greek documents discovered at Masada were edited by Hannah M. Cotton and Joseph Geiger, *Masada II: Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965, Final Report* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1989).

<sup>26</sup> This scroll was discovered on April 8, 1964, in a room in the casemate wall, not far from the snake path gate. It was published by Yadin within a year. See Yigael Yadin, *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 1965); this volume was published to mark the opening of the Shrine of the Book on April 20, 1965. The edition was reprinted by Elisha Qimron with some improved readings and bibliography by Florentino García Martínez, in Talmon and Yadin, *Masada VI*, 152-251.

last group of four scrolls contains parts of a hymn known as the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (*Shirot Olat ha-Shabbat*), nine copies of which were found in the Qumran caves.<sup>27</sup> Fragments of two other unidentified scrolls were also discovered. The last-mentioned work is written in Paleo-Hebrew script on both sides of a papyrus. The word *lirnana* (לִרְנָנָה), “sing joyously,” appears twice on one side, along with the place name “Mount Gerizim.”<sup>28</sup> Of special importance is the finding of the two biblical scrolls buried in the synagogue built at Masada.

### *Excavation at Qumran after 1967*

While the first period discussed above saw large-scale excavations and archaeological surveys, the period since 1967 has been characterized by more limited activity. Some of it was at the Qumran site. Roland de Vaux had conducted five seasons of excavation there from 1951 to 1956, but the full scientific report on them had not been published. This circumstance created some major problems in the understanding of the archaeology of the site. It prompted excavations at Qumran after the end of de Vaux’s dig. These may be divided into two categories: a. excavations to find more artifacts, especially scrolls; b. excavations to answer a specific question about the nature of the site. The following summarizes the archaeological work done at Qumran and neighboring sites after 1967.

Solomon Steckoll had excavated some graves in the main cemetery of Khirbet Qumran in April 1966. Immediately after the 1967 war he continued to dig there. This dig was stopped in 1967, Steckoll having excavated nine graves in this cemetery.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> See Carol Newsom and Yigael Yadin, “The Masada Fragment of the Qumran Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice,” *IEJ* 34 (1984): 77-88.

<sup>28</sup> Talmon believed that the Paleo-Hebrew script of this papyrus, a script later used by the Samaritans, and the reference to Mount Gerizim, indicate that it is a Samaritan prayer. See Talmon and Yadin, *Masada VI*, 138-49. For the possibility that it is in fact a Jewish prayer, recited on 21 Kislev, the holiday instituted to mark the destruction of the Samaritan temple, see Hanan Eshel, “The Prayer of Joseph, a Papyrus from Masada and the Samaritan Temple on APTAPIZIN,” *Zion* 56 (1991): 125-36 (Hebrew).

<sup>29</sup> Solomon H. Steckoll, “Preliminary Excavation Report in the Qumran Cemetery,” *RevQ* 6 (1968): 335-6; “The Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Centro Studi e Documentazione sull’Italia Romana*, V (Milan: Cisalpino-Goliardica, 1973-1974), 199-244; Roland de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), 47-48.

In 1967-1968 Pessach Bar-Adon conducted an archaeological survey in the northern part of the Judean Desert<sup>30</sup> during which he discovered what he termed “another settlement of the Judean Desert Sect” at ‘Ain el-Ghuweir, some 15 kilometers south of Qumran. In 1969 Bar-Adon excavated a building at this site that resembled the one at Khirbet Qumran. This building consisted of a kitchen next to a hall. The pottery at the two sites is similar. A cemetery of the Qumran type with 18 graves was excavated north of this building.<sup>31</sup>

In 1971 Bar-Adon began to excavate a large cave in the limestone cliff north of Qumran, near Qumran cave 11. Bar-Adon, who had found the Chalcolithic treasure in Nahal Mishmar ten years earlier, believed that in this cave he would find one of the treasures mentioned in the *Copper Scroll* because column VI of this scroll contains the following: “In the Cave of the Pillar, of the two entrances facing east, at the northern entrance, three cubits deep is buried a *qalal* [goblet], in it there is one scroll [or one document, and] beneath it there are 42 talents of silver.”<sup>32</sup> Bar-Adon believed that he had identified this cave, and that he could find the *qalal*, the silver talents and the scroll. He dug the cave in 1971, 1977 and 1982. However, the excavation in this cave yielded only some shards of the Hellenistic and Roman periods.<sup>33</sup> In 1977, Vendyl Jones met Bar-Adon and became involved in the excavation of the same cave. After a long illness, Bar-Adon died in 1985, and Jones continued to excavate the so-called “Cave of the Pillar” in 1986 and 1988.<sup>34</sup>

In 1984-1985 Joseph Patrich surveyed the caves in the limestone cliffs, over a range from some four kilometers north of Qumran to four kilometers south of it. Seventeen caves yielded archaeological remains from the Second Temple period.<sup>35</sup> From 1986 to 1991 Patrich excavated five caves

<sup>30</sup> Pessach Bar-Adon, “The Judean Desert and the Plain of Jericho,” in Moshe Kochavi, ed., *Judaea, Samaria and the Golan: Archaeological Survey 1967-1968* (Jerusalem: Carta 1972), 130-31 (Hebrew).

<sup>31</sup> Pessach Bar-Adon, “Another Settlement of the Judean Desert Sect at ‘En-el-Ghuweir on the Shores of the Dead Sea,” *BASOR* 227 (1977): 1-25.

<sup>32</sup> Józef T. Milik, “Le rouleau de cuivre provenant de la grotte 3Q (3Q15),” in Maurice Baillet, Józef T. Milik and Roland de Vaux, *Les ‘petites grottes’ de Qumrân* (DJD III; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 290-91.

<sup>33</sup> Pessach Bar-Adon, “Excavations in the Judean Desert,” *Atiqot* 9 (1989): 15-17 (Hebrew).

<sup>34</sup> Daniel C. Browning, “The Strange Search for the Ashes of the Red Heifer,” *BA* 59 (1996): 74-89.

<sup>35</sup> Joseph Patrich, “Khirbet Qumran in Light of New Archaeological Explorations in the Qumran Caves,” in Michael O. Wise et al., eds., *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 74-75.

in the limestone cliffs in this area, four north of Khirbet Qumran and one south of it. A three-season dig was undertaken in Qumran cave 3 to find out whether its ceiling had collapsed before or after the scrolls were hidden there. After removing huge rocks from the floor of the cave, Patrich concluded that the cave had collapsed before the scrolls were brought to it. He excavated three other caves north of Qumran. One of them was Qumran cave 11. Between this cave and cave 3, a small cave (no. 24) was dug and a rich assemblage of pottery from the Roman period was unearthed, including a cylinder jar, a bag-shaped jar with the Hebrew letter *aleph* written on its shoulder, a cooking pot, and a complete Roman round lamp. Two interesting fragments of bowls were found in cave 24, one of "Nabataean ware" and the other of the so-called "Jerusalemite painted bowls."<sup>36</sup> In cave 13, a few hundred meters north of cave 3, several broken jars were found, one containing dry dates, and a juglet with some kind of liquid in it. Patrich suggested that it was balsam oil, a proposal that was met with criticism.<sup>37</sup> In 1989 Patrich together with Robert Eisenman excavated cave 37, a kilometer and a half south of Qumran. This remains the largest cave ever explored in the area. The finds in this cave were mostly from Iron Age II. They included a complete arrow, wooden beams, an oil lamp and a juglet.<sup>38</sup> Finds from the Roman period included a bronze coin, on which the head of the emperor had been deliberately scraped away, a fragment of a wooden plate, two arrowheads, fragments of four glass plates, two stone vessels, five jars, three cooking pots, twelve juglets, three bowls (two of Jerusalemite painted pottery) and a Herodian oil lamp.<sup>39</sup>

In 1990 Zvi Greenhut and the Hanan Eshel conducted a short excavation in a Qumran-type cemetery, previously discovered by Bar-Adon, north of Wadi Murabba'at, on the cliffs above 'Ain el-Ghuweir. It had 20 graves, of which two were dug. In one of them a 25-year-old male was buried. The

---

<sup>36</sup> Patrich, "Khirbet Qumran," 76-90.

<sup>37</sup> Joseph Patrich and Benny Arubas, "A Juglet Containing Balsam Oil (?) from a Cave near Qumran," *IEJ* 39 (1989): 43-59; but see Yehuda Feliks, "The Incense of the Tabernacle," in David P. Wright, David N. Freedman and Avi Hurvitz, eds., *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 146-7.

<sup>38</sup> Joseph Patrich, "Hideouts in the Judean Wilderness: Jewish Revolutionaries and Christian Ascetics Sought Shelter and Protection in Cliffside Caves," *BAR* 15/5 (1989): 32-42 (34).

<sup>39</sup> Patrich, "Khirbet Qumran," 91-93.

other held a three- to four-year-old child buried with a necklace of 34 glass beads.<sup>40</sup>

In 1992 Vendyl Jones started to dig in a small cave above Qumran cave 11. In this cave a coin from the First Jewish Revolt was found in a pit in the bedrock floor, which was filled with red material that Jones identified as incense used in the Temple, an identification that is probably wrong.<sup>41</sup>

An operation on a larger scale was launched in 1993 by the Israel Antiquities Authority, under the name Operation Scroll. It undertook to survey the caves in the northern portion of the Judean Desert. In this framework the area of Qumran was resurveyed for the fourth time. Dozens of caves in the limestone cliffs and in the marl terrace were checked and dug. The cliff west of Khirbet Qumran was divided into four survey regions (X-XIII); in this area almost 20 caves were excavated. In all of them pottery from the Second Temple period was found. In the cave where Patrich had found the oil juglet a fallen stone was removed. Under it two oil lamps from the end of the Second Temple period and a coin from the second year of the First Jewish Revolt were discovered.<sup>42</sup>

As part of Operation Scroll in 1993 Amir Drori and Yitzhak Magen conducted excavations in Khirbet Qumran. The dig continued for ten years (1993-2004). In 1996 Yuval Peleg replaced Drori.<sup>43</sup> During the renewed excavation a paved square south of the refectory (locus 77) was found. The floor of this square, which consisted of fieldstones and pebbles, was almost flat with a slight inclination to the southeast, namely to the date press.<sup>44</sup> Also excavated were the Iron Age silos on the southern plateau and four refuse dumps; the most important of these was the eastern one. The dumps contained Iron Age pottery, animal bones, basalt grindstones, a bronze jug,

<sup>40</sup> Hanan Eshel and Zvi Greenhut, "Hiam El-Sagha, A Cemetery of the Qumran Type, Judean Desert," *RB* 100 (1993): 252-9; Dan Reshef and Patricia Smith, "Two Skeletal Remains from Hiam El-Sagha," *RB* 100 (1993): 260-69.

<sup>41</sup> Browning, "The Strange Search for the Ashes." On the manufacture of borax in this cave, see Zohar Amar, "The Ash and the Red Material from Qumran," *DSD* 5 (1998): 1-15. It is interesting that an ostrakon with the inscription "Eleazar son of Yeshua *ba-borit*" (the soap maker) was found recently in Khirbet Qumran in the excavations conducted by Yitzhak Magen and Yuval Peleg.

<sup>42</sup> Michel Itah, Yoni Kam and Ronny Ben-Haim, "Survey and Excavations of Caves in the Fault Escarpment South of Almog Junction and West of Qalya," *Atiqot* 41/2 (2002): 169-76. For other surveys in the region see *Atiqot* 41/2 (2002): 177-208.

<sup>43</sup> See Yitzhak Magen and Yuval Peleg, "Back to Qumran: Ten Years of Excavations and Research, 1993-2004," in Katherine Galor, Jean-Baptiste Humbert, and Jürgen Zangenberg, eds., *Qumran: The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates* (STDJ 57; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 55-113.

<sup>44</sup> See Stephen J. Pfann, "The Wine Press at Kh. Qumran," *RB* 101 (1994): 212-14; Magen Broshi, "Date Beer and Date Wine in Antiquity," *PEQ* 139 (2007): 55-59.

various organic materials and a very large quantity of dates and date pits. The dig included a few rooms on the eastern side of Khirbet Qumran (loci 24, 37-39, 41, 51), and the aqueduct on the marl plain was cleaned. Magen and Peleg, who continued the excavation, dug nine graves at the southern end of the cemetery. Four of them had no bones; two contained 14 storage jars with lids, in which residue of an organic material was found, probably date honey. Among the smaller finds in Khirbet Qumran are a second *LMLK* stamp from Iron Age II and an Iron Age weight.<sup>45</sup> From the Second Temple period, Magen and Peleg found arrowheads, a *fibula*, ten *ostraca* – one with a three-line inscription: “Eleazar son of Yeshua the soap maker,” 180 coins and cooking pots with animal bones. Magen and Peleg also excavated two of the largest reservoirs at the site, which most scholars identify as ritual baths (*miqvaot*). Magen and Peleg believe that they identified there a thick layer of clay used for manufacturing pottery. However, the marl found near Qumran is unsuitable for such a purpose.<sup>46</sup> Moreover, the Qumran site lacked perennial water sources needed for such production, and had only small supplies of fuel for the kilns required to make the pottery. So Magen and Peleg’s claim that Qumran housed a center for pottery production is implausible.<sup>47</sup>

In 1995 and 1996 Magen Broshi and Hanan Eshel excavated the area north of Qumran for six weeks (from December 1995 to February 1996).<sup>48</sup> They undertook this dig because the marl terrace in this area had never been systematically surveyed. Moreover, de Vaux’s conclusions about the character of the Qumran site had been challenged by some scholars. For instance, Joseph Patrich argued that there was no connection between Qumran caves 1, 2, 3 and 11 and the Qumran settlement, for in his survey Patrich found no trails connecting between them.<sup>49</sup> Patrich also contested de Vaux’s suggestion that some of the Qumran inhabitants resided in huts, tents and artificial caves on the marl terrace. Patrich in fact concluded that only 50 to 70 people lived at Qumran.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> For another stone, which may have been carved into an Iron Age weight, see Hanan Eshel, “A Three Shekel Weight (?) from Qumran,” *Judea and Samaria Research Studies* 10 (2001): 33-34 (Hebrew).

<sup>46</sup> See Frederick E. Zeuner, “Notes on Qumran,” *PEQ* 92 (1960): 27-36.

<sup>47</sup> See Jodi Magness, “Qumran: The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Review Article,” *RevQ* 22 (2006): 649-59.

<sup>48</sup> Magen Broshi and Hanan Eshel, “Residential Caves at Qumran,” *DSD* 6 (1999): 328-48.

<sup>49</sup> Patrich, “Khirbet Qumran,” 75-76.

<sup>50</sup> Patrich, “Khirbet Qumran,” 93-94.

In light of these suggestions, Broshi and Eshel initiated the excavation for a better notion of daily life at Qumran, especially the form and location of the inhabitants' dwelling. At the beginning of 1993 Eshel discovered a network of paths north of Khirbet Qumran. They led to a series of artificial caves that had collapsed, but had never been mentioned in scholarly publications. Finding those trails and the artificial caves in such proximity to Qumran seems to indicate the existence of more dwelling caves.

The problem of the Qumranites dwelling places should be considered in light of the physical character of the caves in the site's vicinity. There is a significant difference between the natural limestone caves and the marl caves. The limestone caves, namely Qumran caves 1, 2, 3, 6, 11, are unsuitable for human habitation, whereas the marl caves may be used for dwelling in relatively comfortable conditions. Moreover, caves 1 and 2 are accessible with difficulty, and like cave 6 they are too small for habitation. Cave 3 collapsed before the end of the Second Temple period. Cave 11 is relatively large, but it lacks the leveled floor required for proper habitation. In contrast, caves found in the marl plateau are easily carved and may be adapted for human dwelling. Such caves usually possess more than one opening, hence are well ventilated and lit. The high percentage of water in the marl (up to 42%) adds moisture and lowers the temperature inside these caves, providing tolerable dwelling conditions in the fierce summer heat of the Qumran region.<sup>51</sup> Signs of habitation in the marl caves are evident in their leveled floors and the occasional niches for storage.

According to the *Damascus Document* (X, 20-21), on the Sabbath one may not walk farther than 500 meters from the settlement (half the Mishnaic limit of 2000 cubits). The inhabitants of Qumran no doubt kept to this limit. Now Qumran caves 1, 2, 3, 11 and 37 in the limestone cliffs are situated beyond it, whereas the marl caves dug by de Vaux (Qumran caves 4a, 4b, 5, 7-10) and the caves discovered in 1993 by Eshel are well within the 500-meter limit. Before Broshi and Eshel's excavation three artificial caves were known beneath the plateau on which Qumran is built: Qumran caves 7, 8 and 9. On the cliff west of the site five caves were known, Qumran caves 4a, 4b, 5, 10, and the "empty cave." In the Broshi and Eshel dig, six additional caves north of the aqueduct were examined. In all of them traces of illegal Bedouin excavations (probably in the 1950s) were found. The precarious state of these caves made digging too dangerous. It was possible only in two caves, labeled C and F, located some 200 meters north

---

<sup>51</sup> Yaacov Arkin, "Deformation of Laminated Sediments of the Dead Sea," *Geological Survey of Israel Current Research* 5 (1985): 57-65.



of Khirbet Qumran. The potsherds discovered there testify that both caves were occupied during the first century BCE and the first century CE. The 280 potsherds found on the floor of cave C include remains of jars, cooking pots, and bowls, and a splinter of a Herodian oil lamp. In cave F the dig did not reach the floor, for fear of collapse, but in the ruins about 180 shards, mostly of jars and bowls, were unearthed.<sup>52</sup> Together with the two caves excavated north of Qumran, ten artificial caves are known to date. A considerable number of the caves dug in the marl had collapsed and disappeared due to earthquakes, frequent in the Dead Sea area, rains, and flash floods. Sometimes the only evidence for eroded caves was the trails and stairs leading to them. These finds confirm the assumption that most of the Qumran members dwelt in the artificial marl caves.<sup>53</sup> Broshi and Eshel estimated that 20 to 40 artificial caves existed in the gullies near Wadi Qumran.

On the marl plateau, located between the collapsed caves and the site, five complete bowls were found on the surface. These vessels are similar to those found in stratum II of the Qumran site, dated to the first century CE. Four first-century CE bronze coins, the earliest dated to the Roman procurators of Judea and the latest to the First Revolt, were also found in this area, together with an iron wedge, which probably belonged to a tent.<sup>54</sup> So there is good reason to believe that tents stood in this area. Already in 1952 de Vaux found a jar on the plateau, north of cave 5. It was given a Khirbet Qumran inventory number because it was not found in a cave. It seems probable that this jar remained from a tent built above this cave.<sup>55</sup> In the same year, de Vaux discovered in cave 17, just south of cave 1, five wooden poles and various pottery vessels. He believed that the poles had belonged to a tent that had been brought to cave 17 for safekeeping.<sup>56</sup>

Broshi and Eshel also succeeded in locating the main path leading from the site to the northern caves (1, 2, 3, 11). Surveying a 90-meter stretch of this path with a metal detector, they found two Hasmonean coins and about 60 nails from sandals of the Roman period. Significantly, no later material was spotted along the path. These nails suggest that the path was in use for a long time and by many passers-by.

---

<sup>52</sup> Broshi and Eshel, "Residential Caves", 340-42.

<sup>53</sup> Patrich claimed that the marl caves near Qumran were not used for habitation. See Joseph Patrich, "Did Extra-Mural Dwelling Quarters Exist at Qumran?" in Schiffman, Tov, and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years, 720-27*. However, Patrich offered no explanation for the artifacts found by de Vaux, Broshi and Eshel in the marl caves.

<sup>54</sup> Broshi and Eshel, "Residential Caves", 336-9.

<sup>55</sup> De Vaux, in Baillet, *Les Petites Grottes de Qumran*, 27.

<sup>56</sup> De Vaux, in Baillet, *Les Petites Grottes de Qumran*, 9, 14, 16-17, 20 and plate 7.



In 1996 another expedition, led by James Strange, was excavating an area south of the Qumran site. Near the wall that separates the plateau from the main cemetery they found a group of shards, including two ostraca, one relatively well preserved, the other broken.<sup>57</sup> The ostracon in good condition is a deed of gift in Hebrew, whereby a certain Honi conveys all his property to a man named Eleazar son of Nahmani. This ostracon was published by Frank Cross and Esther Eshel.<sup>58</sup> In line 8 they read *ukemaloto la-yahad* (וכמלוהו לייחד) “and when he fulfils [his oath] to the community”; they posited that this deed of gift was a draft of an account written by Eleazar son of Nahmani, who served as an overseer of the community, given by Honi, who wanted to join the Yahad.<sup>59</sup> After the publication of the ostracon various alternative readings were proposed, most of which suggested emendations of the expression *ukemaloto la-yahad*.<sup>60</sup> Until the discovery of this ostracon at Qumran only three deeds of gift from the Judean Desert caves were known, two in Greek and one in Aramaic. In all three the property is bestowed on female members of the family, wives or daughters, for they needed the deed to stipulate that the ownership of the family’s property would be transferred to them, since according to the Roman law they were not considered legal heirs.<sup>61</sup> The ostracon from Qumran is the first deed of gift found in the Land of Israel in which the recipient is a man. This, along with the fact that it is composed in Hebrew, a rare phenomenon in

<sup>57</sup> See James F. Strange, “The 1996 Excavations at Qumran and the Context of the New Hebrew Ostracon,” in Galor, Humbert and Zangenberg, *Qumran, the Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 41-54.

<sup>58</sup> See Frank M. Cross and Esther Eshel, “Ostraca from Khirbet Qumran,” *IEJ* 47 (1997): 17-28.

<sup>59</sup> This interpretation is based on the description found in the *Community Rule*: “If fate decrees that he approaches the Company of the Community, following the decision of the priests and the majority of the members of their Covenant, his property and also his wages shall be handed over to the overseer of the revenues of the Many; but it shall be inscribed to his credit, and shall not be spent to the profit of the Many” (VI, 18-20).

<sup>60</sup> See Frederick H. Cryer, “The Qumran Conveyance: A Reply to F. M. Cross and E. Eshel,” *SJOT* 11 (1997): 232-40; Ada Yardeni, “A Draft of a Deed on an Ostracon from Khirbet Qumran,” *IEJ* 47 (1997): 233-7; Phillip R. Callaway, “A Second Look at Ostracon no. 1 from Khirbet Qumran,” *QC* 7 (1997): 145-70; Gerhard W. Nebe, “Qumranica IV: Die jüngst in Khirbet Qumran gefundene hebräische Schenkungsurkunde auf einer Tonscherbe,” *ZAH* 12 (1999): 96-103; Elisha Qimron, “Improving the Editions of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Meghillot* 1 (2003): 144-5 (Hebrew). See Cross’s reply in Frank M. Cross and Esther Eshel, “1. KhQOstracon,” in Stephen J. Pfann et al., *Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD XXXVI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 505-7.

<sup>61</sup> See Hannah M. Cotton, “Women and Law in the Documents from the Judaean Desert,” in Henri Melaerts and Leon Mooren, eds., *Le rôle et le statut de la femme en Égypte hellénistique, Romaine et Byzantine* (Paris-Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 123-47, and the bibliography cited therein.

the late Second Temple period,<sup>62</sup> supports the hypothesis that it was a draft of a deed drawn up by the overseer Eleazar son of Nahmani for Honi, who wished to join the sect.<sup>63</sup>

In July 2001 the main cemetery neighboring Qumran was freshly surveyed. The aim was to ascertain the precise number of graves, since a proper map of the cemetery had never been drawn. As a result a new map was produced. It recorded the exact location of 1178 tombs identified during the survey, including 124 graves no longer visible on the surface but identified by ground penetrating-radar (GPR).<sup>64</sup> Roland de Vaux, who had stated that there were some 1100 tombs, was proved correct. Of the 1053 tombs whose orientation could be determined, 999 run north-south and belonged, the excavators believed, to the Qumran community. The other 54 east-west tombs were identified as Bedouin. All but three of these different graves were located on the fringes of the cemetery.<sup>65</sup>

Near the east edge of the cemetery the metal detector led the excavators to a previously robbed tomb containing pieces of zinc, the remains of what appeared to be a burial coffin. Unfortunately, the robbers had left little behind. Numerous late-Roman lead coffins are known, but we do not know of any zinc or zinc-plated coffins, or of any large zinc objects from this period.

At the east edge of the cemetery a structure partly dug by de Vaux in 1951 was re-excavated. It is a flimsy stone construction. Little remained of its walls, which were about 60 centimeters thick; a height of three courses at most was preserved. The shards found in this structure dated to the first century BCE. The small excavated structure (5 x 4.5 meters) appears to have served as an open-air mourning enclosure, for its walls could not have supported a roof. Funerary meals were evidently consumed there. Ten other mourning enclosures have been unearthed in Jewish cemeteries in Israel; all are located over tombs, are roofless, and have benches along the walls.

Inside the structure a pile of bones was unearthed some 20 centimeters below the surface, probably a secondary burial in a shallow grave. They

---

<sup>62</sup> Hanan Eshel, "Use of the Hebrew Language in Economic Documents from the Judean Desert," in R. Steven Notley, Marc Turnage and Brian Becker, eds., *Jesus' Last Week* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 245-58.

<sup>63</sup> See Émile Puech, "L'ostracon de *Khirbet Qumran* (KhQ1996/1) et une vente de terrain à Jericho, témoin de l'occupation éssénienne à Qumran," in Hilhorst, Puech and Tigchelaar, *Flores Florentino*, 1-29.

<sup>64</sup> Hanan Eshel et al., "New Data on the Cemetery East of Khirbet Qumran," *DSD* 9 (2002): 135-65.

<sup>65</sup> See Joseph E. Zias, "The Cemeteries of Qumran and Celibacy: Confusion Laid to Rest," *DSD* 7 (2000): 220-53.

belonged to two women, one aged 25-35 years, the other over 50. A radiocarbon test, the first successfully carried out on skeletal remains from Qumran, showed they were from the Second Temple period.

With the aid of the GPR the excavators found a collapsed artificial cave, east of Qumran cave 9. The remains of a mat made of palm leaves, a storage jar, a cooking pot and a bowl found in this cave suggest a period of occupation. On the mat date and olive stones, a grape pit, and grains of wheat and barley were found.<sup>66</sup>

In July 2002 further soundings were taken in the area of the mourning enclosure. It was surveyed by GPR and an anomaly was detected beneath the spot where the bones of the two females were uncovered. Excavations there showed that the mourning enclosure was built over a grave, which at a depth of 1.10 meters contained a skeleton and was oriented east-west. The deceased faced upward, the head to the east and one hand alongside the body, which was that of a male aged 35-45 years. A Hasmonean (first century BCE) cooking pot, which had been deliberately broken, was found near his legs. The man buried beneath the mourning enclosure must have been an important personality, but he could not have been the Teacher of Righteousness. According to general scholarly understanding, the Teacher's activity should be dated to the second century BCE, some 50-100 years prior to the pot's manufacture. Yet the Qumran community had a number of high-ranking functionaries, such as the overseer mentioned in the *Community Rule* and the *Damascus Document* (e.g. 1QS VI, 11-12; CD XIII, 7-12). So the individual may have been one of these officials.<sup>67</sup>

In 2001 Yizhar Hirschfeld re-excavated the site of 'Ain Feshkha.<sup>68</sup> The most important find was a hoard of coins from the time of Mattathias Antigonus (40-37 BCE).<sup>69</sup> In 2004-2006 and in 2008, excavations on the southern plateau of Khirbet Qumran were conducted by Randall Price,

<sup>66</sup> See Hanan Eshel and Magen Broshi, "Excavations at Qumran, Summer of 2001," *IEJ* 53 (2003): 61-73; Mordechai E. Kislev and Mina Marmorstein, "Cereals and Fruits from a Collapsed Cave South of Khirbet Qumran," *IEJ* 53 (2003): 74-77. With appropriate equipment similar Qumran caves may still be discovered in the future.

<sup>67</sup> See Magen Broshi and Hanan Eshel, "Three Seasons of Excavations at Qumran," *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 17 (2004): 321-32.

<sup>68</sup> See Yizhar Hirschfeld, "Excavations at Ein Feshka 2001: Final Report," *IEJ* 54 (2004): 37-74. Most of his interpretations are wrong, see Hanan Eshel, "Qumran Archaeology – Review Article of Y. Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context*," *JAOS* 125 (2005): 389-94; Ehud Netzer, "Did Any Perfume Industry Exist at Ein Feshkha?" *IEJ* 55 (2006): 97-100; Roi Porat, "The Road along the Dead Sea Shore between Qumran and En Gedi in the Second Temple Period," *Cathedra* 121 (2006): 5-22 (Hebrew).

<sup>69</sup> See Gabriela Bijovsky, "A Hoard of Coins of Mattathias Antigonus from 'Ein Feshkha," *IEJ* 54 (2004): 75-76.

Oren Gutfeld and Yakov Kalman. They found pottery vessels with animal bones and nine coins dating from the second century BCE to the fourth century CE.<sup>70</sup>

*Excavation of Refuge Caves of the Bar Kokhba Revolt after 1967*

In 1985 Joseph Patrich published inscriptions found in a cistern in a cave in a rock shelf on the northern slope of Nahal Michmas (Wadi Suweinit).<sup>71</sup> The cistern was adjacent to a ritual bath carved into the rock shelf. These caves lie about a kilometer and a half east of the Arab village of Muchmas. The caves of this group seem to have been quarried out between 159 and 152 BCE, when Jonathan the Hasmonean made his headquarters in Michmas (1 Macc 9:73). Inside the cistern inscriptions and drawings made with a carbonized stick were discovered. They include illustrations of a seven-branched candelabra, a five-pointed star with smaller five-pointed stars inside it, and two lines of the Hebrew alphabet: the letters from *'alef* to *mem* are preserved in the first line, while the second line has the entire alphabet. Beneath the star there is an Aramaic inscription: "Joezer was uprooted, the guards entered." According to Patrich, Joezer wrote this graffito after he was injured and Roman legionaries were about to enter his hiding place in the cistern, at the farthest edge of the cave complex. The inscriptions are written in the late Jewish script. Even though Patrich found there spouts of four jars typical of the Bar Kokhba period, he dated the inscription to the time of the First Jewish Revolt, for paleographic reasons. However, early in 1998 coins and other artifacts from the Bar Kokhba era were found in a cave on the southern slope of Nahal Michmas, opposite the cave complex with Patrich's cistern. From a comparison of the forms of the letters in the cistern inscriptions with other documents found in the Judean Desert it was proposed to date the inscriptions to the Bar Kokhba Revolt rather than to the first Jewish Revolt.<sup>72</sup>

In a dig begun in the spring of 1986 a small cave west of Jericho was discovered. Fragments of five papyrus documents were found there.<sup>73</sup> One

---

<sup>70</sup> Yoav Farhi and Randall Price, "The Numismatic Finds from the Qumran Plateau excavations 2004-2006, and 2008 Seasons," *DSD* 17 (2010): 210-25.

<sup>71</sup> Joseph Patrich, "Inscriptions Araméennes Juives dans les grottes d'El-'Aleiliyat," *RB* 92 (1985): 265-73.

<sup>72</sup> Hanan Eshel, Boaz Zissu, and Amos Frumkin, "Two Refuge Caves in Nahal Mikhmas (Wadi Suweinit)," in Eshel and Amit, *The Refuge Caves*, 103-7 (Hebrew).

<sup>73</sup> See Hanan Eshel et al., "A. Ketef Jericho," in Charlesworth et al., *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert*, 3-113.

of them (P. Jericho 1) is to be dated to the fourth century BCE. The inner side of this Aramaic document contains a list of persons who had borrowed money. The owner of this document had lent money—a total of 21 shekels—to more than a dozen individuals. On the back of the papyrus the sums repaid by the borrowers are noted, adding up to nearly thirteen shekels, leaving a debt of slightly more than eight shekels.<sup>74</sup> The cave was named *Abi'or Cave*, after one of the names mentioned in this document. The other four documents found in this cave were from the Bar Kokhba period: two in Aramaic (P. Jericho 2-3) and two in Greek (P. Jericho 4-5). The Aramaic documents seem to be a loan contract and a deed of sale.<sup>75</sup> The two Greek documents are also deeds of sale, one of real estate and the other of seeds.<sup>76</sup> One of the Aramaic documents from the Bar Kokhba era was found in a crevice in the floor of the cave that had been filled in with dirt. The other four documents were found in dirt that had been compacted into a terrace at the entrance to the cave. The stratigraphy of this terrace was inverted (upside-down stratigraphy); that is, the older objects, including the fourth-century BCE document, were unearthed on top of those of the Roman period, including the three documents from the time of the Bar Kokhba Revolt.

The aforementioned Operation Scroll launched by the Israel Antiquities Authority in 1993 set out to survey the caves in the northern portion of the Judean Desert before the Jericho area was handed over to the Palestinian Authority. As part of this effort the caves on the ridge west of Jericho (“Ketef Jericho”) were scoured again. Because the documents found in 1986 in the *Abi'or Cave* were buried in a terrace at the entrance and in a crack in the cave floor, it was decided to investigate whether the monks who lived in that cave during the Mamluk period had removed most of the dirt from it. That would explain why documents were found only in the terrace and in the crack in the floor. In excavations conducted below the lower entrance of the same cave, fragments of 14 economic papyri were unearthed. Four small fragments may be dated to the fourth century BCE (P. Jericho 6); the rest are from the time of the Bar Kokhba Revolt, including five in Aramaic (P. Jericho 7, 8, 12, 13, and 15), four in Hebrew

---

<sup>74</sup> Hanan Eshel and Haggai Misgav, “A Fourth Century B.C.E. Document from Ketef Yeriho,” *IEJ* 38 (1988): 158-76.

<sup>75</sup> Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, “2. Jericho papDeed of Sale or Lease ar”; “3. Jericho papDeed of Sale ar,” in Charlesworth, *Miscellaneous Text from the Judaean Desert*, 31-41.

<sup>76</sup> Nahum Cohen, “4-5e. Jericho pap gr,” in Charlesworth, *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert*, 43-52.

(P. Jericho 9, 10, 11, and 14) and four in Greek (P. Jericho 16-19).<sup>77</sup> In 1993 the right-hand part of the document found inside the cave in 1986 (P. Jericho 2) was found below the entrance of the cave. The newly found fragment clarified that the document was not a loan contract but a deed of sale, in which the purchaser pledged to pay the balance of his debt to the seller. The date formulas in four of the documents from the Abi'or Cave cite the name of rulers. P. Jericho 7 has: "on the twenty-fifth of Tevet [year] three [of] Domition C[aesar]", namely 85 CE. P. Jericho 9 states: "[in] the twenty-fourth of our lord [A]grippa". So this document dates to 84-85 CE. This date is explained by the fact that Nero awarded Agrippa II "the town of Julias in Perea [Transjordan, namely east of Jericho] with fourteen villages around it" (Josephus., *Ant.* 20.159). P. Jericho 13 seems to have been written in 116 CE, in the 18th year of "Trajan Caes[ar]". P. Jericho 16, a Greek document, refers to Hadrian. Dated to May 128 CE, it deals with the supply of agricultural produce to a Roman military unit.<sup>78</sup>

In November 2002 a cave at the En Gedi oasis (the Har Yishai Cave) was surveyed and excavated. The artifacts discovered included pottery, a stone vessel, a dozen arrowheads, and eleven bronze coins that had been restruck by Bar Kokhba's administration.<sup>79</sup> Fragments of two Greek documents were also found in this cave; one is a deed of sale of a plot of land, the other a letter.<sup>80</sup>

In summer 2004, Bedouin of the Rashaidah tribe found four fragments of a scroll in a tiny cave in Naḥal Arugot, along with pottery from the time of the Bar Kokhba Revolt.<sup>81</sup> The surviving fragments of this scroll contain verses from Leviticus chapters 23 and 24.<sup>82</sup> One of them consists of the upper margin of the scroll; two others, with parts of two columns, were

---

<sup>77</sup> For the official publication of the documents from Abi'or's Cave, see Hanan Eshel et al., "A. Ketef Jericho," in Charlesworth, *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert*, 3-113.

<sup>78</sup> On this document, see Rudolf Haensch, "Zum Verständnis von P. Jericho 16 gr," *Scripta Classica Israelica* 20 (2001): 155-67.

<sup>79</sup> On the finds at Har Yishai Cave, see Roi Porat, Hanan Eshel, and Amos Frumkin, "Two Groups of Coins from the Bar Kokhba War from En Gedi," *Israel Numismatic Journal* 15 (2006): 79-86; "Finds from the Bar Kokhba Revolt from Two Caves at En-Gedi," *PEQ* 139 (2007): 35-53.

<sup>80</sup> See Nahum Cohen, "New Greek Papyri from a Cave in the Vicinity of En Gedi," *Scripta Classica Israelica* 25 (2006): 87-95.

<sup>81</sup> See Roi Porat, Hanan Eshel and Amos Frumkin, "Bar-Kokhba Refuge Caves in Naḥal Arugot," *Judea and Samaria Studies* 15 (2006): 107-32 (Hebrew).

<sup>82</sup> See Hanan Eshel, Yossi Baruchi and Roi Porat, "Fragments of a Leviticus Scroll (ArugLev) Found in the Judean Desert in 2004," *DSD* 13 (2006): 55-60.

joined together.<sup>83</sup> Based on these remains it may be established that a single column in this scroll consisted of 36 lines. Prior to the discovery of these fragments fourteen scrolls from Bar Kokhba's time were known, containing passages from the other four books of the Pentateuch. The fragments from Nahal Arugot are the first to come from Leviticus.<sup>84</sup> The text is identical to the Masoretic Text, except for the word *sukkot*, which here is written in *plene* orthography (i.e. a *waw* between the *kaf* and the *tav*). The Masoretic Text is written in a defective orthography, without *waw*. The discovery of these fragments suggests that there is still a chance of finding additional scrolls and documents in the Judean Desert caves.

### *Epilogue*

Most of the scrolls found in the Judean Desert were discovered by the Bedouin or scholarly excavations before 1967. However, the foregoing survey records the significant discoveries in this region made by Israeli archaeologists and scholars after 1967. No study of the finds in the Judean Desert can be conducted without taking them into account.

---

<sup>83</sup> These fragments were acquired with the assistance of the David and Jemima Jeselsohn Epigraphic Center of Jewish History at Bar-Ilan University. After they were cleaned and photographed, they were transferred to the Israel Antiquities Authority.

<sup>84</sup> For the hypothesis of an indication that the scrolls from the time of the Bar Kokhba Revolt found in the Judean Desert caves were last read at Passover of 135 CE, see Yossi Baruchi, "Fragmentary Biblical Scrolls from Bar Kokhba Revolt Refuge Caves," *Meghillot* 3 (2005): 177-90 (Hebrew).

# DEAD SEA SCROLLS SCHOLARSHIP IN EUROPE





QUMRAN RESEARCH:  
CONTRIBUTION OF THE ÉCOLE BIBLIQUE ET  
ARCHÉOLOGIQUE FRANÇAISE IN JERUSALEM

ÉMILE PUECH

*Roland de Vaux and Members of the EBAF*

The École Biblique et Archéologique Française de Jérusalem (EBAF) and its scholars played a unique role in the history of Qumran research. As host of the academics engaged in studying the Scrolls and sponsor of the excavations of the caves and the Qumran site, the EBAF has left an indelible mark on the research of the Qumran documents and artefacts. The central figure in this process was Roland Guérin de Vaux (1903-1971), the director of the EBAF at the time of the discoveries. His scholarly stature and renown, and his energy and authority, enabled him to head the excavations at and around the Qumran site, and to direct publications on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Scholars of the EBAF have been involved in all aspects of the Qumran research and were linked to it from the start of the excavations of the caves in 1949, if not earlier. In the last week of July 1947, the Syrian Metropolitan Mar Samuel Athanasius consulted the École Biblique about the four scrolls he had bought. But in the absence of Raphael Savignac, the epigraphist, Sebastianus Marmardji, Professor of Arabic at the École, and Johannes van der Ploeg, Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament at Nijmegen, then staying at the École, were consulted. They recognized among the scrolls a copy of the Book of Isaiah and a Habakkuk scroll. However, since both scholars considered the manuscripts to be late, perhaps medieval, they did not assign too much importance to them, for their opinion was influenced by the famous Shapira forgeries at the beginning of the century. So only in February 1948 were the scrolls shown to John Trever at the American Schools of Oriental Research in Jerusalem; he took photographs of the *Great Isaiah Scroll* (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>), the *Community Rule* (1QS), and the *Peshet of Habakkuk* (1QpHab).

The famous scrolls were probably found in the late winter or early spring of 1947.<sup>1</sup> The place where they were found was identified by an officer of the Arab Legion together with a United Nations Belgian observer, Captain Philip Lippens, in January 1949. At once, on January 28, 1949, the director of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan, Gerald Lankester Harding, asked Roland de Vaux to lead a joint expedition to excavate the cave. The expedition was organized jointly by the Department of Antiquities of Jordan, the École Biblique et Archéologique Française, and the Palestine Archaeological Museum. The dig was carried out from February 15 to March 5, 1949, and concurrently a surface survey of *Khirbet Qumran* was undertaken.<sup>2</sup>

In 1948 Eliezer Sukenik had suggested identifying the scrolls as Essene on the basis of the accounts of Pliny the Elder and Flavius Josephus, and on the basis of their palaeographic date. Once this proposal was accepted by other scholars (1950), de Vaux undertook some soundings at *Khirbet Qumran* between November 24 and December 12, 1951; the pottery brought to light from the ruins was identical to that discovered in the cave. Likewise the coins found there established the approximate date of occupation, thus confirming the site's connection with the cave of the scrolls.<sup>3</sup> Thereupon it was decided to undertake a thorough excavation of the ruins. This was done in four additional campaigns, from 1953 to 1956.<sup>4</sup> Later the dig was extended to 'Ain Feshkha, three kilometers south of Qumran, where a completely buried building was unearthed. In 1958 it was fully excavated with its annexed installations.<sup>5</sup>

Meanwhile the Ta'amireh Bedouin, who discovered the scrolls in the first cave, found written documents and archaeological artifacts in the Wadi Murabba'at caves, southwest of Qumran, about 25 kilometers east-south-east of Jerusalem. Between January 21 and March 3, 1952, the institutions mentioned above excavated these caves under the direction of Roland de

<sup>1</sup> Harding wrote "early in the summer of 1947." See Gerald Lankester Harding, in Dominique Barthélemy and Józef T. Milik, with contributions by Roland de Vaux, Grace M. Crowfoot, Harold J. Plenderleith, Gerald L. Harding, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD I; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 5.

<sup>2</sup> Roland de Vaux, "Post-scriptum. La cachette des manuscrits hébreux," *RB* 56 (1949): 234-7; "La grotte des manuscrits hébreux," *RB* 56 (1949): 586-609; Harding in Barthélemy and Milik, *Qumran Cave 1*, 5-7.

<sup>3</sup> Roland de Vaux, "Fouilles au Khirbet Qumrân. Rapport préliminaire," *RB* 60 (1953): 83-106.

<sup>4</sup> Roland de Vaux, "Fouilles au Khirbet Qumrân. Rapport préliminaire sur la deuxième campagne," *RB* 61 (1954): 206-36; "Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân. Rapport préliminaire sur les 3<sup>e</sup>, 4<sup>e</sup> et 5<sup>e</sup> campagnes" *RB* 63 (1956): 533-77.

<sup>5</sup> Roland de Vaux, "Fouilles à Feshkha. Rapport préliminaire," *RB* 66 (1959): 225-55.

Vaux. He discovered further documents and objects. In March 1955 a Hebrew scroll of the Minor Prophets was discovered by the bedouin in the fifth Murabba'at cave. The last fragments from these caves were purchased by the Palestine Archaeological Museum and the École Biblique in 1958.<sup>6</sup> It was then established that most of the documents found there date from the Second Jewish Revolt, and that there had been four phases of occupation in these caves: Chalcolithic, Middle Bronze, Iron II B, and Hellenistic-Roman.

About the same time, February 1952, the Bedouin discovered a second cave containing manuscripts in the Qumran area. These finds led to the excavation of the cave and a systematic exploration of the rocky cliffs from March 10 to 29 by a joint expedition: the Palestine Archaeological Museum, the American Schools of Oriental Research in Jerusalem and the École Biblique et Archéologique Française. It was directed by Roland de Vaux and Dominique Barthélemy, as well as Józef Milik for the first time. The expedition investigated every cave and hollow that could be found in the cliffs for eight kilometers around Qumran, between Ḥajar Eṣba' and Ras Feshkha. Inspections of 275 caves, hollows and crevices were conducted, with a number of caves containing pottery similar to that from cave 1 and from *Khirbet* Qumran. During this survey a third undisturbed cave containing manuscripts was discovered. Among the finds were the two copper rolls (March 20). The excavation of the cave was supervised by Henri de Contenson, a student at the École Biblique et Archéologique Française (1952-1953).<sup>7</sup>

Afterwards the Bedouin discovered new caves and offered manuscripts for sale in Jerusalem from July to September 20, 1952.<sup>8</sup> This prompted the archaeologists to return to Qumran. De Vaux and his team from the Jordanian Department of Antiquity, the Palestine Archaeological Museum and

<sup>6</sup> See Roland de Vaux, "Les grottes de Murabba'at et leurs documents. Rapport préliminaire," *RB* 60 (1953): 245-67; "Quelques textes hébreux de Murabba'at," *RB* 60 (1953): 268-75; "Archéologie," in Pierre Benoit, Józef T. Milik, et Roland de Vaux, avec des contributions de Grace M. Crowfoot et Elisabeth Crowfoot, Adolf Grohmann, *Les grottes de Murabba'at* (DJD II; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960), 3-50.

<sup>7</sup> De Contenson's studies at the EBAF were financed by a scholarship from the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres in Paris. See Roland de Vaux, "Exploration de la région de Qumrân. Rapport préliminaire," *RB* 60 (1953): 540-61; Maurice Baillet, Józef T. Milik et Roland de Vaux, avec une contribution de Henry Wright Baker, *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân. Exploration de la falaise, les grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q, le rouleau de cuivre* (DJDJ III; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 3-17.

<sup>8</sup> Most of these manuscripts came from caves in Wadi Khabra, south of En Gedi, and they are not connected to the Qumran finds. See, for instance, Józef T. Milik, "Un contrat juif de l'an 134 après J.-C.," *RB* 61 (1954): 182-90.

the École Biblique et Archéologique Française unearthed several hundred fragments in a new cave, numbered 4A and B, in the marl terrace discovered by the Bedouin in the first half of September. Nearby, north of cave 4, de Vaux found another cave, numbered 5, with fragments of manuscripts unearthed by Józef Milik. The two caves were excavated between September 22 and 29.<sup>9</sup> At the foot of the cliff on the north side of the Wadi Qumran a hole was identified, later numbered cave 6, from which more fragments of manuscripts were recovered by the Bedouin. They were bought by the Palestine Archaeological Museum on September 13. The *Khirbet Mird* site (Hyrkania), west of Qumran and fourteen kilometers southeast of Jerusalem, whence came other texts from later periods, was excavated in February-April 1953 by Robert de Langhe of the University of Louvain and Captain Lippens, under the auspices of a "Mission Archéologique Belge."<sup>10</sup>

During the fourth season of Qumran excavations, between February and April 1955, three new caves, numbered 7-9, almost completely destroyed by erosion, were discovered by de Vaux on the slope of the marl terrace on which the ruins of Qumran stand. Cave 10 was found west of cave 4B, yielding some fragments and an ostrakon.<sup>11</sup>

Finally, in February 1956 the Bedouin found another cave, 11, whose entrance, blocked by fallen rocks in antiquity, opened a crack in the powerful earthquake in winter 1956. They took from it important manuscripts, most of which they sold to the Palestinian Archaeological Museum between March 1956 and 1961. Among the scrolls found there at that stage was the *Temple Scroll*, which was acquired from Khalil Iskandar Shahin (Kando), the Bethlehem antiquities dealer, by Yigael Yadin later on at the beginning of the Six Day War in June 1967. De Vaux and his team unearthed this cave during the final season of the dig at Qumran, and collected some more fragments from it.<sup>12</sup> The final report on the excavations of this cave

<sup>9</sup> See Roland de Vaux, "Fouilles au Khirbet Qumrân. Rapport préliminaire," *RB* 60 (1953): 86; and Roland de Vaux et Józef T. Milik, avec des contributions de John W. B. Barns et John Carswell, *Qumrân grotte 4.II: I. Archéologie, II. Tefillin, Mezuzot et Targums (4Q128-4Q157)* (DJD VI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 3-22.

<sup>10</sup> Charles Perrot, a student at the EBAF, who was supported by a scholarship from the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres (1962-1963), published a manuscript in Christopalestinian writing and language, "Un fragment christo-palestinien découvert à Khirbet Mird (*Actes des Apôtres*, x, 28-29; 32-41)," *RB* 70 (1963): 506-55. For other texts, see Józef T. Milik, "Une inscription et une lettre en araméen christo-palestinien," *RB* 60 (1953): 526-39. Most of the manuscripts found at *Khirbet Mird* are still awaiting publication.

<sup>11</sup> Roland de Vaux, "Archéologie," in Baillet, Milik, et de Vaux, in *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân* (DJD III), 3-36.

<sup>12</sup> De Vaux, "Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân. Rapport préliminaire sur les 3<sup>e</sup>, 4<sup>e</sup> et 5<sup>e</sup> campagnes," *RB* 63 (1956): 573-4; *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Schweich Lec-*

was set to be published in a volume containing the scrolls found in the cave, but de Vaux died on September 10, 1971. All the cave 11 manuscripts were published only 27 years later, in 1998.<sup>13</sup>

De Vaux was first and foremost a historian of Ancient Israel and published several books on the subject;<sup>14</sup> an exegete of the Old Testament, and an archaeologist, he excavated mainly at Tell el-Far'ah (north) and Qumran.<sup>15</sup> In his student days in the 1930s he studied West Semitic epigraphy under the tutelage of his teacher Raphael Savignac, working on the Lachish ostraca. Later he ventured to publish three fragments from Qumran cave 1.<sup>16</sup> These qualities prepared him to be the first editor-in-chief of an international and interconfessional team formed to edit the manuscripts recovered from the Qumran caves. He assembled the team between 1952 and 1954, with the consent of the Jordanian government. It consisted of eight scholars who undertook the editorial work at the scrollerly of the Rockefeller–Palestine Archaeological Museum in Jerusalem.<sup>17</sup> The first five volumes of the Oxford-published series Discoveries in the Judean Desert

---

*tures of the British Academy 1959* (rev. ed., London: Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, 1973), 96.

<sup>13</sup> Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11.II: (11Q2–18, 11Q20–31)* (DJD XXIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

<sup>14</sup> Roland de Vaux, *Les Institutions de l'Ancien Testament* (2 vols.; Paris: Le Cerf, 1958-1960); *Histoire ancienne d'Israël. Des Origines à l'installation en Canaan* (Paris: Gabalda, 1971); *La période des Juges* (Paris: Gabalda, 1973).

<sup>15</sup> Beside the digs at Qumran (site and caves), 'Ain Feshkha and Murabba'at, de Vaux excavated a Byzantine mosaic at Ma'in in 1937, a caravanserai at Qaryet el-'Enab - Abu Ghosh in 1944, Tell el-Far'ah North between 1946 and 1960 (nine campaigns). In Jerusalem he excavated site J, south of the el-Aqsa Mosque in the Ard al-Khatuniyya area. This was carried out between 1962 and 1964 as part of a joint expedition with Kathleen Kenyon of the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem and the EBAF. See Roland de Vaux, "Jérusalem, Chronique archéologique," *RB* 69 (1962): 80-82, 98-100; 70 (1963): 416-19; 71 (1964): 253-8; *CRAI* (1964): 202-7.

<sup>16</sup> Roland de Vaux, "La grotte des manuscrits," *RB* 56 (1949): 586-609; "À propos des manuscrits de la mer Morte," *RB* 57 (1950): 417-29; "Quelques textes hébreux de Murabba'at," *RB* 60 (1953): 268-75.

<sup>17</sup> Roland de Vaux, "Le travail d'édition," in de Vaux and Milik, *Qumrân grotte 4.II* (DJD VI), 6-7, where he gives the composition of the team for editing the fragments from cave 4: Józef Milik, who was at the EBAF from January 1952 and already in charge of fragments from cave 1 and Murabba'at; Frank Cross from May 1953, John Allegro from the end of 1953, Jean Starcky from January 1954 (he joined the EBAF already in October 1952, working at the scrollerly), Patrick Skehan from June 1954, John Strugnell from July 1954, and Claus-Hunno Hunzinger from October 1954. Finally Maurice Baillet joined the team in 1958; he was already present at the EBAF (from October 1952) as a scholar sent by the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres in Paris. He was then appointed to publish documents found in "Les 'Petites Grottes,'" namely caves 2, 3 (except for the *Copper Scroll*), and 6 to 10. The scrolls found in cave 11 were to be edited by scholars appointed by the Royal Academy of the Netherlands.

(DJD) appeared under his general editorship. In the following years he concentrated on the archaeological digs and the study of the artifacts he found, and left the specialized study of texts to his student Dominique Barthélemy, and to Józef Milik, whom he had invited in 1951 to join him in Jerusalem.

De Vaux promptly prepared careful and lengthy reports of his excavation seasons. They are models of accurate scholarship. Accompanied by plates of the pottery types they outline the main finds and the progress of the work carried out by himself and his team. In his fieldwork as well as in his reports, de Vaux greatly benefited from the help of his closest collaborators: the proficiency of the architect Charles Couâsnon,<sup>18</sup> the organizational capacities of his chief of staff Jean-Marie Rousée,<sup>19</sup> and the erudition of Józef Milik. With these associates he conducted daily *in situ* discussions on the problems and solutions connected with the work in progress. In the study of the archaeological remains and texts, de Vaux was later helped by his colleagues at the École, chiefly Raymond Tournay and Bernard Couroyer.<sup>20</sup>

Several students of the École Biblique and a few other archaeologists joined him, primarily Lankester Harding, Director of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan at the time. Every fortnight he would spend a few days at the dig. Various anthropologists belonging to other expeditions also visited the site and studied excavated bones.

De Vaux had to grapple with much criticism from scholars who opposed his historical interpretation of all kinds of finds, chiefly the link he was able to establish between the caves and *Khirbet* Qumran and the three main periods of his stratigraphy of the site (Ia-Ib, II and III). He was convinced that the deposits of manuscripts in the caves could not have been *genizot*, as some had proposed, because of the similarity of the artifacts in caves with and without manuscripts,<sup>21</sup> and because of the similarity of these artifacts to those found at the Qumran site. Also, de Vaux did not favor the *genizot* hypothesis because he considered the inhabitants of Qumran a closed religious Jewish community along the lines of the *Community Rule* found in

<sup>18</sup> Charles Couâsnon drew all the remarkable plans of the excavation: of the Israelite Period, and Periods Ia, Ib, II and III at Qumran and at 'Ain Feshkha. They were published by de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, plates III-IV, VI, XVII, XXIII, XXXIX-XLII.

<sup>19</sup> See Jean-Marie Rousée, "Fouiller avec le P. de Vaux," in Ernest-Marie Laperrousaz (sous la direction de), *Qumrân et les Manuscrits de la mer Morte. Un cinquantenaire* (Paris: Le Cerf, 2000), 39-47, where he said that he served mostly as topographer and chief of staff.

<sup>20</sup> Raymond Tournay, "Les anciens manuscrits hébreux récemment découverts," *RB* 56 (1949): 204-33, and Bernard Couroyer, "À propos des dépôts de manuscrits dans des jarres," *RB* 62 (1955): 76-81.

<sup>21</sup> Roland de Vaux, "Les manuscrits de Qumrân et l'archéologie," *RB* 66 (1959): 87-110.

the caves and the descriptions of the Essenes by Flavius Josephus. Additionally, Josephus places the Essenes in the last centuries BC, which tallies with the date of the site according to the coins found there. Yet de Vaux never described the Qumran site as a “monastery” as some of his critics asserted, and repeatedly clarified his position in print.<sup>22</sup> If, as he wrote, the archaeology could not prove or disprove the identification with the Essenes, he believed that the archaeology certainly did not oppose that conclusion.<sup>23</sup>

Because Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls occupied his attention for many years as an excavator, an authority in the field, and as a historian, the British Academy invited Roland de Vaux to deliver the Schweich Lectures in December 1959. The edition of this volume of synthesis *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* was divided into three chapters: 1) *Khirbet Qumran*; 2) The archaeology of the area surrounding Qumran; 3) The ruins and the texts. The volume appeared first in French.<sup>24</sup> It was followed by a revised English edition in 1973, particularly the third chapter, taking into account the latest identification of the coins by Augusto Spijkerman and other new discoveries.<sup>25</sup> De Vaux had time to prepare this revision before his untimely death, on September 10, 1971.

While the definitive report on the excavations at *Khirbet Qumran* and ‘Ain Feshkha awaits publication, de Vaux’s field notes and most of the photographs of the excavation of the sites have been recently published.<sup>26</sup> This gives an idea of the basis of de Vaux’s fair and accurate statement of the facts, and of the sober assessment he offered for them. In his notes de Vaux

<sup>22</sup> See, for instance, de Vaux’s reaction in his review of Godfrey R. Driver, *The Judean Scrolls* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965) in “Esséniens ou Zélotes? À propos d’un livre récent,” *RB* 73 (1966): 212-35; “Review Article. The Judaean Scrolls,” *NTS* 13 (1966-1967): 89-104 (99, n. 1): “In the course of his discussion of my conclusions, Driver frequently speaks of the ‘monastery’ of Qumran: thus in ‘quotes’. I am keeping the ‘quotes’ because I have never used the word in writing about the excavations at Qumran, precisely because it represents an inference which archaeology, taken alone, could not warrant.”

<sup>23</sup> Roland de Vaux, “Les manuscrits de Qumrân et l’archéologie,” *RB* 66 (1959): 87-110.

<sup>24</sup> Roland de Vaux, *L’archéologie et les manuscrits de la mer Morte* (London: Oxford University Press, for the British Academy, 1961).

<sup>25</sup> De Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*.

<sup>26</sup> *Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân et de ‘Ain Feshkha. I - Album de photographies, répertoire du fonds photographique, synthèse des notes de chantier du Père Roland de Vaux* présentées par Jean-Baptiste Humbert et Alain Chambon au nom de l’École Biblique et Archéologique Française de Jérusalem (NTOA, Series Archaeologica 1; Fribourg-Göttingen: Éditions universitaires-Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994). German translation: *Die Ausgrabungen von Qumran und En Feshkha: IA Die Grabungstagebücher* (trans. by Ferdinand Rohrhirsch and Bettina Hofmeir; NTOA 1A; Fribourg - Göttingen, 1996). English translation: *The Excavations of Khirbet Qumran and Ain Feshkha: Synthesis of Roland de Vaux’s Field Notes* (trans. and rev. by Stephen J. Pfann; NTOA 1B; Fribourg-Göttingen, 2003).



presents a synthesis of great importance for the historical research of a new field. The criticisms of this synthesis leveled by younger scholars, who have a very partial and often limited view of the data and of the geographical context, do not affect the essence of de Vaux's results. Among the dozen or more conflicting hypotheses proposed by his critics, de Vaux's synthesis, namely that the buildings of Qumran were occupied by the Essenes and that the Scrolls belonged to this community, still remains the best explanation of the mass of archaeological and textual data related to the Qumran site and documents.<sup>27</sup>

What may be challenged in de Vaux's interpretation is the identification of the ruins of Qumran with a specific ancient settlement. Having discovered remains of a Judean Iron Age II fortress at Qumran, de Vaux followed a suggestion by Martin Noth, who proposed to identify the ruins with 'Îr ham-Mélah = "The City of Salt," mentioned in the list of Josh. 15:61-62.<sup>28</sup> But in light of further discoveries in the region of the Dead Sea, this should now be rejected as more Iron Age II settlements were discovered along the Dead Sea shore by Pesach Bar-Adon around 1970.<sup>29</sup> It appears that 'Îr ham-Mélah should now be identified with the Iron Age settlement of 'Ain el-Ghuweir - 'Ain el-Turabeh, about 15 kilometers south of Qumran and directly on the sea shore. Another point in de Vaux's presentation that has been clarified is the identification of tombs with remains of women and children in the Qumran south cemetery and on the eastern slopes of the main cemetery east of the site. Apparently they are late Bedouin tombs that do not belong to the Essene cemeteries of Qumran.<sup>30</sup> Finally, the length of the interval between periods Ib and II in de Vaux's synthesis may be debated. It was certainly much shorter than the length suggested by de Vaux, from 31 to 4 BC, but the dates of this interval are still subject to debate.

---

<sup>27</sup> On that matter, see a *status quaestionis* by Émile Puech, "Khirbet Qumrân et les Esséniens," *RevQ* 25 (2011): 63-102.

<sup>28</sup> See de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 92.

<sup>29</sup> Pesach Bar-Adon, "Chronique archéologique," *RB* 77 (1970): 398-400; "Another Settlement of the Judean Desert Sect at 'En Ghuweir on the Dead Sea," *ErIs* 10 (1971): 72-89 (Hebrew with a summary in English); English version: "Another settlement of the Judean Desert Sect at 'En el-Ghuweir on the Shores of the Dead Sea," *BASOR* 227 (1977): 1-25. See de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 59, 88-89, 93. De Vaux knew only some of the results of these excavations; he had not yet altered his conclusion, still maintaining the conclusions of an expedition by Frank Cross and Józef Milik (see below) who proposed to identify some places of the list in Josh 15:61-62 with Iron Age settlements in the Buqeiah.

<sup>30</sup> See Joseph E. Zias, "The Cemeteries of Qumran and Celibacy: Confusion Laid to Rest?" *DSD* 7 (2002): 220-53.

An important collaborator of de Vaux was Dominique Barthélemy (1921-2002). Arriving at the École Biblique in 1949 and teaching from 1951 to 1953, first the Dead Sea Scrolls and then biblical theology of the Old Testament, he became intimately involved in all aspects of the sensational discovery of the manuscripts at Qumran: buying fragments from the Bedouin, excavating the site (from 1950 to 1953) and publishing texts. After a critical review of the first edition of the *Great Isaiah Scroll*<sup>31</sup> he was ready to study and publish mainly the biblical scrolls found in cave 1, and the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa), also published in DJD I.<sup>32</sup> During his first year of teaching, Barthélemy had one of his most brilliant insights. While disputing William Brownlee's interpretation of 1QS X, 1-5, he suggested that these lines concerned the calendar of the Qumran community and hypothesized that the Essenes followed the same calendar espoused by *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch*. This solar calendar consisted of 364-day years, divided into twelve months of 30 days plus 4 extra days, one of which was added every third month: 30+30+31. The calendrical cycle began on Wednesday and the feasts always fell on the same day and never on the Sabbath. This calendar, he thought, may have been at the origin of the Essene movement.<sup>33</sup> During the 1951-1952 academic year a student in Barthélemy's courses was Annie Jaubert, who went to the École Biblique on a scholarship from the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres. She later confirmed Barthélemy's insight.<sup>34</sup>

Barthélemy participated in the exploration of the Qumran cliffs in the winter of 1952 and in the excavations at the site in early 1953. The contact with the Scrolls prompted him to study the history of the Masoretic Text, the origin of the Hebrew vocalization, and the origin of the ancient Greek versions.<sup>35</sup> But an event in July 1952 determined the orientation of his future studies. It was the discovery of fragments from a Greek scroll of the Minor Prophets. Found by the Ta'amireh Bedouin in a cave in Wadi Khabra, south of En Gedi, it led Barthélemy to devote his time and energy to its

<sup>31</sup> Dominique Barthélemy, "Le grand rouleau d'Isaïe trouvé près de la mer Morte," *RB* 57 (1950): 530-45.

<sup>32</sup> Barthélemy and Milik, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD I).

<sup>33</sup> Dominique Barthélemy, "Notes en marge des publications récentes sur les manuscrits de Qumrân," *RB* 59 (1952): 187-218 (199-203).

<sup>34</sup> Annie Jaubert, *La date de la Cène: calendrier biblique et liturgique chrétienne* (Paris: Gabalda, 1957). She argues that the existence of the two calendars (solar and lunisolar) explains the discrepancy between the Gospel of John's chronology and that of the Synoptic Gospels regarding the date of the Last Supper.

<sup>35</sup> Dominique Barthélemy, "Notes en marge"; *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO 21; Fribourg-Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires-Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 1-53.

study. This research permitted him to open new perspectives in the study of the Greek biblical versions and recensions.<sup>36</sup> He discovered what he later named the *Kaige* recension, and presented his results in the authoritative work *Les devanciers d'Aquila*.<sup>37</sup> Sebastian Brock of Cambridge University described it as “a work which ranks as one of the most important contributions to Septuagint studies for many years.”<sup>38</sup> Barthélemy passed his texts and his notes to Emanuel Tov of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, who published the final edition of the scroll.<sup>39</sup>

Ill health obliged Barthélemy to leave Jerusalem in June 1953, and in 1957 he received a teaching position at the University of Fribourg (Switzerland). There he became increasingly involved in the study of the Greek biblical text<sup>40</sup> and in the Hebrew Old Testament Project. He published numerous articles on textual criticism of the Old Testament, and four volumes contain his work as secretary of the Hebrew Old Testament Project.<sup>41</sup>

A colleague of Roland de Vaux, Pierre Benoit (1906-1987), Professor of New Testament at the École Biblique, was entrusted with the study and publication of the Greek and Latin fragments, leather, papyri and ostraca, found in the Murabba'at caves.<sup>42</sup> He also wrote some notes on the Greek papyri found in Qumran cave 7.<sup>43</sup> After de Vaux's death in September 1971, Benoit as Director of the École Biblique et Archéologique Française succeeded him as editor-in-chief of the international team and of the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series. He attempted to advance the publication process, which encountered difficulties due to the 1967 war and the politics of the Middle East. Two more volumes in the DJD series were published,<sup>44</sup>

<sup>36</sup> Dominique Barthélemy, “Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante,” *RB* 60 (1953): 18-29.

<sup>37</sup> Dominique Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963).

<sup>38</sup> Sebastian Brock, “Lucian *redevivus*. Some Reflections on Barthélemy's *Les devanciers d'Aquila*,” (*SE VI/ TU* 103; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1968): 176-81 (176).

<sup>39</sup> Emanuel Tov with the collaboration of Robert A. Kraft, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)* (DJD VIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).

<sup>40</sup> Dominique Barthélemy, *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO 21; Fribourg-Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires-Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 1-90, regroupant des études parues entre 1960 et 1974.

<sup>41</sup> Dominique Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament: rapport final du Comité pour l'analyse textuelle de l'Ancien Testament hébreu institué par l'Alliance biblique universelle* (OBO 50; Fribourg-Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires-Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982-2005).

<sup>42</sup> See Benoit, Milik, et de Vaux, *Les grottes de Murabba'at* (DJD II), 209-80.

<sup>43</sup> Pierre Benoit, “Notes sur les fragments grecs de la grotte 7 de Qumrân,” *RB* 79 (1972): 321-4; “Nouvelle note sur les fragments grecs de la grotte 7 de Qumrân,” *RB* 80 (1973): 5-12.

<sup>44</sup> De Vaux and Milik, *Qumrân grotte 4.II* (DJD VI); Maurice Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482-4Q520)* (DJD VII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).

together with Milik's preliminary edition of the Aramaic fragments of the *Book of Enoch*, before Benoit retired in 1984 because of ill health. That year John Strugnell, then living year round at the École Biblique, was appointed Benoit's deputy, and in September 1986 his successor as editor-in-chief, in order to complete the publication of his large and most important lot, the second in size after that of Józef Milik.

*First Generation of Scholars at the EBAF*

Perhaps the most notable member of the team at the École Biblique, who exerted a lasting influence on the shaping of the Qumran research, was Józef Tadeusz Milik (1922-2006). The thirteen scholarly notes on variants of the biblical manuscripts in spelling, phonetics, and text, as well as the Latin translation of the *Community Rule* from cave 1, published between 1950 and 1951 by the erudite Franco-Polish orientalist, were highly appreciated by de Vaux.<sup>45</sup> At the end of 1951 he invited Milik to the École Biblique in Jerusalem to study and publish the hundreds of Hebrew and Aramaic fragments of manuscripts recovered during the first excavation of cave 1 in 1949, and the fragments bought on the antiquities market. They were all published in DJD I in 1955, together with the other artifacts found in the cave (pottery, cloth, and the like). Milik was in charge of the non-biblical fragments. Endowed with a perceptive intuition, while excavating he was able to identify some apocryphal books in Hebrew and in Aramaic as well as commentaries as they turned up. At this early stage he already manifested his extraordinary skill in deciphering badly preserved fragments of unknown scrolls. Moreover, in the first DJD volume he devised the sigla and the modes of quotation of the Qumran manuscripts, and the basic graphic indications for the edition. All these features have been adopted in succeeding scholarly editions of the Scrolls.<sup>46</sup>

Soon after starting to work on his new tasks, receiving more extremely damaged fragments from the caves of Wadi Murabba'at, he joined de Vaux in the excavation of cave 2, in which a handful of fragments similar to the cave 1 scrolls were recovered. He also participated in the survey of the cliffs around Qumran. Alone he explored a cave in the southern area, south of Wadi Qumran, and found jars with a pile of bowls, labeled then by Milik

<sup>45</sup> See his bibliography by Florentino García Martínez, "Bibliographie qumranienne de Józef Tadeusz Milik," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 11-12.

<sup>46</sup> See Barthélemy and Milik, *Qumran Cave I* (DJD I), 46-48.

“my Timothy’s cave.”<sup>47</sup> On September 22, 1952, de Vaux and Milik took over from the Bedouin working in cave 4A and B, the “partridge cave,” and completed the excavation in a week. They recovered several hundred more manuscript fragments. Milik succeeded in identifying on the spot the first Aramaic fragments of the *Book of Enoch*. Peering into some nearby cracks to the north of cave 4 in the marl terrace, he unearthed remains of a dozen manuscripts in an untouched cave, cave 5.

To these fragments should be added those bought on September 13 by Yusef Sa’ad, curator of the Palestine Archaeological Museum. Milik was in charge of preparing the fragments for the infrared photographs taken by Najib Anton Albina, the photographer of the Palestine Archaeological Museum. Most of the fragments were very dusty, with limestone adherences, often black, and they had to be cleaned with a brush; some had to be opened and flattened before being placed between two glass plates. They were photographed randomly according to their entry and how ready their preparation was, and not in order on plates. Milik started to work on the big jigsaw puzzle of the fragments, attempting to join as many fragments as possible. He was helped by Jean Starcky who arrived at the École Biblique in October 1952, and later by Frank Cross in May 1953, and John Allegro at the end of that year. After the arrival of Patrick Skehan and John Strugnell in June-July 1954, and of Claus-Hunno Hunzinger in October, the international and interconfessional team was established by Roland de Vaux, and the first distribution of the cave 4 fragments could begin. Milik got the largest lot, namely the non-biblical fragments from that cave, consisting of apocryphal compositions he had already identified and many other manuscripts, for he had prepared all those that had already been photographed and registered in the museum. The study of the biblical texts was allotted to the American team, the parabiblical texts, commentaries and paraphrases to Allegro. Hunzinger was assigned the *War Scroll* texts and some liturgical texts, while Strugnell received the sapiential, poetical and liturgical manuscripts. Starcky had some important non-biblical Hebrew fragments and most of the unidentified Aramaic fragments.

The international team was in agreement that Milik was the most energetic, rapid, and effective member for the work of joining, classifying and deciphering the fragments. Indeed, he was the first to become interested and engaged in the study of these types of manuscripts and writings. Endowed with a prodigious memory, Milik remembered everything he de-

---

<sup>47</sup> See “Józef Tadeusz Milik. Souvenirs de terrain,” interview with Farah Mébarki, *MdB* 107 (1997): 11-15 (12).

ciphered. He also had a gift for minute observation, and noted the quality of the leather, its preparation as a support for writing, the scribe's handwriting, the shape of the breaks, the ink, the language and vocabulary, and the subject treated. Thus, he mastered everything that individualized a fragment so as to link it to another fragment, even at a distance, or to determine if a fragment belonged to another sheet or a manuscript. He excelled in the art of reconstructing manuscripts. Members of the international team remember the story of his decipherment of a cryptic inscription in one hour over lunch.<sup>48</sup> De Vaux was right to have made him the pillar of the team, entrusting him with the publication of the fragmentary and extremely difficult fragments.

Naturalized as a French citizen, Milik was admitted as a research scholar to the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) in Paris in October 1952, where he remained until his retirement in 1987; at first he was attached to the École Biblique in Jerusalem. In 1952 Milik had just finished editing the manuscripts from cave 1, and was concurrently working on the numerous difficult fragments from the caves of Murabba'at. Engaged in this study, he deciphered an Aramaic cursive script, unknown until then,<sup>49</sup> in addition to fragments from other caves.<sup>50</sup> He was also in charge of the editing of cave 5 fragments<sup>51</sup> and of the *Copper Scroll* from cave 3, whose content he surmised right after its recovery and cleaning *in situ*.<sup>52</sup>

During the nine years he spent at the École Biblique and in the scrollery of the Palestine Archaeological Museum, performing with his colleagues the painstaking and rigorous work of joining and interpreting the thousands of scroll fragments, Milik published the first volume of synthesis, describing

<sup>48</sup> See "Józef Tadeusz Milik. Souvenirs de terrain," 14.

<sup>49</sup> Józef T. Milik, "Textes hébreux et araméens," in Benoit, Milik, et de Vaux, *Les grottes de Murabba'at* (DJD II), 67-205.

<sup>50</sup> Józef T. Milik, "Une lettre de Simon Bar Kokheba," *RB* 60 (1953): 276-94; "Une inscription et une lettre en araméen christo-palestinien," *RB* 60 (1953): 526-39; "Un contrat juif de l'an 134 après J.-C.," *RB* 61 (1954): 182-90.

<sup>51</sup> See Baillet, Milik et de Vaux, *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân* (DJDJ III), 165-97.

<sup>52</sup> See Baillet, Milik et de Vaux, *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân* (DJDJ III), 211-302, with an Excursus on "The Palaeographical Dating of the Copper Document" by Frank M. Cross (217-21). Before the *editio princeps* of this scroll, Milik had published many notes and a French translation and interpretation of the text. See Józef T. Milik, "Le rouleau de cuivre de Qumrân (3Q15). Traduction et commentaire topographique," *RB* 66 (1959): 321-57. For Milik's notes on the *Copper Scroll*, see Émile Puech, "Le rouleau de cuivre de la grotte 3 de Qumrân (3Q15). Édition révisée," in Daniel Brizemeure, Noël Lacoudre et Émile Puech, *Le Rouleau de cuivre de la grotte 3 de Qumrân (3Q15): expertise, restauration, épigraphie* (STDJ 55; Leiden-Jerusalem: Brill - École biblique et archéologique française de Jérusalem, 2006), 1: 225.

the chief contributions of these discoveries to the knowledge of the Bible and Oriental studies. His booklet appeared first in French and in Italian in the same year.<sup>53</sup> Later updated, it was translated into English by his colleague John Strugnell.<sup>54</sup> Later still it was translated into other languages.<sup>55</sup> Although this book was intended for scholars as well as for the wider public, it is authoritative because “the author was an expert who knew better than anyone else the sites and the texts he describes,” as de Vaux states in the Preface to the French edition.

Having participated in the excavations of the site and of most of the caves, and having in mind the fragments which he was progressively identifying and deciphering, Milik had an overall view and approach based on personal experience and being in touch with all the evidence. From the outset he subscribed to the identification of the Wicked Priest with the Hasmonaean ruler Jonathan, adhering to this solution as the only one that could account for all the data gathered. This proposal was indeed adopted by the majority of scholars, at least by the Qumran experts of the first generation, and accepted even by de Vaux, although he still hesitated and could not decide whether it was Jonathan or his brother Simon.<sup>56</sup>

In addition to the excavations at Qumran, Milik together with Frank Cross conducted a surface exploration and soundings in the Buqueia above the cliffs of the Qumran area in an attempt to understand the topography and toponymy of the region. Milik tried to locate the places listed in Josh 15:61-62, agreeing that the identification of Qumran as the “City of Salt” by de Vaux was correct.<sup>57</sup> But Milik later accepted the place-name Meşad Ḥasidîn = “The Fortress of the Pious,” following the comment in the papyrus Mur 45 line 6.<sup>58</sup>

<sup>53</sup> Milik, *Dix ans*. The Italian version was entitled *Dieci anni di scoperte nel Deserto de Giuda* (Sintesi dell’Oriente e della Bibbia 2; Rome: Marietti, 1957).

<sup>54</sup> Milik, *Ten Years*. The English preface was written when Milik was excavating at ‘Ain Feshkah.

<sup>55</sup> Spanish: *Diez años de descubrimientos en el desierto de Judá* (Madrid, 1961); Polish: *Dziesięć lat odkryć na Pustyni Judzkiej* (Warsaw: The Enigma Press, 1968).

<sup>56</sup> See de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 5, 116-17.

<sup>57</sup> Józef T. Milik, “Chronique archéologique: El-Bouqei’ah. *Dominus Flevit*,” *RB* 63 (1956): 74-77; Frank M. Cross and Józef T. Milik, “Explorations in the Judaeen Buqé’ah,” *BASOR* 142 (1956): 5-17. They did a surface exploration in spring 1954 and soundings in summer 1955 (8-17 August). They found remains of Iron Age II settlements, probably not later than Uzziah in the middle of the eighth century BC, and contemporary with Qumran’s Israelite occupation. Following the geographical sequence from north to south of the settlements mentioned by Josh 15:61-62, they arrived at the following identifications: Middin = *Khirbet* Abu Tabaq, Sekaka = *Khirbet* es-Samra, Han-Nibshan = *Khirbet* el-Maqari.

<sup>58</sup> See Benoit, Milik, et de Vaux, *Les grottes de Murabba’at* (DJD II), 163-64.



Exceptionally gifted and erudite, Milik evinced these qualities in many ways. The first to join the editorial team, he was also the one who edited the greatest number of texts. Extracting data from even the tiniest fragment, he was able to reconstruct precisely the literary, historical and religious content and context of works whose complete versions were forever lost. Finally, he played a crucial role in completing the *Manual Concordance*, deposited in the Palestine Archaeological Museum and intended to help the editorial team to find sections of overlapping texts or expressions.

Based at the École Biblique et Archéologique Française in Jerusalem, Milik had the opportunity to explore many more subjects. He built friendships with the Samaritan priests in Nablus, who permitted him to record their recitation of biblical books. This served his editions, for example, of the phylacteries from cave 4.<sup>59</sup>

After nine years in Jerusalem, Milik left for Rome to continue research for his editions of manuscripts. At the end of the 1960s he moved to Paris and pursued his scientific work there. Two volumes in the DJD series were published after he left Jerusalem: DJD III (1962) and DJD VI (1977). But he continued to study the Aramaic fragments of his lot, mainly the *Book of Enoch*<sup>60</sup> and the *Testament of Levi*.<sup>61</sup> He also published other Aramaic fragments from Starcky's lot.<sup>62</sup>

<sup>59</sup> See de Vaux and Milik, *Qumrân grotte 4.II* (DJD VI), 39-46.

<sup>60</sup> Józef T. Milik, "Hénoch au pays des aromates (ch. XXVIII-XXXII). Fragments araméens de la grotte 4 de Qumrân," *RB* 65 (1958): 70-77; *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976). This preliminary edition also includes fragments of the *Book of Giants* from Starcky's lot.

<sup>61</sup> Józef T. Milik, "Le Testament de Lévi araméen. Fragment de la grotte 4," *RB* 62 (1955): 398-406; "Écrits préesséniens de Qumrân: d'Hénoch à 'Amram," in Delcor, *Qumrân, sa piété*, 91-106, where Milik states that he is about to complete the first volume on the *Books of the Patriarchs*, devoted exclusively to the *Testament of Levi*. This book is now to be edited by Zdzisław J. Kapera. See Józef T. Milik, "Traduction continue du Testament de Lévi," *QC* 15 (2007): 5-24, and Ursula Schattner-Rieser, "Remarques préliminaires sur le Testament de Lévi, monographie inachevée de J.T. Milik et quelques restitutions du document araméen supposé original (4Q213A frag. 1-2)," *The Polish Journal of Biblical Research* 6 (2007): 113-21. These articles give the title of the book as prepared by Józef T. Milik, *Le Testament de Lévi. Essai de reconstruction du document (araméen) original*, préparé pour la publication par Ursula Schattner-Rieser avec le concours de Zdzisław J. Kapera (Qumranica Mogilanensia 10; Krakow-Mogilany), announced to be published in 2009 (?), but which has not yet come out. The first essay by Schattner-Rieser shows that the editor introduced changes into Milik's reconstruction.

<sup>62</sup> Józef T. Milik, "Turfan et Qumrân. Livre des Géants juif et manichéen," in Gert Jeremias, Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn and Hartmut Stegemann, eds., *Tradition und Glaube. Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt. Festgabe für Karl Georg Kuhn zum 65. Geburtstag* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 117-27; "4QVisions de 'Amram et une Citation d'Origène," *RB* 79 (1972): 77-97; "Écrits préesséniens"; "Daniel et Susanne à Qumrân?" in Maurice Carrez, Joseph Doré and Pierre Grelot (sous la direction de), *De la Torah au Messie*.



In the 1990s Milik shared the results of his research with younger members of the enlarged editorial team, so they could benefit from his work, already considerably advanced with many fragmentary manuscripts. As a master of decipherment with such long and wide-ranging experience, he was frequently consulted as he had firsthand experience of the first work done on the site as well as on the original texts. Some subsequent editors of the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert volumes acknowledged their debt to Milik's decipherment and numerous notes, which enabled them to complete their editions. Thus Milik is thanked as co-author in DJD XIII<sup>63</sup> and XVIII,<sup>64</sup> or at times inside the volume, as is the case in DJD XIX,<sup>65</sup> DJD XX,<sup>66</sup> DJD XXI,<sup>67</sup> DJD XXII,<sup>68</sup> DJD XXVI,<sup>69</sup> DJD XXVII,<sup>70</sup> DJD XXVIII,<sup>71</sup> DJD XXIX,<sup>72</sup> DJD XXXV,<sup>73</sup> and DJD XXXVI.<sup>74</sup> But it must be

---

*Études d'exégèse et d'herméneutique bibliques offertes à Henri Cazelles* (Paris: Desclée, 1981), 337-59; "Les modèles araméens du livre d'Esther dans la grotte 4 de Qumrân," *RevQ* 15 (1991-1992): 321-99.

<sup>63</sup> Józef T. Milik and James VanderKam, "Jubilees," in *Qumran Cave 4. VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part I* (DJD XIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 1-185, after five joint preliminary notes published by Milik and VanderKam between 1991 and 1994; see his bibliography in Florentino García Martínez et Émile Puech, "Hommage à Józef T. Milik," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 20.

<sup>64</sup> Joseph M. Baumgarten on the basis of transcriptions by Józef T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 4. XIII. The Damascus Document (4Q266-273)* (DJD XVIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

<sup>65</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Tobit," in Magen Broshi et al., *Qumran Cave 4. XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 1-76.

<sup>66</sup> Torleif Elgvin et al., partially based on earlier transcriptions by Józef T. Milik and John Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4. XV. Sapiential Texts, Part I* (DJD XX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 1-158. The volume includes 4Q298 (*cryptic A*), 4Q299-4Q300-4Q301 (*Mysteries*), 4Q302-4Q305.

<sup>67</sup> Shemaryahu Talmon et al., *Qumran Cave 4. XVI. Calendrical Texts* (DJD XXI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001). In this volume Milik is quoted only occasionally, although he did the assembling, first decipherment and identification of the fragments.

<sup>68</sup> George Brooke et al., *Qumran Cave 4. XVII. Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD XXII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996). It includes 4Q213-4Q214 (*Levi*), 4Q215 (*Naphthali*) (Milik is not quoted), 4Q242-4Q245 (*Nabonidus and Pseudo-Daniel*). Milik is quoted in the text; see Józef T. Milik, "Prière de Nabonide' et autres écrits d'un cycle de Daniel. Fragments araméens de Qumrân grotte 4," *RB* 63 (1956): 407-15. The volume also includes 2Q252-2Q254 (*Commentary on Genesis*), where Milik is quoted in the notes (4Q246 was given to Starcky in exchange for other manuscripts).

<sup>69</sup> Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX. Serekh ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (DJD XXVI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), where Milik is cited in the Preface: "We would like to pay tribute to J. T. Milik, whose initial sorting and decipherment of the fragments of the *Community Rule* has put all subsequent scholarship in his debt." The volume contains 4Q255-4Q264, 4Q275 and 4Q279.

<sup>70</sup> Hannah M. Cotton and Ada Yardeni, *Aramaic, Hebrew and Greek Documentary Texts from Nahal Hever and Other Sites, with an Appendix Containing Alleged Qumran Texts* (DJD XXVII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997). The Appendix contains groups of fragments assembled and worked on by Milik but he is not mentioned. They are the following: 4Q342-

emphasized that the initial decipherment, assembly and identification of all the manuscripts numbered from 4Q196 to 4Q363b<sup>75</sup> were the major work of Józef Milik when he was working at the scrollerly of the Palestine Archaeological Museum in Jerusalem. Milik was deeply offended by the strategy of the new editorship which, he felt, appropriated his long and arduous labor on the fragments. The last and only article he published thereafter was a contribution to the volume in memory of Jean Starcky, his faithful and close friend.<sup>76</sup>

Milik's work on the Dead Sea Scrolls was not limited to the manuscripts in his lot from cave 4. As noted above, he came into contact with or studied all the fragments from all the caves,<sup>77</sup> even the *Temple Scroll*. He and de Vaux strove to obtain funds for the purchase of this scroll from the beginning of the 1960s, but the Six Day War in June 1967 dislodged their plan.<sup>78</sup> Milik was and remains the greatest master of his generation in deciphering the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>79</sup>

---

4Q346a, 4Q348, 4Q351-4Q354, 4Q356-4Q360a. This group may have come from Wadi Seiyal.

<sup>71</sup> Moshe Bernstein et al., *Wadi Daliyeh II, The Samaria Papyri from Wadi Daliyeh, and Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII. Miscellanea, Part 2* (DJD XXVIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001). 4Q238 was edited by Peter Flint, and he expresses his deep gratitude to Józef Milik for identifying the scroll, and for generously sharing his early assessment of it (119, note 3). For the Cryptic A-B-C, Stephen Pfann published only the plates.

<sup>72</sup> Esther G. Chazon et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XX. Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XXIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999). Milik is quoted only for 4Q280, but not for 4Q291-4Q292-4Q293!

<sup>73</sup> Joseph M. Baumgarten et al., based in part on earlier transcriptions by J. T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 4.XXV: Halakhic Texts* (DJD XXXV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999). 4Q249 Cryptic A, included in this volume, was deciphered by Milik, the first to read this writing.

<sup>74</sup> Philip S. Alexander et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD XXXVI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000). Milik is cited only occasionally for 4Q201 (*Enoch*), 4Q203 and 4Q206 (*Book of Giants*), 4Q208-4Q209 (*Astronomical Enoch*), and 4Q331, 4Q333.

<sup>75</sup> For Milik's lot, see Emanuel Tov et al., *The Texts from the Judaean Desert. Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (DJD XXXIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 48-49, 51-61.

<sup>76</sup> Józef T. Milik, "Les modèles araméens du Livre d'Esther dans la grotte 4 de Qumrân," *Mémorial Jean Starcky. Textes et études qumrâniens, II, RevQ* 15 (1992): 321-407.

<sup>77</sup> See Józef T. Milik, "Fragments d'une source du Psautier (4Q Ps 89) et fragments des Jubilés, du Document de Damas, d'un phylactère dans la grotte 4 de Qumrân," *RB* 73 (1966): 94-106.

<sup>78</sup> Private communication by John Strugnell during his stay at the EBAF.

<sup>79</sup> For biography and complete bibliography see Émile Puech, "Józef Tadeusz Milik," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 5-10; Florentino García Martínez, "Bibliographie qumranienne de Józef Tadeusz Milik," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 11-20; Émile Puech, "In memoriam Józef Tadeusz Milik (1922-2006)," *RevQ* 22 (2006): 335-9.

Another member of the Scrolls editorial team was Maurice Baillet (1923-1998). After brilliant studies in Ancient and Modern Semitics in France, he came to the École Biblique on a two-year scholarship from the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres in Paris. It was granted for the period from October 1952 to September 1954.<sup>80</sup> The year 1952 was precisely the time of the main epigraphic discoveries in the Judean Desert: excavations of the Murabba'at caves and of Qumran cave 2, exploration of the Qumran cliffs and the discovery of cave 3, discoveries in the caves of Wadi Khabra and Wadi Seiyal, and manuscripts in *Khirbet* Mird, and discoveries of manuscripts and excavations in Qumran caves 4, 5 and 6. Baillet started work on the fragments at once. He studied a manuscript of Jeremiah from cave 2 (2Q15) and a copy of the Aramaic *New Jerusalem* work, also from cave 2.<sup>81</sup> After this preliminary study of fragments, de Vaux asked him in 1954 to prepare the edition of the manuscripts found in caves 2, 3 (except the *Copper Scroll*) and 6. Meanwhile he published some of them.<sup>82</sup> After two years (1955-1957) of teaching at the Institut Catholique in Toulouse, he returned to the École Biblique to finish his work. In 1957 de Vaux asked him to study also the fragments recovered two years before from caves 7 to 10. Baillet finished his edition in 1958.<sup>83</sup>

The fragments from cave 7 are all in Greek. For their study and identification Baillet was assisted by Marie-Émile Boismard (7Q1 and 7Q5) and by Boismard and Pierre Benoit (7Q2). Ten years after the publication of Baillet's volume, some of these Greek fragments sparked lively discussions, because in 1972 a few scholars suggested that some of them came from books of the New Testament, particularly 7Q4 and 7Q5. Being in Jerusalem at the time, Baillet firmly rejected these new readings and proposals and justified his own identifications with objective paleographic arguments, having

---

<sup>80</sup> For a fuller biography and bibliography, see Émile Puech, "Abbé Maurice Baillet (1923-1998)," in Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez and Eileen M. Schuller, eds., *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran. Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo 1998, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet* (STDJ 34; Leiden: Brill, 2000), ix-xx.

<sup>81</sup> See his two 'Mémoires' for the Académie: "La grotte II de Qumrân et le manuscrit de Jérémie 2QJer (= 2Q15)," 1952-1953; and "Essai sur les fragments araméens de Qumrân Grotte 2 (= 2Q24)," 1953-1954, written during his two-year stay at the EBAF.

<sup>82</sup> Maurice Baillet, "Fragments araméens de Qumrân 2. Description de la Jérusalem Nouvelle," *RB* 62 (1955): 222-45; "Fragments du Document de Damas. Qumrân, grotte 6," *RB* 63 (1956): 513-23.

<sup>83</sup> See Baillet, Milik et de Vaux, *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân* (DJDJ III), 45-164.

checked his readings again; Boismard and Benoit, the scholars who studied the originals with him, concurred.<sup>84</sup>

In June 1958 Baillet was invited to join the international team in charge of the manuscripts from cave 4. He willingly accepted, having performed exacting and unrewarding work on the small and badly preserved fragments from the small caves. Starcky passed him some Hebrew fragments belonging to liturgical and halakhic manuscripts in his lot: 4Q504, 4Q508, 4Q511, 4Q513, 4Q514, and also 4Q501, which he himself had previously received from Milik. John Strugnell gave Baillet 4Q507 and 4Q510. In 1959 the team was about to complete sorting most of the cave 4 fragments, and nobody wanted to spend time studying the mass of small papyrus fragments (1659), some inscribed also on the reverse (398)—all in all 2057 pieces! In fact, de Vaux imposed this task on Baillet. In the final edition the grouping of these fragments formed the following series of manuscripts: 4Q482-4Q490, 4Q496-4Q500, 4Q502, 4Q505-4Q506, 4Q509 and 4Q515-4Q520. The first draft of his work was completed in 1969 when de Vaux suggested that he study the manuscripts previously allotted to Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, and in 1971 after some discussion he added to his manuscripts the scrolls 4Q491-4Q494, 4Q503 and 4Q512. To these John Strugnell added another, manuscript 4Q495. Such was the slow creation of Baillet's lot from cave 4. After much difficulty and arduous work, Baillet completed his editorial work on May 6, 1976, but his volume came out only in 1982 after procedural editorial difficulties.<sup>85</sup> Meanwhile Baillet produced a few preliminary publications of several fragments, among them 4Q504<sup>86</sup> and others,<sup>87</sup> and regularly informed the scholarly world of his progress in the work.<sup>88</sup> He, the last to join the international team, was proud to have completed his edition before his colleagues.

<sup>84</sup> Maurice Baillet, "Les manuscrits de la grotte 7 de Qumrân et le Nouveau Testament," *Bib* 53 (1972): 508-16; "Les manuscrits de la grotte 7 et le Nouveau Testament (suite)," *Bib* 54 (1973): 340-50; "Le Nouveau Testament dans la grotte 7 de Qumrân?" *Archéologie* 65 (1973): 64-65; "Les fragments de la grotte 7 de Qumrân et le Nouveau Testament," in Frédéric Feydit (sous la direction de), *Orient Chrétien: Actes du XXIX<sup>e</sup> congrès international des Orientalistes* (Paris: L'Asiathèque, 1975), 4-10. See Marie-Émile Boismard, "À propos de 7Q5 et Mc 6,52-53," *RB* 102 (1995): 585-8.

<sup>85</sup> Maurice Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482-4Q520)* (DJD VII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).

<sup>86</sup> Maurice Baillet, "Un recueil liturgique à Qumrân, grotte 4: 'Les Paroles des Luminaires,'" *RB* 68 (1961): 195-250 (4Q504 8 verso and 1-2 recto).

<sup>87</sup> Maurice Baillet, "Débris de textes sur papyrus de la grotte 4 de Qumrân," *RB* 71 (1964): 353-7: 4Q496 2 and 8, 4Q506 132, 4Q509 2, 8 and 132.

<sup>88</sup> Maurice Baillet, "Psaumes, hymnes, cantiques et prières dans les manuscrits de Qumrân," in Robert de Langhe (sous la direction de), *Le Psautier. Ses origines, ses problèmes littéraires, son influence. Études présentées aux XII<sup>e</sup> Journées Bibliques (29-31 août 1960)* (OBL

During his stay in Jerusalem as a scholar of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique until his retirement in 1988, Baillet developed a keen interest in the Samaritans and their texts, following in the steps of his colleagues Milik and Starcky. Having finished the publication of his cave 4 lot, he was able to devote himself fully to the study of Samaritan manuscripts, bought by Milik and Starcky and entrusted to him for publication. As an orientalist, he was well prepared for this task, possessing a good knowledge of West Semitic and Arabic. While he was preparing the edition of a Samaritan Pentateuch bought from the High Priest Amram ben Isaac and dated to 629 of Hegira, and many manuscripts of the High Priest library, Baillet wrote the exhaustive entry “Samaritains” for the *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*.<sup>89</sup>

The last member of the original international team to be mentioned here is Jean Starcky (1909-1988). He came to the École Biblique first as a student on a scholarship from the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres in 1936-1937. Later he spent years studying inscriptions in Palmyra in Syria. After the Second World War he taught Aramaic and New Testament at the Institut Catholique in Paris. Then he asked to be released from his courses to leave for Beirut and Jerusalem in October 1952. The sensational discovery of cave 4 had taken place a month before. This marked the beginning of a new enterprise, as he took an active part in the work on the Dead Sea Scrolls, joining first Milik and others in classifying and grouping the tens of thousands of recovered fragments, and in reconstructing manuscripts. In January 1954 de Vaux entrusted him with a lot consisting of Hebrew and Aramaic manuscripts from cave 4 as a member of the international team then being formed around de Vaux, with Milik as the foremost scholar. A group of documents in Nabataean cursive and imitation of monumental script recovered from caves in the wadis south of En Gedi was also given to him, for he was an expert in Nabataean and Palmyrenian epigraphy. He immediately published the best-preserved papyrus contract.<sup>90</sup>

---

4; Louvain: Publications universitaires, 1962), 389-405; “Les manuscrits de la Règle de la Guerre de la grotte 4 de Qumrân,” *RB* 69 (1972): 217-26.

<sup>89</sup> Maurice Baillet, “Samaritains,” *DBSup* 11 (1991): 773-1047. He announced that he had finished “Le livre des commandements d’Abu l-Faraj ben Ishaq ben Kaṭṭar” and “Le commentaire des 72 lois d’Ismaël Rumayḥi.” To the best of my knowledge he never published them.

<sup>90</sup> Jean Starcky, “Un contrat nabatéen sur papyrus,” *RB* 61 (1954): 161-81. This contract has now been augmented by two small fragments found by Yadin’s expedition in a cave of Wadi Khabra, so its provenance is now known: ‘X<sup>H</sup>Ev/Se nab 1’ (= P. Yadin 36). See Cotton and Yardeni, “General Introduction,” *Aramaic, Hebrew and Greek Documentary Texts from Nahal Hever*, 3.

As a researcher at the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique in Paris he worked in many fields. He upheld his previous commitment to volumes II, III/I-II of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*,<sup>91</sup> and at the same time pursued studies in Nabataean, Palmyrenian and Syriac, as well as in Canaanite, Old Aramaic, Phoenician and Ammonite epigraphy. Concurrently he contributed to the French translations and commentaries of the Jerusalem Bible, specially the *Books of Maccabees*. He also published articles on archaeology, numismatics, art and religion, exegesis of the New Testament and history of religions.<sup>92</sup> He wrote two important and authoritative articles of synthesis about the desert caravan centers, Palmyra, and Petra and the Nabatenaean.<sup>93</sup> Before retirement he was appointed associate director of the Institut Français d'Archéologie du Proche-Orient in Beirut. In all these subjects he closely collaborated with Józef Milik until the end of his life.

In Jerusalem Starcky spent much time and energy on grouping fragments, searching for direct joins to improve the decipherment and understanding of the fragments of his lot, all belonging to unknown compositions, in Hebrew or in Aramaic.<sup>94</sup> Realizing the scope of the project and his multiple commitments, Starcky passed to Baillet in 1958 some Hebrew manuscripts which he had prepared in order to speed up the publication of part of his lot. He also brought out preliminary publications of some of his manuscripts, as an Aramaic *Messianic Text*,<sup>95</sup> *Apocryphal Psalms*,<sup>96</sup> and the *New Jerusalem*.<sup>97</sup> He also published his often quoted presentation about the Qumran messianic worldview, in which he distinguished four

<sup>91</sup> *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum, Pars secunda, tomus III, tabule, fasciculus I* (in collaboration with Jean-Baptiste Chabot), Paris: Klincksieck, 1951, *tabule, fasciculus II*, Paris: Klincksieck, 1954.

<sup>92</sup> See his biography and his bibliography in Émile Puech, "Jean Starcky," *Mémorial Jean Starcky, I Textes et études qumrâniens, RevQ* 15 (1991): 1-10 (Biography), 11-20 (Bibliography). His study, together with Józef Milik, of the inscriptions from Petra is to be published by Laïla Nehmé.

<sup>93</sup> Jean Starcky, "Palmyre," *DBSup* 6 (1960): 1066-103; "Pétra et la Nabatène," *DBSup* 7 (1964): 886-1017.

<sup>94</sup> Jean Starcky reported on his work and identifications in "L'état actuel du déchiffrement des manuscrits du Désert de Juda, et le plan de leur publication," in collaboration with Józef T. Milik, *CRAI* (1954): 403-9; "Le travail d'édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumrân," *RB* 63 (1955): 63, 66-67.

<sup>95</sup> Jean Starcky, "Un texte messianique araméen de la grotte 4 de Qumrân," in *Mémorial du Cinquantenaire de l'École des Langues orientales anciennes de l'Institut Catholique de Paris* (Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1964), 51-66.

<sup>96</sup> Jean Starcky, "Psaumes apocryphes de la grotte 4 de Qumrân (4QPs<sup>f</sup> VII-X)," *RB* 73 (1966): 353-71.

<sup>97</sup> Jean Starcky, "Jérusalem et les manuscrits de la mer Morte," *MdB* 1 (1975): 38-40.

stages of development.<sup>98</sup> The political situation surrounding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict slowed publication, and the work of the international team at the Rockefeller-Palestine Archaeological Museum stopped. Accordingly, in 1973 Starcky asked Émile Puech, who was a student at the EBAF in 1971-1973, to cooperate with him to advance the publication of the remains of his lot.

*The Second Generation of Scholars at the EBAF: Permanent and Attached*

Another scholar active at the École Biblique et Archéologique Française, Jerome Murphy O'Connor (1935-), must also be mentioned. After spending a year (1965-1966) at the Qumranforschungsstelle, directed by Karl Georg Kuhn at the University of Heidelberg, Murphy O'Connor returned to the École Biblique, where he had been a student in 1963-1965. At the École he taught intertestamental literature, first the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, concentrating on the literary strata and the history of the composition. In *Ten Years*, Milik advanced his hypothesis that Essenes history should be divided into four periods, a hypothesis which Murphy O'Connor intended to study further. From 1968 to 1975 he studied Qumran texts, chiefly Essenes compositions, and presented his thesis on the literary genesis of the *Community Rule* (1QS). In his opinion, it developed in three stages,<sup>99</sup> a proposal which was favorably received by many scholars. Then he undertook a similar analysis of the *Damascus Document*, trying to demonstrate that the 'Admonition' (columns I-VIII; XIX-XX of the Geniza manuscripts) is a Qumranic compilation of four documents composed before the community settled at Qumran.<sup>100</sup> Taking into account certain criticisms, he subsequently published a revised version of his thesis,<sup>101</sup> of-

<sup>98</sup> Jean Starcky, "Les quatre étapes du messianisme à Qumrân," *RB* 70 (1963): 481-505.

<sup>99</sup> Jerome Murphy O'Connor, "La genèse littéraire de la Règle de la Communauté," *RB* 76 (1969): 528-49.

<sup>100</sup> Jerome Murphy O'Connor, "An Essene Missionary Document? CD II,14 - VI,1," *RB* 77 (1970): 201-29; "A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document VI,2 - VIII,3," *RB* 78 (1971): 210-32; "The Translation of Damascus Document VI,11-14," *RevQ* 7 (1971): 553-6; "The Original Text of CD 7:9-8:2 = 19:5-14," *HTR* 64 (1971): 379-86; "Remarques sur l'exposé du Professeur Y. Yadin," *RB* 79 (1972): 98-100; "The Critique of the Princes of Judah (CD VIII, 3-19)," *RB* 79 (1972): 200-216; "A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document XIX, 38-XX, 34," *RB* 79 (1972): 544-64.

<sup>101</sup> Jerome Murphy O'Connor, "The Damascus Document Revisited," *RB* 92 (1985): 223-46.



fering a new vision of Essenes history.<sup>102</sup> He suggested that the Essenes came from Babylonia, called “Damascus,” and arrived in Palestine only in the second century BC. He accepted the hypothesis of Milik and others that the Teacher of Righteousness was the Zadokite High Priest from 159 to 152 BC.<sup>103</sup> Some authors accepted this theory, others rejected it. Since no new or important Essene manuscripts were published, in 1975 he abandoned this line of research and turned to the study of the New Testament, also responding to the needs of the École. Nevertheless, he published two remarkable studies of synthesis.<sup>104</sup>

A younger member of the original international team of editors, who continues its work, is Émile Puech (1941-). After studies with Henri Cazelles, Jean Carmignac, Jean Daniélou and Pierre Grelot at the Institut Catholique in Paris, and with André Dupont-Sommer and André Caquot at the École Pratique des Hautes Études in Paris, Puech came to the École Biblique in Jerusalem in 1971-1972, he too on a scholarship of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres. Dupont-Sommer asked him to study West Semitic Epigraphy, chiefly the inscriptions from Jordan, in order to complete the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, founded by Ernest Renan; its Third Part was not yet done. The project was later abandoned, as in 1973 Starcky, at the suggestion of Maurice Baillet who was working at that time at the École Biblique, asked Puech to help him and prepare himself for future collaboration. Starcky, then, was the instigator of Puech’s entry into the international team of editors of cave 4 manuscripts.<sup>105</sup>

The collaboration between the two became full and effective in 1974 when Puech had access to the original manuscripts at the Rockefeller–Palestine Archaeological Museum. Since Starcky did not want to publish his Hebrew and Aramaic manuscripts separately, he asked Puech to start with the Hebrew ones. Starcky and Puech compared and discussed at great length their decipherments, accomplished independently. Starcky accepted most of Puech’s new readings, new joins and new dispositions. Meanwhile, in

<sup>102</sup> Jerome Murphy O’Connor, “The Essenes and Their History,” *RB* 81 (1974): 215-44; “The Essenes in Palestine,” *BA* 40 (1977): 100-124.

<sup>103</sup> Jerome Murphy O’Connor, “Demetrius I and the Teacher of Righteousness (1 Macc X, 25-45),” *RB* 83 (1976): 400-420; “Judah the Essene and the Teacher of Righteousness,” *RevQ* 10 (1981): 579-85.

<sup>104</sup> Jerome Murphy O’Connor, “The Judean Desert [Manuscripts],” in Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg, eds., *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* (The Bible and Its Modern Interpreters 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 119-56; “Qumrân and the New Testament,” in Eldon J. Epp and George W. MacRae, eds., *The New Testament and Its Modern Interpreters* (The Bible and Its Modern Interpreters 3; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 55-71.

<sup>105</sup> The following description is based on the author’s personal experience.



1977 Puech became a member of the faculty at the EBAF, where he assumed the teaching of epigraphy and of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In January 1980 he was nominated to a research post at the CNRS in Paris but was seconded to the EBAF for the study of the Scrolls in the Rockefeller Museum in Jerusalem. A year later, in 1981, Starcky transferred to Puech full responsibility for the edition of the Hebrew manuscripts of his lot, on condition that they not be separated from the Aramaic ones. In 1982 he included Puech in the study of his Aramaic fragments also. Because of failing health, in 1986, just two years before his death, he entrusted Puech with full responsibility for his entire lot, including some Nabataean papyri from the Judean Desert. In spring 1990 members of the international team appointed Puech as the representative of the EBAF in the direction of the international team, replacing John Strugnell (who in 1986 succeeded Pierre Benoit as editor-in-chief of the team).<sup>106</sup> Most of the editors of the manuscripts, coming from the United States and Canada, and from Europe, mainly Germany (the Qumran Institute in Göttingen), the Netherlands, Spain, Norway and England,<sup>107</sup> lodged for some time at the EBAF, which is not far from the Rockefeller Museum and has a very good library. Thus the EBAF was from the outset an important center for the study of the Scrolls. Puech benefited from the contact with most of the scholars involved in editorial work on the Scrolls who stayed at the École, as well as with visiting scholars at the Institute for Advanced Study at Giv'at Ram in Jerusalem (1989-1990).

In 1975 Puech's former teacher of Qumran manuscripts, Jean Carmignac,<sup>108</sup> wished to give up his directorship of the *Revue de Qumrân* that he

---

<sup>106</sup> See Émile Puech, "Préface," *Qumrân Grotte 4 XXVII. Textes araméens. Deuxième partie (4Q550-4Q575a, 4Q580-4Q587 et Appendices)* (DJD XXXVII; Oxford: Clarendon press, 2009), xvii.

<sup>107</sup> Among other scholars, editors of manuscripts or texts, who stayed at the EBAF, mention should be made of Frank Cross, John Strugnell, Hartmut Stegemann, Eugene Ulrich, Julio Trebolle Barrera, James VanderKam, Florentino García Martínez, Carol Newsom, Eileen Schuller, Annette Steudel, Judith Sanderson, Sidnie White-Crawford, James Davila, Nathan Jastram, Julie Duncan, Russell Fuller, Mark Smith, Sarianna Metso, Peter Flint, Erik Larson, George Brooke, Eibert Tigchelaar, Matthias Albani, Uwe Glessmer, Timothy Lim, Saul Olyan, Torleif Elgvin, Loren Stuckenbruck, Daniel Falk, James Charlesworth, André Lemaire (listed according to their stay at the École). But many other scholars from all over the world came and still come for study on the manuscripts at the EBAF in Jerusalem.

<sup>108</sup> Jean Carmignac was a student at the EBAF from 1953 to 1955. He studied first the textual criticism of the books of Chronicles (1953-1954) and in 1954-1955 the manuscript of the *War Scroll*, later publishing a translation and commentary: *La Règle de la Guerre. Texte restauré, traduit, commenté* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1958). These two main subjects, textual criticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls, became the focus of his teaching at the Institut Catholique in Paris until his retirement in 1980.

founded in 1958. Puech agreed to help him as the associate director of the periodical for issues 33 (1976 with a change of publisher) to 46 (1986). In October 1986, two months before his death, Carmignac presented his reasons for entrusting Puech with full responsibility for the journal.<sup>109</sup> It published a memorial volume dedicated to its founder and first director, Jean Carmignac,<sup>110</sup> another to Jean Starcky,<sup>111</sup> and a Festschrift to Józef Milik, a member of its editorial board, for his 75th birthday.<sup>112</sup>

In 1974 Starcky asked Puech to start working on the *Messianic Apocalypse* (4Q521). The study and the commentary of these fragments gave Puech the opportunity to look again into published manuscripts like 1QHodayot<sup>a-b</sup>, 11QMelkîsedeq, 11QApocryphal Psalms<sup>a</sup>, and other fragments,<sup>113</sup> but at this stage Starcky was against putting out preliminary publications of manuscripts. However, under the pressure of colleagues, Puech did not follow this recommendation.<sup>114</sup> In the 1990s it was decided to publish the He-

<sup>109</sup> See Jean Carmignac, "Un nouveau directeur et un nouveau secrétaire pour la Revue de Qumrân," *RevQ* 12 (1986): 325-6.

<sup>110</sup> Florentino García Martínez et Émile Puech (sous la direction de), *Mémorial Jean Carmignac. Études qumrâniennes*, *RevQ* 13 (1988), where his biography and his bibliography are published.

<sup>111</sup> Émile Puech et Florentino García Martínez (sous la direction de), *Mémorial Jean Starcky. Textes et études qumrâniens, I-II*, *RevQ* 15 (1991-1992).

<sup>112</sup> Florentino García Martínez et Émile Puech (sous la direction de), *Hommage à Józef Tadeusz Milik*, *RevQ* 17 (1996).

<sup>113</sup> Émile Puech, "Notes sur le manuscrit XIQMelkîsedeq," *RevQ* 12 (1987): 483-513; "Quelques aspects de la restauration du rouleau des Hymnes (1QH)," *JJS* 39 (1988): 38-55; "Un Hymne essénien en partie reconstitué et les Béatitudes. 1QH V, 12-VI, 18 (= col. XIII-XIV) et 4QBéat," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 59-88; "Les deux derniers Psalms davidiques du rituel d'exorcisme 11QPsAp<sup>a</sup> IV-V, 14," in Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Forty Years of Research* (STDJ 10; Leiden-Jerusalem: Brill-Yad Itzhak Ben-Zvi, 1992), 64-89; "11QPsAp<sup>a</sup>: un rituel d'exorcismes. Essai de reconstruction," *RevQ* 14 (1990): 377-408; *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien* (2 vols.; EBib N.S. 21-22; Paris: Gabalda, 1993), where many other fragments are studied.

<sup>114</sup> Émile Puech, "4Q525 et les péripécopes des Béatitudes en Ben Sira et en Matthieu," *RB* 98 (1991): 80-106; "La pierre de Sion et l'autel des holocaustes d'après un manuscrit hébreu de la grotte 4 (4Q522)," *RB* 99 (1992): 676-96; "Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521)," *RevQ* 15 (1992): 477-524; "The Collection of Beatitudes in Hebrew and in Greek (4Q525 1-4 and Mt 5,3-12)," in Frédéric Manns and Eugenio Alliata, eds., *Early Christianity in Context. Monuments and Documents. Essays in Honour of Emmanuel Testa* (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, Collectio Maior 38; Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1993), 353-68; "Présence sacerdotale et Messie-Roi dans la Règle de la Congrégation (1QSa ii 11-22)," *RevQ* 16 (1994): 351-65; "L'image de l'arbre en 4QDeutéro-Ezéchiél (4Q385 2,9-10)," *RevQ* 16 (1994): 429-40; "Restauration d'un texte hymnique à partir de trois manuscrits fragmentaires: 1QH<sup>a</sup> XV, 37 - XVI, 4 (= vii 34-viii 3), 1Q35 (H<sup>b</sup>) et 4Q428 (H<sup>b</sup>) 7 1-10)," *RevQ* 16 (1995): 543-58; "Un autre manuscrit de la Genèse récemment identifié dans les fragments de la grotte 4 (4QGn<sup>a</sup>)," *RevQ* 16 (1995): 637-40; "Jonathan le Prêtre Impie et les débuts de la Communauté de Qumrân. 4QJonathan

brew and Aramaic manuscripts separately. In preparing the edition of the

(4Q523) et 4QPsAp (4Q448),” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 241-70; “Les fragments du plus ancien exemplaire du *Rouleau du Temple* (4Q524),” in Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen, eds., *Legal Texts and Legal Issues. Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Cambridge 1995* (STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 19-64; “Notes sur 11Q19 LXIV 6-13 et 4Q524 14 2-4. À propos de la crucifixion dans le *Rouleau du Temple* et dans le Judaïsme ancien,” *RevQ* 18 (1997): 109-24; “Le grand prêtre Simon (III), fils d’Onias III, le Maître de Justice?” in Bernd Kollmann, Wolfgang Reinbold and Annette Steudel, *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum. Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag* (BZnW 97; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999), 137-58; “Some Remarks on 4Q246 and 4Q521 and Qumran Messianism,” in Donald W. Parry and Eugene C. Ulrich, eds., *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Technological Innovations, New Texts, and New and Reformulated Issues* (STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 545-65; “Un nouveau manuscrit de la Genèse de la grotte 4: 4Q483 = pap4QGenèse<sup>a</sup>,” *RevQ* 19 (1999): 259-60; “Une nouvelle copie du *Livre des Jubilés*: 4Q484 = pap4QJubilés<sup>j</sup>,” *RevQ* 19 (1999): 261-4; “Les Psaumes davidiques du rituel d’exorcisme (11Q11),” in Daniel F. Falk, Florentino García Martínez and Eileen M. Schuller, eds., *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran. Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies* (STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 160-81; “Note additionnelle sur le fragment paléo-hébreu,” *RevQ* 19 (2000): 449-51; “Un nouveau fragment du manuscrit<sup>b</sup> de l’Ecclésiaste (4QQohélet<sup>b</sup> ou 4Q110),” *RevQ* 19 (2000): 617-21; “Un nouveau fragment du manuscrit 4QInstruction<sup>c</sup> (XQ7 - 4Q417-4Q418)” (avec Annette Steudel), *RevQ* 19 (2000): 623-7; “Identification de nouveaux manuscrits bibliques: *Deutéronome* et *Proverbes* dans les débris de la grotte 4,” *RevQ* 20 (2001): 121-7; “Un autre fragment du Psaume 122 en 4Q522 (4Q522 26),” *RevQ* 20 (2001): 129-32; “Apports des textes apocalyptiques et sapientiels à l’eschatologie du judaïsme ancien,” in Florentino García Martínez, ed., *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition. Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense, Journées Bibliques de Louvain LI, July 31-August 1-2, 2002* (BETL 168; Leuven: University Press, 2003), 133-70; “Un autre manuscrit du *Lévitique*,” *RevQ* 21 (2003): 311-13; “Notes sur le manuscrit des Juges 4Q50<sup>a</sup>,” *RevQ* 21 (2003): 315-19; “La croyance à la résurrection des justes dans un texte qumranien de sagesse: 4Q418 69 ii,” in Chaim Cohen, Avi Hurvitz and Shalom Paul, eds., *Sefer Moshe: The Moshe Weinfeld Jubilee Volume. Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East, Qumran, and Post-Biblical Judaism* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2004), 427-44; “Le fragment 2 de 4Q377 *Pentateuque apocryphe* B: l’exaltation de Moïse,” *RevQ* 21 (2004): 469-75; “Les fragments eschatologiques de 4QInstruction (4Q416 1 et 4Q418 69 ii, 81-81a et 127),” *RevQ* 22 (2005): 89-119; “Les manuscrits 4QJuges<sup>c</sup> (= 4Q50<sup>a</sup>) et 1QJuges (= 1Q6),” in Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov and James C. VanderKam, eds., *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (VTSup 101; Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2006), 184-202; “Apports des manuscrits de Qumran à la croyance à la résurrection dans le judaïsme ancien,” in André Lemaire et Simon C. Mimouni (sous la direction d’), *Qumran et le Judaïsme du tournant de notre ère. Actes de la Table ronde, Collège de France, 16 novembre 2004* (Collection de la REJ; Paris-Louvain-Dudley: Peters, 2006), 81-110; “L’ostracon de Khirbet Qumran (KhQ1996/1) et une vente de terrain à Jéricho, témoin de l’occupation essénienne à Qumran,” in Hilhorst, Puech and Tigchelaar, *Flores Florentino*, 1-39; “4QSamuel<sup>a</sup> (4Q51). Notes épigraphiques et nouvelles identifications,” in Hans Ausloos, Bénédicte Lemmelijn and Marc Vervenne, eds., *Florilegium lovaniense. Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (BETL 224; Leuven: Peters, 2008), 373-86; “Les identités en présence dans les scènes du jugement dernier de 4QInstruction (4Q416 1 et 4Q418 69 ii),” in Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović, eds., *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Others in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of IOQS in Groningen* (STDJ 70; Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2008), 147-73;

Hebrew manuscripts Puech studied the Aramaic ones too, and some other texts.<sup>115</sup> He was also asked to check the originals and to respond to the identification of some fragments of papyri as books of the New Testament.<sup>116</sup> In 1993 the Jordanian authorities of the Amman National Museum decided to undertake the restoration of the *Copper Scroll* and the Mécénat of Électricité De France (EDF) asked Puech for help because Józef Milik, the first editor, was unable to assume this responsibility due to ill health. This was an opportunity to produce a revised edition based on a new set of photographs (1:1) and a beautiful reproduction (1:1) by galvanoplasty.<sup>117</sup>

In the exchange of Aramaic manuscripts, Starcky gave Milik a *Targum Leviticus* (4Q156), a copy of *1 Enoch* (4Q207) and a copy of *Testament of Levi* (4Q213), while Milik passed to him the *Apocryphon of Daniel* (4Q246).

---

“Quelques observations sur le ‘canon’ des ‘Écrits,’” in Mladen Popović, ed., *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*, (JSJSup 141; Leiden-Boston: 2010), 117-41.

<sup>115</sup> Émile Puech, “Fragments d’un apocryphe de Lévi et le personnage eschatologique. 4QTestLévi<sup>c-d</sup>(?) et 4QAJa,” in Trebolle Barrera and Vegas Montaner, *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 449-50; “Fragment d’une apocalypse en araméen (4Q246 = Pseudo-Dan<sup>d</sup>) et le ‘royaume de Dieu,’” *RB* 99 (1992): 98-131; “Notes sur le fragment d’apocalypse 4Q246 – ‘le fils de Dieu,’” *RB* 101 (1994): 533-58; “À propos de la Jérusalem Nouvelle d’après les manuscrits de la mer Morte,” in *La Ville de 1200 avant J.-C. à l’Hégire d’après les sources épigraphiques et littéraires ouest-sémitiques. Actes de la Table ronde organisée par l’URA 1062, le 14 novembre 1992, Sem* 43-44 (1995): 87-102; “La prière de Nabonide (4Q242),” in Kevin J. Cathcart and Michael Maher, eds., *Targumic and Cognate Studies. Essays in Honour of Martin McNamara* (JSOTSup 230; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1996), 208-27; “Le ‘fils de Dieu’ en 4Q246,” *Erls* 26 (1999), 143\*-52\*; “Les fragments 1 à 3 du *Livre des Géants* de la Grotte 6 (6Q8 1-3),” *RevQ* 19 (1999): 227-38; “Les songes de Šemihazah dans le *Livre des Géants* de Qumrân,” *CRAI* (2000): 7-26; “Le Testament de Lévi de la Geniza du Caire,” *RevQ* 20 (2002): 511-56; “The Names of the Gates of the New Jerusalem (4Q554),” in Paul et al., *Emanuel*, 379-92; “Notes sur le Testament de Lévi de la grotte 1 (1Q21),” *RevQ* 21 (2003): 297-310; “Le fils de Dieu, le fils du Très-Haut, messie roi en 4Q246,” in *Le jugement dans l’un et l’autre Testament, I - Mélanges offerts à Raymond Kuntzmann* (LD 197; Paris: Le Cerf, 2004), 271-86; “Morceaux de sagesse populaire en araméen: 4QProverbes araméens (= 4Q569),” in *Apocryphal, Pseudepigraphical and Para-Biblical Texts. Fourth Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Basel 5-7 August 2001, RevQ* 21 (2004): 379-86.

<sup>116</sup> Émile Puech, “Des fragments grecs de la Grotte 7 et le Nouveau Testament? 7Q4 et 7Q5, et le Papyrus Magdalen Grec 17 = P<sup>64</sup>,” *RevQ* 16 (1995): 543-58; “Notes sur les fragments grecs du manuscrit 7Q4 = 1 Hénoch 103 et 105,” *RB* 106 (1996): 592-600; “Sept fragments grecs de la Lettre d’Hénoch (1 Hen 100, 103 et 105) dans la grotte 7 de Qumrân (= 7QHéng),” *RevQ* 18 (1997): 313-23; “Note sull’identificazione di 7Q5 con Mc 6,52-53,” *HTh* 17 (1999): 73-84.

<sup>117</sup> Émile Puech, “Some Results of the Restoration of the *Copper Scroll* by EDF Mécénat,” in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years*, 889-94; “Quelques résultats d’un nouvel examen du Rouleau de cuivre (3Q15),” *RevQ* 18 (1997): 163-90; “Some Results of a New Examination of the *Copper Scroll* (3Q15),” in George J. Brooke and Philip R. Davies, eds., *Copper Scroll Studies* (JSPSup 40; Sheffield: Academic Press, 2002), 58-89; Puech, *Le rouleau de cuivre*.

This was later published by Puech.<sup>118</sup> In 1998 the volume of the Hebrew manuscripts from Starcky's lot appeared, edited by Puech.<sup>119</sup> As for the Aramaic texts of this lot, their quantity and the size of the accompanying commentaries necessitated publication in two parts. In 2001 Puech published the first part<sup>120</sup> and in 2009 the second part, with appendices.<sup>121</sup> At last the long-awaited *editio princeps* of Starcky's lot has been completed, but the last word has not been said. Even though not all these tiny fragments could be identified, the official edition shows that they involve more than just a linguistic interest, as first noted by Starcky himself.

Teaching Semitic epigraphy and Dead Sea Scrolls at the EBAF, Puech had the opportunity to initiate several students in the palaeography of this period and to show them a proper approach to the study of the Qumran fragments. It also gave him a chance to write other notes on the content of the manuscripts, the history of the Qumran community, the Qumran cemeteries, and the like.<sup>122</sup> Much work on the Qumran fragments is still left to younger scholars. Puech works regularly with the Göttingen team of scholars in checking readings of scrolls for the preparation in Göttingen of the *Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zu den nicht-biblischen Texten vom Toten Meer*. In this respect, the EBAF continues the efforts of the first generation of Qumran scholars in trying to arrive at a synthesis of the history of the Essenes and of their practices and beliefs.

De Vaux died before publishing his final Archaeological Report. In 1986 the EBAF asked Robert Donceel, Professor at Louvain-la-Neuve University, to come to Jerusalem and study the notes and the finds of the archaeological excavations at Qumran and 'Ain Feshkha in order to prepare the final publication. Until 1990 he was coordinator of the team working on the edition.<sup>123</sup> Then Puech was entrusted with the study of the epigraphic

<sup>118</sup> See Émile Puech, "246. 4QApocryphe de Daniel ar," in George J. Brooke et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XVII. Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD XXII: Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 165-84.

<sup>119</sup> Émile Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XVIII. Manuscrits hébreux (4Q521-528, 4Q576-579)* (DJD XXV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

<sup>120</sup> Émile Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII. Textes araméens. Première partie (4Q529-4Q549)* (DJD XXXI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001).

<sup>121</sup> Émile Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXVII. Textes araméens. Deuxième partie (4Q550-4Q575a, 4Q580-4Q587) et appendices* (DJD XXXVII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009).

<sup>122</sup> See his bibliography until 2005 published in García Martínez, Steudel, and Tigchelaar, *From 4QMMT to Resurrection*, 357-75.

<sup>123</sup> Contrary to what is asserted by Jean-Baptiste Humbert in Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Estelle Villeneuve, *L'affaire Qumrân. Les découvertes de la mer Morte* (Paris: Gallimard, 2006), 36-37. See Robert Donceel, "Reprise des travaux de publication des fouilles au Khirbet Qumran," *RB* 99 (1992): 557-73; Robert Donceel and Pauline Donceel-Voûte, "The

finds, ostraca and inscriptions, and began their listing and study.<sup>124</sup> After a few years of work, Jean-Baptiste Humbert (1940-) decided to assume the task of the team, and passed the study of the epigraphical data to André Lemaire. With the help of Alain Chambon, a former student at the EBAF (1970-1971), he published the “*notes de chantier*” of Roland de Vaux.<sup>125</sup> Later some other small finds were published by collaborators,<sup>126</sup> but the most awaited volume of the pottery is still not out.<sup>127</sup> In the notes he published, Humbert challenged de Vaux’s synthesis, proposing to see in Qumran successively a Hasmonaean *Villa*, destructions and a gap, resettlement as a refuge camp, occupation by a new group, and a sectarian center of worship, ultimately replaced by a religious center for Essenes communities living along the sea shore. These suggestions, forthrightly overlooking the discovery of manuscripts in caves all around the site, are debatable, and have rightly been criticized.<sup>128</sup> De Vaux had the advantage of digging the

---

Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran,” in Michael O. Wise et al., eds., *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site. Present Realities and Future Prospects, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 722 (1994): 1-38; Robert Donceel, “Poursuite des travaux de publication du matériel archéologique de Khirbet Qumrân. Les lampes en terre cuite,” *Qumranica Mogilanensia* 15 (1998): 87-104; *Synthèse des observations faites en fouillant les tombes des nécropoles de Khirbet Qumrân et des environs. The Khirbet Qumran Cemeteries. A Synthesis of the Archaeological Data* (QC 10; Krakow: Enigma Press, 2002).

<sup>124</sup> See Donceel, “Reprise des travaux,” 573.

<sup>125</sup> *Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân et de Aïn Feshkha. I Album de photographies, répertoire du fonds photographique, synthèse des notes de chantier du Père Roland de Vaux* (présentées par Jean-Baptiste Humbert et Alain Chambon au nom de l’École Biblique et Archéologique Française de Jérusalem) (NTOA, Series Archaeologica 1; Fribourg–Göttingen, 1994) (see the translations in note 26 above). But Humbert altered and reinterpreted some notes so they do not reflect exactly de Vaux’s. See for example Puech’s remarks about the tombs and the confusion of T9-10 with TA-B, not excavated on the same date and in the same year! Émile Puech, “The Necropolises of Khirbet Qumrân and Aïn el-Ghuweir and the Essene Belief in Afterlife,” *BASOR* 312 (1998): 21-36.

<sup>126</sup> See *Khirbet Qumrân et Aïn Feshkha. II - Études d’anthropologie, de physique et de chimie. Studies of Anthropology, Physics and Chemistry* (présentées par Jean-Baptiste Humbert et Jan Gunneweg au nom de l’École biblique et archéologique française de Jérusalem) (NTOA, Series Archaeologica 3, Fribourg-Göttingen: Éditions universitaires-Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003).

<sup>127</sup> The stone astronomical instrument has been studied recently by Paul Tavadon, *Le disque de Qumrân* (Cahiers de la RB 75; Pendé: Gabalda, 2010).

<sup>128</sup> Jean-Baptiste Humbert, “L’espace sacré à Qumrân. Propositions pour l’archéologie,” *RB* 101 (1994): 161-214; “Qumrân, esséniens et architecture,” in Kollmann, Rienhold and Steudel, *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum*, 183-200 (188) (in note 8 Humbert writes that an oral tradition at the École attributes to Milik the suggestion of a Hasmonaean villa. I have never heard of such a tradition from anyone, and nowhere did Milik write about such an identification); “Reconsideration of the Archaeological Interpretation,” in Humbert et Gunneweg, *Khirbet Qumrân et Aïn Feshkha*, 419-25; “The Chronology During the First Century BC, de Vaux and his Method: a Debate,” in Humbert et Gunneweg, *Khirbet Qumrân et Aïn Feshkha*, 425-44; “Arguments en faveur d’une résidence pré-essénienne,”



site himself and having in mind all the stages of the field excavations; and he had shown that the caves and the manuscripts, which are ancient, are closely related to the inhabitants of *Khirbet Qumran*, implying the existence of an organized community.<sup>129</sup> The use of de Vaux's brief notes to challenge his main conclusion is audacious when done by those who had no personal experience of the excavations, even if some corrections may be proposed. De Vaux himself was open to the discussion and improvement of his arguments.

This short survey of the history of scholarship on the Dead Sea Scrolls and Qumran research at the EBAF in Jerusalem illuminates the central role it played from the very beginning of the discovery and study of the Scrolls. It was the center of activity regarding the excavation of Qumran and 'Ain Feshkha, and of the publication of the Scrolls and the pertinent data. Its periodical *Revue Biblique* served this purpose well before the creation of the *Revue de Qumrân*. All the fragments in the Rockefeller-Palestine Archaeological Museum in Jerusalem have been photographed and published.<sup>130</sup> Only a few fragments were ever sold to "tourists" and some have escaped research and publication until today.<sup>131</sup> The contribution of the EBAF to Qumran research should be remembered as constituting the main center for this branch of study for its first 60 years.

---

Humbert et Gunneweg, *Khirbet Qumrân et 'Ain Feshkha*, 467-82; "Some Remarks on the Archaeology of Qumran," in Katharina Galor, Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Jürgen Zangenberg, eds., *Qumran. The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates. Proceedings of a Conference Held at Brown University, November 17-19, 2002* (STDJ 57; Leiden-Boston; Brill, 2006), 19-39.

<sup>129</sup> De Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 91-138.

<sup>130</sup> Contrary to the often repeated story, de Vaux and the EBAF never held back from publication, at the order of the Vatican, any fragment which could jeopardize the Christian faith. See for instance Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception* (New York: Summit, 1991), which distorts all the data.

<sup>131</sup> Recently, photographs of a fragment have been produced for study and editing; see Émile Puech, "Un nouveau fragment 7a de 4QGn-Ex<sup>3</sup> = 4QGn-Ex 1 et quelques nouvelles lectures et identifications du manuscrit 4Q1," *RevQ* 25 (2011): 103-11.

## QUMRAN RESEARCH IN FRANCE

ANDRÉ LEMAIRE

Roland de Vaux and the École Biblique et Archéologique Française in Jerusalem played a major part identifying the first Qumran cave with its manuscripts and in the excavations of Khirbet Qumran, as well as in the discovery and excavations of the other caves containing manuscripts. De Vaux later recruited, directed, and organized the work of the small international team charged with editing and publishing the manuscripts. After his death, Pierre Benoît shouldered this task. But this team worked in Jerusalem, and therefore its activity is related separately.<sup>1</sup> However, it should be remembered that other French members of the team (Jean Starcky, Józef Milik and Maurice Baillet) were members of the French Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) and were in touch with the foremost Qumran scholars in France, André Dupont-Sommer and André Caquot; the activity in Paris cannot be completely detached from the activity at the Jerusalem École Biblique. In fact, Starcky, Milik and Baillet did much of their work in France.

The first period of Qumran research in France (1948-1970) is characterized by two distinct orientations, adopted by two different centers.<sup>2</sup> The first, espousing a historical, synthetic and secular approach, was based at two Paris institutions, the École Pratique des Hautes Études and the Collège de France. Its leading scholar was André Dupont-Sommer. The other, based at the Catholic Institute in Paris, took a philological and analytical approach from a Roman Catholic perspective; its salient figure was Jean Carmignac. Valuable and detailed studies were produced by authors at both centers, as were translations of the Qumran texts and influential syntheses of Qumran research. At the same time the two were engaged in sharp, if courteous, debate.<sup>3</sup>

This first phase of the Qumran research was undoubtedly dominated by the forceful personality and scientific authority of André Dupont-Sommer

---

<sup>1</sup> See the survey by Émile Puech in this volume.

<sup>2</sup> Florentino García Martínez and Julio Trebolle Barrera, "Qumran Scholarship: An European Perspective," in Kugler and Schuller, *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty*, 129-41 (135-6).

<sup>3</sup> García Martínez and Trebolle Barrera, "Qumran Scholarship," 135.



(1900-1983).<sup>4</sup> After teaching for some years at the Catholic Institute in Paris, he became the *directeur d'études* at the École Pratique des Hautes Études (in the 4th Section for Philology and History) in 1938, in charge of teaching ancient history of the Orient. In 1953 he was appointed professor at the Sorbonne, and taught languages and civilizations of the ancient Semites. Ten years later he was elected to the chair of Hebrew and Aramaic at the Collège de France, where he remained until his retirement in 1971. From 1961 he was a member of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, and in 1968 became its permanent secretary, a position he held until his death.

As an Aramaist and a Hebrew epigraphist, a historian of religions in the tradition of Ernest Renan, and a specialist of Hellenistic Judaism, Dupont-Sommer was well trained for the study of the Scrolls.<sup>5</sup> With the first announcement of the discovery he at once grasped their importance, and very soon associated their authors with the Essenes. His proofs for this connection still remain valid. But he was also quick to see the relevance of this discovery for an understanding of Judaism at the start of the Common Era, and of the formative phases of Christianity, a circumstance that he emphasized in various contexts. His first publication on the Scrolls<sup>6</sup> was soon followed by another.<sup>7</sup> After numerous detailed studies, and a translation of the Qumran Hymns,<sup>8</sup> he published his volume on the Scrolls with a synthesis of his views on the subject. It served as a standard introduction to the field for the first decades of the Qumran research, underwent

---

<sup>4</sup> For a complete bibliography of André Dupont-Sommer, see "Publications de M. André Dupont-Sommer," in André Caquot and Marc Philonenko, eds., *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1971), 541-56, supplemented by Hélène Lozachmeur and Maurice Sznycer, "André Dupont-Sommer (1900-1983)," *JA* 272 (1984): 1-13 (10-13). For a general appreciation of his scientific work see André Caquot, "Notice sur la vie et les travaux de André Dupont-Sommer," *CRAI* (1986): 10-22, and the contributions of Jean Leclant, André Lemaire, Marc Philonenko, Florentino García Martínez, Martin Hengel and André Caquot in "Séance du 14 novembre 2003: Hommage rendu à André Dupont-Sommer," *CRAI* (2003): 1395-453.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. André Dupont-Sommer, *Le Quatrième livre des Machabées: Introduction, traduction et notes* (Bibliothèque des Hautes Études 274; Paris: Champion, 1939).

<sup>6</sup> Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires; The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey* (Eng. trans. E. Margaret Rowley; Oxford: Blackwell, 1952).

<sup>7</sup> André Dupont-Sommer, *Nouveaux aperçus sur les manuscrits de la mer Morte* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1953); *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes: New Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Eng. trans. R. D. Barnett; New York: Macmillan, 1954).

<sup>8</sup> André Dupont-Sommer, *Le livre des Hymnes découvert près de la mer Morte: Traduction intégrale avec introduction et notes* (Sem 7; Paris: Maisonneuve, 1957).

repeated re-issues,<sup>9</sup> and was translated into German,<sup>10</sup> English,<sup>11</sup> and other languages.

Dupont-Sommer summarized his ideas about the Scrolls in the following passage:

All the discovered manuscripts proceed from an Essene community settled in the Qumran area, from the Essene community mentioned by Pliny the Elder; the story of the Teacher of Righteousness is to be placed roughly in the first third of the first century B.C., a little before the capture of Jerusalem by the Roman Pompey, and the community which he founded hid its books in the neighboring caves and left Qumran at the time of the great Jewish War (A.D. 66-70); this Teacher, who very probably died during the persecution directed against the sect by a Hasmonean High Priest, was an eminent personality and the object of his followers' fervent admiration; finally, and above all, the new texts show that the primitive Christian church was rooted in the Jewish Essene sect to a degree none would have suspected.<sup>12</sup>

The last two propositions, touching on the problems of the origins of Christianity, were hotly debated and criticized, and by no less a scholar than Roland de Vaux.<sup>13</sup> However, in a famous communication submitted at the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres (April 1952), Roland de Vaux publicly admitted that he made a mistake in his preliminary late dating of the archaeological excavations: "Je me suis trompé en disant que..."<sup>14</sup> Over time, Dupont-Sommer toned down and nuanced his likening of the Teacher of Righteousness to Jesus and of the Essenes to Christians.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>9</sup> André Dupont-Sommer, *Les Écrits esséniens découverts près de la mer Morte* (Paris: Payot, 1959) and repeatedly reprinted.

<sup>10</sup> André Dupont-Sommer, *Die essenischen Schriften vom Toten Meer* (trans. W. W. Müller; Tübingen: Mohr, 1960).

<sup>11</sup> André Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (trans. Geza Vermes; Oxford: Blackwell, 1961; repr., New York: Meridian Books, 1962).

<sup>12</sup> Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings* (1962), 18 (= *Les Écrits esséniens*, 28-29).

<sup>13</sup> See Roland de Vaux, "Les manuscrits de la mer Morte et les origines chrétiennes," *La Vie Intellectuelle* (April 1951): 60-70.

<sup>14</sup> Roland de Vaux, "Suite aux manuscrits de la mer Morte," *CRAI* (1952): 173-80 (174-5): "Je me suis trompé — avec tous les archéologues compétents qui les ont vues — en attribuant les jarres des manuscrits à l'époque pré-romaine: elles sont d'un siècle plus tardives et prouvent que, dans un milieu fermé, des techniques anciennes peuvent survivre. Je me suis trompé aussi en disant que ces jarres avaient été spécialement fabriquées en vue du dépôt des manuscrits: elles étaient un modèle courant de la poterie domestique. Je me suis trompé enfin en rattachant à une violation postérieure les fragments de marmite, de cruchette et de lampes trouvés dans la grotte: ils ont tous leurs équivalents dans notre série du Khirbet Qumrân et sont donc de la même époque que les jarres. Cela ne préjuge pas de la date des manuscrits, qui peuvent être plus anciens mais cela est décisif pour la date du dépôt: il a été fait au cours du I<sup>er</sup> siècle de notre ère et, s'il s'agit d'une cachette, probablement à la veille de l'abandon du Khirbet, pendant la guerre juive."

<sup>15</sup> On this problem see André Caquot, "Le milieu palestinien et l'essénisme," *Études*

This polemical aspect at the beginnings of Qumran research in France made an unfortunate impact on the field. At the time, de Vaux was forming his international team of Scroll editors, but neither André Dupont-Sommer, nor any of his students, such as André Caquot, was invited to join; it was clearly understandable why later they bitterly complained about the slow pace of the Scrolls' publication. This ill-feeling was aggravated by the fact that Dupont-Sommer, enjoying some authority at the CNRS, helped to bring other members of the international team (Maurice Baillet, Jean Starcky and Józef Milik) into a CNRS research team in Semitic epigraphy, subsequently headed by André Caquot, his successor at the Collège de France.

To André Dupont-Sommer's credit, he trained and oriented several of his students to Qumran research, among them André Caquot, Marc Philonenko, Ernest-Marie Laperrousaz, and Francis Schmidt. These students continued to develop and enlarge this scholarly field in France. With them, Dupont-Sommer put together a collection in French translation of the major Jewish literary works produced at the start of the Era. This volume was intended to assemble the non-biblical Qumran texts and pseudepigraphic works which, in Dupont-Sommer's opinion, were linked to the Essenes. But the first volume of this collective *œuvre* was published only after his death, under the direction of his erstwhile student, by then a professor at Strasbourg, Marc Philonenko.<sup>16</sup> Philonenko is now preparing a second volume in collaboration with younger scholars. It will include further Qumran texts recently published.

The most prominent student and later collaborator of Dupont-Sommer was undoubtedly André Caquot (1923-2004). Indeed, he was a major contributor to the first volume initiated by Dupont-Sommer. The book contains Caquot's translations of the pseudepigraphic works *Jubilees*, *1 Enoch* and the *Martyrdom of Isaiah*, and of several Hebrew and Aramaic Qumran texts (among them the *Temple Scroll*, the *Melchizedek Pesher* and the *Book of Mysteries*). After brilliant studies at the École Normale Supérieure in Paris, Caquot became *directeur d'études* for comparative Semitic religions at the École Pratique des Hautes Études (5<sup>th</sup> section for Religious Studies), where he taught from 1955 to 1972. Following in the steps of his teacher, Caquot was elected in 1972 to the chair of Hebrew and Aramaic at the Collège de France and lectured there until his retirement in 1994. For 27

---

*renaniennes* 49 (1982): 4-16.

<sup>16</sup> André Dupont-Sommer and Marc Philonenko, eds., *La Bible: Écrits intertestamentaires* (Bibliothèque de la Pléiade; Paris: Gallimard, 1987).

years (1977-2004) he served as a member of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres.<sup>17</sup> A renowned Semitist with wide-ranging expertise, Caquot was versed in ancient west- and south-Semitic languages, including Ugaritic and old Ethiopic (*ge'ez*), as well as Hebrew and Aramaic.

Caquot continued his mentor's tradition of Qumran research in France, but ushered the field into its second phase, lasting from 1970 to the present. This period has witnessed the publication of new Qumran texts, studied by Caquot immediately on their appearance. The translations of new Qumran texts, based upon precise philological analysis, occupied him especially in his later years. His articles were published in various journals<sup>18</sup> but towards the end mainly in the *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* (*RHPR*), edited at the University of Strasbourg.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>17</sup> See André Lemaire, "Hommage à André Caquot," *REJ* 164 (2005): 5-8; Émile Puech, "In Memoriam André Caquot," *RevQ* 22 (2005): 3-5; Moshe Bar-Asher, "André Caquot," *Meghillot* 3 (2005): xxi-xxiv (Hebrew); Christophe Batsch, Ariel Feldman and Atar Livneh, "Bibliography of Articles Connected with the Scrolls by André Caquot," *Meghillot* 3 (2005) (Hebrew); André Lemaire, "André Caquot et les études qumrâniennes: Un hommage," in André Lemaire and Simon A. C. Mimouni, eds., *Qoumrân et le judaïsme du tournant de notre ère: Actes de la Table ronde, Collège de France, 16 novembre 2004* (Collection de la *REJ*; Louvain: Peeters, 2006), 1-6.

<sup>18</sup> See *Annuaire du Collège de France* from 1972-1973 to 1993-1994. See also André Caquot, "Un écrit sectaire de Qoumrân: Le 'Targum de Job'," *RHR* 185 (1974): 10-27; "Le messianisme qumrânien," in Delcor, *Qumrân, sa piété*, 231-47; "Le rouleau du Temple de Qoumrân," *ETR* 53 (1978): 445-500; "La pérennité du sacerdoce," in *Paganisme, judaïsme, christianisme: Influences et affrontements dans le monde antique: Mélanges offerts à Marcel Simon* (Paris: de Boccard, 1978), 109-16; "Le service des anges," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 423-9; "4QMess Ar 1 i 8-11," *RevQ* 16 (1991): 145-55; "Grandeur et pureté du sacerdoce: Remarques sur le *Testament de Qahat* (4Q542)," in Ziony Zevit, Seymour Gitin and Michael Sokoloff, eds., *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995) 39-44; (with Arnaud Sérandon) "La périodisation: De la Bible à l'apocalyptique," in Françoise Briquel-Chatonnet and Hélène Lozachmeur, eds., *Proche-Orient ancien: Temps vécu, temps pensé* (Antiquités sémitiques 3; Paris: Maisonneuve, 1998), 83-98 (85-98); "Réflexions sur l'apocryphe araméen de la Genèse à Qumrân," in Dariusz Dlugosz and Henryk Ratajczak, eds., *Józef Tadeusz Milik et cinquantième de la découverte des manuscrits de la mer Morte de Qumrân* (Warsaw: Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 2000), 9-14.

<sup>19</sup> André Caquot, "La secte de Qoumrân et le Temple (Essai de synthèse)," *RHPR* 72 (1992): 3-14; "Nouveaux fragments de l'Écrit de Damas," *RHPR* 74 (1994): 369-94; "Les textes de sagesse de Qumrân (Aperçu préliminaire)," *RHPR* 76 (1996): 1-34; "Un exposé polémique de pratiques sectaires (4Q MMT)," *RHPR* 76 (1996): 257-76; "Les cantiques qoumrâniens de l'holocauste du sabbat," *RHPR* 77 (1997): 1-29; "Les testaments qoumrâniens des pères du sacerdoce," *RHPR* 78 (1998): 3-26; "Deux textes messianiques de Qoumrân," *RHPR* 79 (1999): 155-71; "Retour à la mère du Messie: 1 QH 3 (Suknik), 6-18," *RHPR* 80 (2000): 5-12; "Suppléments qoumrâniens à la Genèse," *RHPR* 80 (2000): 339-58; "Poésie religieuse de Qoumrân," *RHPR* 81 (2001): 131-7; "Malédiction et bénédiction qoumrâniennes," *RHPR* 82 (2002): 3-14; "Les prodromes du déluge: Légendes araméennes de Qoumrân," *RHPR* 83 (2003): 41-59; "Trois textes religieux de la Grotte 4," *RHPR* 84 (2004): 129-47.

For many years this journal was edited by another student of Dupont-Sommer, Marc Philonenko (1930-), who taught history of religions in the Protestant Faculty of Theology at the University of Strasbourg. Since 1999 he has also been a member of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres. In a note on his mentor, Philonenko tells how he himself became involved in Qumran research:

To a young man of twenty, who asked at the end of his lectures in 1950, "Sir, what is your advice to me?" Dupont-Sommer replied: "Make the Pseudepigrapha your bedside book." And so it was.<sup>20</sup>

This anecdote illuminates Philonenko's approach to Qumran texts. Like Dupont-Sommer, he is interested in the origins of Christianity, and like him he thinks that the Hellenistic Synagogue, namely the milieu of the intertestamental literature, is one of the keys to understanding it, in addition to the influences of Egyptian and Iranian ideas. His comparative approach explores all possible parallels or connections between the Qumran texts and the pseudepigraphic literature or the New Testament. This orientation is expressed in his books,<sup>21</sup> his editorial work,<sup>22</sup> and his numerous articles,<sup>23</sup>

<sup>20</sup> "À un jeune homme de vingt ans qui lui demandait, en 1950, à la fin d'un cours: 'Monsieur, que me conseillez-vous?', Dupont-Sommer répondit: 'Faites des "Pseudépigraphes" votre livre de chevet!'. Ce fut fait." See Marc Philonenko, "André Dupont-Sommer, les Apocryphes et les Pseudépigraphes de l'Ancien Testament," *CRAI* (2003): 1415-20 (1418).

<sup>21</sup> Marc Philonenko, *Les interpolations chrétiennes des Testaments des Douze Patriarches et les manuscrits de Qoumrân* (Cahiers d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses 35; Paris: PUF, 1960); *Joseph et Aséneth: Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes* (StPB 13; Leiden: Brill, 1968); *Le Testament de Job* (Sem 18; Paris: Maisonneuve, 1968); (in collaboration with Belkis Philonenko-Sayar) *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham* (Sem 31; 1981); (with Belkis Philonenko-Sayar) *Die Apokalypse Abrahams* (JSHRZ VI/5; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1982), 414-60.

<sup>22</sup> Marc Philonenko et al., eds., *Pseudépigraphes de l'Ancien Testament et manuscrits de la mer Morte* (Cahiers de la RHPR 41; Paris: PUF, 1967); notable are his contributions to the volume *Écrits intertestamentaires* (with André Caquot): "Introduction générale" (XV-CXLVI); "Testaments des Douze Patriarches" (811-944); "Livre des Secrets d'Hénoch" (1165-223); "Joseph et Aséneth"; "Testament de Job" (1559-645); (with Belkis Philonenko-Sayar) "Apocalypse d'Abraham" (1691-730). See also his *Apocalyptique iranienne et dualisme qoumrânien*, with Geo Widengren and Anders Hultgård (Recherches intertestamentaires 2; Paris: Maisonneuve, 1995).

<sup>23</sup> For a general and provisional bibliography see "Publications de Marc Philonenko (1955-1999)," in *Hommage à Marc Philonenko*, RHPR 80 (2000): 199-204. The following are his main articles devoted to Qumran issues: "Sur l'expression 'corps de chair' dans le *Commentaire d'Habacuc*," *Sem* 5 (1955): 39-40; "La notice du Josèphe slave sur les Esséniens," *Sem* 6 (1956): 69-73; "Le *Testament de Job* et les Thérapeutes," *Sem* 8 (1958): 41-53; "Le Maître de justice et la Sagesse de Salomon," *TZ* 14 (1958): 81-88; "L'origine essénienne des Cinq Psaumes syriaques de David," *Sem* 9 (1959): 35-48; "Remarques sur un hymne essénien de caractère gnostique," *Sem* 11 (1961): 43-54; "Le martyre d'Ésaïe et l'histoire de la secte de Qoumrân," in Marc Philonenko et al., eds., *Pseudépigraphes de l'Ancien Testament*, 1-10; "Une tradition essénienne dans le Coran," RHPR 170 (1966):

especially those published in the Strasbourg *RHPR*.<sup>24</sup>

143-57; "Une expression qoumranienne dans le Coran," in Mariano Arribas Palau and Giacomo Girolamo Chiappe, *Datos relativos a la actuación de Giacomo Girolamo Chiappe en los años 1790 a 1792: Estratto dagli Atti del III Congresso di Studi Arabi e Islamici (Ravello 1966)* (Naples: Instituto Universitario Orientale, 1967), 553-6; "L'âme à l'étroit," in Caquot and Philonenko, eds., *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer*, 421-28; "Une règle essénienne dans le Coran," *Sem* 22 (1972): 49-52; "Joseph et Aséneth: Questions actuelles," in Willem C. van Unnik, ed., *La littérature juive entre Tenach et Mishna: Quelques problèmes* (RechBib 11; Leiden: Brill, 1974), 73-76; "David humilis et simplex: L'interprétation essénienne d'un personnage biblique et son iconographie," *CRAI* (1977): 536-44; "Magister iustitiae: Note sur la christologie de Lactance," in *Paganisme, judaïsme, christianisme*, 227-31; "Essénisme et misogynie," *CRAI* (1982): 339-53; "L'apocalyphtique qoumranienne," in David Hellholm, ed., *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (2d ed.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 211-18; "Prière au soleil et liturgie angélique," in *La littérature intertestamentaire: Colloque de Strasbourg 17-19 octobre 1983* (Paris: PUF, 1985), 221-8; "Philon d'Alexandrie et l'Instruction sur les Deux Esprits," in André Caquot and Mireille Hadas-Label, eds., *Hellenica et Judaica: Hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky* (Louvain: Peeters, 1986), 61-68; "Culte sacrificiel et offrande des lèvres dans le judaïsme essénien," in *Prière, mystique et judaïsme: Colloque de Strasbourg 10-12 septembre 1984* (Paris: PUF, 1987), 9-19; "De l'habitation des deux Esprits en nous," *CRAI* (1987): 388-400; "La parabole sur la lampe (Luc 11, 33-36) et les horoscopes qoumranien," *ZNW* 79 (1988): 145-51; "Melkiresha' et Melkira': Note sur les *Visions de Amram*," *Sem* 41-42 (1993): 159-62; "Les paroles de Jésus contre 'cette génération' et la tradition qoumranienne," in Hubert Cancik, Hermann Lichtenberger and Peter Schäfer, eds., *Frühes Christentum* (vol. 3 of *Geschichte - Tradition - Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*; Tübingen: Mohr, 1996), 89-96; "L'origine essénienne du livre de *Judith*," *CRAI* (1996): 1139-56; "Dehors les chiens: Apocalypse 22.16 et 4QMMT B58-62," *NTS* 43 (1997): 445-50; "Les *Oracles d'Hystape* et deux textes qoumranien (1QS 8, 12-14 et 4Q385, 3, 2-7)," *Sem* 47 (1998): 111-16; "'Aimer la vérité et haïr le mensonge': Histoire d'une formule," *CRAI* (1998) 459-73; "La Nouvelle Jérusalem et le Vara de Yima," in Martin Hengel et al., eds., *La Cité de Dieu = Die Stadt Gottes: 3. Symposium Strasbourg, Tübingen, Uppsala, 19.-23. September 1988 in Tübingen* (WUNT 129; Tübingen: Mohr, 2000), 139-46; (in collaboration with B. Philonenko-Sayar) "Sur l'expression 'temps de justice' en 4Q215a, dans l'*Apocalypse d'Abraham* et dans l'*Épître à Diognète*," *Sem* 50 (2001): 234-5; "Sur les expressions 'maison fidèle en Israël', 'maison de vérité en Israël', 'maison de perfection et de vérité en Israël' (Contribution à l'étude du sociolecte esséno-qoumranien)," in García Martínez, Steudel and Tigchelaar, *From 4QMMT to Resurrection*, 243-6; "'La lumière dans mon coeur vient de Ses Mystères merveilleux': De la Règle de la Communauté XI 5 à II Corinthiens 4,6 (Contribution à l'étude du sociolecte esséno-qoumranien)," in Christophe Batsch and Madalina Vârtejanu-Joubert, eds., *Manières de penser dans l'Antiquité méditerranéenne et orientale: Mélanges offerts à Francis Schmidt par ses élèves, ses collègues et ses amis* (JSJSup 134; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 231-8; "Les 'Paraboles' du livre d'*Hénoch* et André Caquot," in Jean Riaud and Marie-Laure Chaieb, eds., *L'oeuvre d'un orientaliste: André Caquot 1923-2004* (Paris: Champion, 2010), 119-26.

<sup>24</sup> Marc Philonenko, "Les études qoumranien I," *RHPR* 2 (1961): 163-72; "Les études qoumranien II," *RHPR* 4 (1963): 62-77; "Deux horoscopes qoumranien: Identification des personnages," *RHPR* 65 (1985): 61-66; "Un arbre se courbera et se redressera: 4Q385 2 9-10," *RHPR* 73 (1993): 401-4; "Son soleil éternel brillera: 4Q TestLévi(?) 9 i 3," *RHPR* 73 (1993): 405-8; "De Qoumran à Doura-Europos: La vision des ossements desséchés (Ezéchiel 37,1-14)," *RHPR* 74 (1994): 1-12; "'Que ton Esprit vienne sur nous et qu'il nous purifie' (Luc 11,2): L'arrière-plan qoumranien d'une variante lucanienne du 'Notre Père'," *RHPR* 75 (1995): 61-66; (with A. Marx) "Quatre 'Chants' pseudo-davidiques trouvés dans la Gueniza du Caire et d'origine esséno-qoumranienne," *RHPR* 77 (1997): 385-406;



Philonenko's enterprise and interests turned the University of Strasbourg into a center for the study of the Jewish pseudepigraphic works and their ties to the Qumran texts. This activity has attracted younger scholars to the field. Another representative of this tendency at the Protestant Faculty of Theology in Strasbourg is the linguist and philologist Jan Joosten (1959-). He studies the linguistic features of the Dead Sea Scrolls in connection with his investigation of post-classical Hebrew. He is especially interested in detecting various *états de langue* and the evolution of ancient Hebrew.<sup>25</sup>

Another scholar of the second generation, a student of Marc Philonenko, is Francis Schmidt (1939-). In the early years he was closely attached to the circle of the University of Strasbourg, where he wrote his doctoral dissertation.<sup>26</sup> At that stage he was involved in the work on the pseudepigraphic lit-

---

"De la 'Prière de Jésus' au 'Notre Père': Abba; targoum du Psaume 89,27; 4Q369, 1, 2, 1-12; *Luc* 11,2," *RHPR* 77 (1997): 133-40; "Marc 1,15a et 4Q215a: La préhistoire esséno-qoumrânienne d'une proclamation eschatologique," *RHPR* 80 (2000): 213-20; "Adonai, le Messie et le Saoshyant: Observations nouvelles sur 4Q521," *RHPR* 83 (2002): 259-66; "Le Vivificateur: Étude d'eschatologie comparée: De 4Q521 aux Actes de Thomas," *RHPR* 83 (2003): 61-69; "Rhétorique paulinienne et terminologie qoumrânienne," *RHPR* 84 (2004): 149-61; "Romains 7,23, une glose qoumrânienne sur Job 40.32 (Septante) et trois textes qoumrâniens," *RHPR* 87 (2007): 257-65.

<sup>25</sup> Jan Joosten, "Pseudo-Classicism in Late Biblical Hebrew, in Ben Sira, and in Qumran Hebrew," in Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde, eds., *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages: Proceedings of a Second International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, and the Mishnah, held at Leiden University, 15-17 December 1997* (STDJ 33; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 146-59; "The Knowledge and Use of Hebrew in the Hellenistic Period: Qumran and the Septuagint," in Takamitsu Muraoka and John F. Elwolde, eds., *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 115-30; "Sectarian Terminology and Biblical Exegesis: The Meaning of the Verb 'WT' in Qumran Writings," *Meghillot* 1 (2003): 219-26 (Hebrew); "Linguistic Innovations in the Hebrew of the Hellenistic Period: Qumran and the Septuagint," *Meghillot* 2 (2004): 151-5 (Hebrew); "The Interpretation of Deut. 29:18 in the Qumran Scrolls," *Meghillot* 3 (2005): 231-8 (Hebrew); "L'excédent massorétique du Livre de Jérémie et l'hébreu post-classique," in Jan Joosten and Jean-Sébastien Rey, eds., *Conservatism and Innovation in the Hebrew Language of the Hellenistic Period: Proceedings of a Fourth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (STDJ 73; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 93-108; "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Septuagint in Mutual Illumination," in Hans Ausloos, Benedicte Lemmelijn and Marc Vervenne, eds., *Florilegium Lovaniense: Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (BETL 224; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 245-52; "Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek in the Qumran Scrolls," in Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 351-74; "L'araméen de Qumran entre l'araméen d'empire et les Targumim: L'emploi de la préposition 'devant' pour exprimer le respect dû au roi et à Dieu," in Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, eds., *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June – 2 July 2008* (STDJ 94; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 83-100.

<sup>26</sup> Francis Schmidt, *Le Testament grec d'Abraham* (TSAJ 11; Tübingen: Mohr, 1986).

erature conducted there and published related investigations.<sup>27</sup> From 1972 until his retirement in 2006 he taught at the École Pratique des Hautes Études (5<sup>th</sup> section for Religious Studies), where he was appointed in 1981 *directeur d'études* for the history of Judaism in the Hellenistic and Roman periods.<sup>28</sup> In those years he published several studies on themes related to the Qumran texts, among them inquiries into the Temple,<sup>29</sup> the calendar<sup>30</sup> and astrology.<sup>31</sup>

Ernest-Marie Laperrousaz (1924-) was another student of André Dupont-Sommer. Early on he studied the *Testament of Moses*,<sup>32</sup> and several themes of the Qumran manuscripts.<sup>33</sup> But time spent on the archaeolog-

<sup>27</sup> Francis Schmidt, "Une source essénienne chez Commodien," in Philonenko et al., eds., *Pseudépigraphes de l'Ancien Testament*, 11-25; "The Two Recensions of the *Testament of Abraham*: In Which Direction Did the Transformation Take Place?," in George W.E. Nickelsburg, ed., *Studies on the Testament of Abraham* (SCS 6; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976), 65-83; "Testament d'Abraham," in *Écrits intertestamentaires*, 1647-90.

<sup>28</sup> See Christophe Batsch and Madalina Vârtejanu-Joubert, "Francis Schmidt, historien du judaïsme ancien," in Batsch and Vârtejanu-Joubert, *Manières de penser dans l'Antiquité*, 1-10.

<sup>29</sup> Francis Schmidt, *La pensée du Temple: De Jérusalem à Qoumrân: Identité et lien social dans le judaïsme ancien* (Paris: Seuil, 1994); *How the Temple Thinks: Identity and Social Cohesion in Ancient Judaism* (Eng. trans. J. Edward Crowley; The Biblical Seminar 78; Sheffield: Academic Press, 2001); "Les modèles du Temple à Qoumrân," in Ernest-Marie Laperrousaz, ed., *Qoumrân et les manuscrits de la mer Morte: Un cinquantenaire* (Paris: Cerf, 1997), 345-66.

<sup>30</sup> Francis Schmidt, "Le calendrier liturgique des Prières quotidiennes (4Q503): En annexe: l'apport du verso (4Q512) à l'édition de 4Q503," in Christian Grappe and Jean-Claude Ingelaere, eds., *Le temps et les temps dans les littératures juives et chrétiennes au tournant de notre ère* (JSJSup 112; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 55-87.

<sup>31</sup> Francis Schmidt, "Astrologie juive ancienne: Essai d'interprétation de 4QCryptique, 4Q186," *RevQ* 18 (1997): 125-41; English version: "Ancient Jewish Astrology: An Attempt to Interpret 4QCryptic, 4Q186," in Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon, eds., *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 May, 1996* (STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 189-205; "Élection et tirage au sort (1QS VI, 13-23 et Ac 1,15-26)," *RHPR* 80 (2000): 105-17; "Essai d'interprétation de 4QTirage au sort (4Q279)," in Menahem Mor et al., eds., *For Uriel: Studies in the History of Israel in Antiquity Presented to Professor Uriel Rappaport* (Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 2005), 189-204; "Recherche son thème de géniture dans le mystère de ce qui doit être: Astrologie et prédestination à Qoumrân," in Lemaire and Mimouni, *Qoumrân et le judaïsme*, 51-62; "Le mazzal et le mérite: Du *Testament d'Abraham* à Rabbi Aqiba," in Moshe Bar-Asher and Emanuel Tov, eds., *Festschrift for Devorah Dimant, Meghillot* 5-6 (2007), 101\*-18\*; "Gôrâl versus payis: Casting Lots at Qumran and in the Rabbinic Tradition," in Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović, eds., *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen* (STDJ 70; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 175-85.

<sup>32</sup> Ernest-Marie Laperrousaz, *Le Testament de Moïse (généralement appelé "Assomption de Moïse")*, *Sem* 19 (1970); "Testament de Moïse," in *Écrits intertestamentaires*, 993-1016.

<sup>33</sup> Ernest-Marie Laperrousaz, *Lattente du Messie en Palestine à la veille et au début de l'ère chrétienne à la lumière des documents récemment découverts* (Paris: Picard, 1982); "Le



ical excavations of the Qumran site, then conducted by Roland de Vaux, stimulated his interest in that aspect of Qumran research; he subsequently devoted several books and articles to interpreting the results of this dig and their historical meaning<sup>34</sup> in connection with the manuscripts found nearby.<sup>35</sup> Later he became *directeur d'études* at the École Pratique des Hautes Études (5<sup>th</sup> section for Religious Studies), teaching biblical and Palestinian archaeology.

André Dupont-Sommer's last student was André Lemaire (1942-). An epigraphist of Hebrew and Aramaic, he was appointed in 1987 *directeur d'études* at the École Pratique des Hautes Études (4<sup>th</sup> section for Historical and Philological Studies) to teach subjects of his expertise until his administrative retirement in 2010. Lemaire had an opportunity to investigate Qumran subjects quite early in his career and he devoted a study to the problematic connection between the Qumran organization and the ministries mentioned in the New Testament.<sup>36</sup> He returned to study Qumran themes in the 1990s, when new texts were published. He turned his attention to the small inscriptions found in the excavations of Khirbet Qumran,<sup>37</sup> and did epigraphic and historical research on 4Q448.<sup>38</sup> Lemaire de-

---

classement chronologique des passages messianiques des manuscrits de la mer Morte," in *La littérature intertestamentaire*, 69-88.

<sup>34</sup> See especially Ernest-Marie Laperrousaz, *Qoumrân: L'établissement essénien des bords de la mer Morte: Histoire et archéologie du site* (Paris: Picard, 1976); *Les Esséniens selon leur témoignage direct* (Religions et culture; Paris: Desclée, 1982); "Méthodologie et datation des manuscrits de la mer Morte: Le rouleau de cuivre 3Q15," in George J. Brooke, ed., *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the IOQS, Paris 1992* (STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994) 233-9; "Does the Temple Scroll date from the First or Second Century B.C.E.?" in George J. Brooke, ed., *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll, Manchester, December 1987* (JSPSup 7; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1989), 91-97; "L'établissement de Qoumrân près de la mer Morte: Forteresse ou couvent?," *Revue de la Société Ernest-Renan* NS 42 (1999): 69-80.

<sup>35</sup> See especially Ernest-Marie Laperrousaz, *Les manuscrits de la mer Morte* (Que sais-je? 953; Paris: PUF, 1961 with 10 editions and many translations); Laperrousaz, ed., *Qoumrân et les manuscrits de la mer Morte: Un cinquantenaire*, 11-34, 71-116, 205-13, 367-408; Laperrousaz, *Qoumrân et les manuscrits de la mer Morte: Quelques problèmes fondamentaux* (Paris: Paris-Méditerranée, 2004); *Qoumrân et ses manuscrits de la mer Morte* (Paris: Non Lieu, 2006).

<sup>36</sup> André Lemaire, "Excursus: L'organisation de Qumran et les ministres de l'Église," in *Les ministères aux origines de l'Église* (LD 68; Paris: Cerf, 1971), 203-17.

<sup>37</sup> André Lemaire, "Inscriptions du khirbeh, des grottes et de 'Ain Feshkha," in Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Jan Gunneweg, eds., *Khirbet Qumrân et 'Ain Feshkha II: Études d'anthropologie, de physique et de chimie* (NTOA/Series Archaeologica 3; Fribourg: Academic Press, 2003), 341-88; see also "Nouveaux fragments du rouleau du temple de Qumrân," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 271-3; "Un fragment araméen inédit de Qumrân," *RevQ* 18 (1997): 331-3; "XQOffering ar," in Philip S. Alexander, et al., in consultation with James C. VanderKam and Monica Brady, *Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD XXXVI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 490-91.

voted special studies to the teaching activity at Qumran,<sup>39</sup> and suggests seeing the site as a kind of Essene *bêt midrash*.<sup>40</sup>

The other branch of the French activity connected with the Scrolls developed differently. As noted, in its first phase French Qumran research centered on the intellectual personality of Jean Carmignac (1914-1986). A traditional priest but open to other directions, Carmignac spent a year (1953-1954) at the Jerusalem École Biblique, where he came in contact with the Scrolls.<sup>41</sup> In a booklet he published later he criticizes adventurous interpretations of the Scrolls advanced by the media.<sup>42</sup> Having published several scientific papers,<sup>43</sup> he collaborated with other scholars in producing a collection of translations and commentaries of the major Qumran texts available at the time.<sup>44</sup> This collection takes a judicious and informative approach to the Qumran texts and may be read with profit even today.<sup>45</sup> Perhaps Carmignac's most significant undertaking, and of lasting

<sup>38</sup> André Lemaire, "Le roi Jonatan à Qoumrân (4Q448,B-C)," in Laperrousaz, *Qoumrân et les manuscrits de la mer Morte; un cinquantenaire*, 57-70; "Attestation textuelle et critique littéraire: 4Q448 et Psaume 154," in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years, 12-18*; "Le Psaume 154: Sagesse et site de Qoumrân," in García Martínez, Steudel and Tigchelaar, *From 4QMMT to Resurrection*, 195-204.

<sup>39</sup> André Lemaire, "L'enseignement essénien et l'école de Qumrân," in Caquot and Hadas-Label, *Hellenica et Judaica*, 191-203; "L'expérience essénienne de Flavius Josèphe," in Folker Siegert, ed., *Internationale Josephus-Kolloquium Paris 2001: Studies on the Antiquities of Josephus* (Münsteraner Judaistische Studien 12; Münster: Lit, 2002), 138-51; "Lire, écrire, étudier à Qoumrân et ailleurs," in Lemaire and Mimouni, *Qoumrân et le judaïsme*, 63-79; "Remarques sur le vocabulaire hébreu de l'enseignement et de l'étude à Qumrân et dans Ben Sira," in Joosten and Rey, *Conservatism and Innovation*, 109-24; "PŠR et PRŠ, Esséniens et Pharisiens: Deux interprétations de l'Écriture," in Batsch and Vártejanu-Joubert, *Manières de penser dans l'Antiquité*, 51-60; "Nabonide et Gilgamesh: L'araméen en Mésopotamie et à Qoumrân," in Berthelot and Stökl Ben Ezra, *Aramaica Qumranica*, 125-44.

<sup>40</sup> André Lemaire, "Qoumrân: sa fonction et ses manuscrits," in Laperrousaz, *Qoumrân et les manuscrits de la mer Morte; un cinquantenaire*, 117-49; "Réflexions sur la fonction du site de Qumrân," in Dlugosz and Ratajczak, *Józef Tadeusz Milik, 37-43*; "Les écrits de sagesse à Qoumrân et l'interprétation du site," *JA* 294 (2006): 53-65; "Qumran – essenki *beit-midrash*? Proba wstepnej syntezy," in Waldemar Chrostowski, ed., "Przeznaczyles nas dla Twojej prawdy" (4Q 495): *Studia dla Dr. Zdzisława J. Kapery* (Rozprawy I Studia Biblijne 29; Warsaw: Vocatio, 2007), 187-203.

<sup>41</sup> See Mathias Delcor, "À la mémoire de Jean Carmignac (1914-1986)," *FO* 25 (1988): 233-40; Émile Puech, "Jean Carmignac (1914-1986)," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 1-7.

<sup>42</sup> Jean Carmignac, *Le Docteur de Justice et Jésus-Christ* (Paris: Orante, 1957). English translation: *Christ and the Teacher of Righteousness: The Evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1962).

<sup>43</sup> See his full bibliography in Florentino García Martínez, "Bibliographie de M. l'Abbé Jean Carmignac," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 9-20.

<sup>44</sup> Jean Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1958).

<sup>45</sup> See Jean Carmignac and Pierre Guilbert, *Les textes de Qumrân traduits et annotés: I, La règle de la communauté, La règle de la guerre, Les hymnes* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1961); Jean

influence in Qumran research, was his founding of a new scientific journal, devoted solely to the Qumran studies, the *Revue de Qumran*. He edited it from its beginnings in 1958 until his death, and in it he published most of his studies. His articles are always written in a sober, clear and erudite manner. From 1967 till 1980 he also taught textual criticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls at the Catholic Institute of Paris. He devoted a special study to the New Testament prayer "Our Father."<sup>46</sup> Engaged in the hypothesis of a Hebrew substratum to the Synoptic Gospels, he invested much effort in translating the Gospels into Hebrew.

Other teachers at the Catholic Institute of Paris such as Jean Daniélou, later Cardinal (1905-1974),<sup>47</sup> and Edouard Cothenet (1924-)<sup>48</sup> published only occasional studies on the Scrolls. It was Mathias Delcor (1919-1992)<sup>49</sup> who contributed most to this domain. For 22 years (1958-1980) he taught at the Catholic Institute of Toulouse, and concomitantly pursued studies at the Paris Catholic Institute and the École Pratique des Hautes Études. There he was able to attend the lectures of André Dupont-Sommer, Charles Virolleaud and Édouard Dhorme. Later he became *directeur d'études* at the same institution, teaching Semitic Religion and Hebrew Bible (1980-1986). From the beginning of his scientific activity he took a passionate interest in the Scrolls, as reflected by his books,<sup>50</sup> his numerous articles,<sup>51</sup>

---

Carmignac, Edouard Cothenet and Hubert Lignée, *Les textes de Qumrân traduits et annotés: II, Règle de la congrégation, Recueil des bénédictions, Interprétation de prophètes et de psaumes, Document de Damas, Apocryphe de la Genèse, Fragments divers de la Grotte 1, Fragments des grottes 1 et 4* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1963).

<sup>46</sup> Jean Carmignac, *Recherches sur le "Notre Père"* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1969).

<sup>47</sup> Jean Daniélou, *Les manuscrits de la mer Morte et les origines du christianisme* (Paris: Orante, 1957, repr. 1974 and 1996).

<sup>48</sup> Carmignac, Cothenet and Lignée, *Les textes de Qumrân II*; Edouard Cothenet, "Qumrân: 50 ans après les découvertes," *Esprit et Vie* 108 (1998): 145-65.

<sup>49</sup> See Mathias Delcor, *Bio-bibliographie, Chronique* (BLESup 1; Toulouse: Institut Catholique de Toulouse, 1994).

<sup>50</sup> Notable are his volumes devoted to the Qumran texts: Mathias Delcor, *Les manuscrits de la mer Morte: Essai sur le midrash d'Habacuc* (Paris: Cerf, 1951); *Les Hymnes de Qumrân (Hodayot)* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1962). He wrote an introduction to the Scrolls in Spanish in collaboration with García Martínez: Florentino García Martínez and Mathias Delcor, *Introducción a la literatura esenia de Qumran* (Academia Cristiana 20; Madrid: Cristiandad, 1982).

<sup>51</sup> See André Caquot, Simon Legasse and Michel Tardieu, eds., *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Mathias Delcor* (AOAT 215; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1985), 437-44, and Delcor, *Midrash d'Habacuc*; García Martínez and Delcor, *Introducción a la literatura esenia*. Delcor's papers are collected in the volumes Mathias Delcor, *Religion d'Israël et Proche-Orient ancien: Des Phéniciens aux Esséniens* (Leiden: Brill, 1976); *Études bibliques et orientales de religions comparées* (Leiden: Brill, 1979); *Environnement et Tradition de l'Ancien Testament* (AOAT 228; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990). Among the latest papers, see "Jewish Literature in Hebrew and Aramaic in

and his teaching at the École Pratique.<sup>52</sup> His international reputation as a Qumran scholar enabled him to organize and preside at the 27<sup>th</sup> Louvain colloquium on the scrolls, whose *Proceedings* he later edited. Erudition, philological precision, comparative method and wide knowledge of the historical and literary context of his subjects were the distinctive mark of his approach.

André Paul (1933-) is another contributor to Qumran research in France. After teaching for some time at the Catholic Institute in Paris he became a private scholar and a publisher. Early in his career Paul explored the problem of the relationship between the Qumran documents and Karaism.<sup>53</sup> But more recently he has written several surveys for the general public, especially highlighting the problem of the birth of the Bible, which, in his opinion, materialized as a “canon” not before 70 CE.<sup>54</sup> With a group of younger collaborators he initiated a bilingual, Hebrew/Aramaic and French, edition of all the non-biblical Qumran texts.<sup>55</sup>

Some of the young scholars contributing to the edition initiated by André Paul are also participating in the second volume of *Écrits intertestamentaires* directed by Marc Philonenko. Note should be taken of their doctoral dissertations, now published, as well as several papers in the linguistic (Ursula Schattner-Rieser),<sup>56</sup> epigraphic (Michael Langlois)<sup>57</sup> or religious as-

---

the Greek Era,” in Winton D. Davies and Louis Finkelstein, eds., *The Cambridge History of Judaism II: The Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge: University Press, 1989), 352-408; “La fête des Huttes dans le Rouleau du Temple et dans le Livre des Jubilés,” *RevQ* 15 (1991): 181-98.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. *Annuaire de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études, V<sup>e</sup> section, Sciences religieuses* 1980-1981 to 1984-1985.

<sup>53</sup> André Paul, *Écrits de Qumran et sectes juives aux premiers siècles de l'Islam: Recherches sur l'origine du karaïsme* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1969); see also “Qumran et les Karaïtes,” in Daniel Tollet, ed., *Politique et religion dans le judaïsme ancien et médiéval* (Paris: Desclée, 1989), 201-7.

<sup>54</sup> André Paul, *Les manuscrits de la mer Morte: La voix des Esséniens retrouvée* (Paris: Bayard/Centurion, 1997); “Les révélations de la mer Morte: Un bilan du cinquantenaire,” *NRT* 121 (1999): 197-217; *Et l'homme créa la Bible: D'Hérodote à Flavius Josèphe* (Paris: Bayard, 2000); “Les ‘Écritures’ dans la société juive au temps de Jésus,” *RSR* 89 (2001): 13-42; *La Bible avant la Bible: La grande révélation des manuscrits de la mer Morte* (Paris: Cerf, 2005); (with Katell Berthelot) “Bulletin de judaïsme ancien,” *RSR* 93 (2005): 597-618; “Bulletin du judaïsme ancien: Qumrân et les manuscrits de la mer Morte,” *RSR* 94 (2006): 129-60; “Les manuscrits de la Mer Morte et les origines du christianisme,” *NRT* 128 (2006): 388-404; *Qumrân et les Esséniens: L'éclatement d'un dogme* (Paris: Cerf, 2008).

<sup>55</sup> Two volumes came out recently: Katell Berthelot, Thierry Legrand and André Paul, eds., *Torah: Genèse* (vol. 1 of *La bibliothèque de Qumrân*; Paris: Cerf, 2008); Katell Berthelot and Thierry Legrand, eds., *Torah: Exode – Lévitique – Nombres* (vol. 2. of *La bibliothèque de Qumrân*; Paris: Cerf, 2010).

<sup>56</sup> Ursula Schattner-Rieser, *L'araméen des manuscrits de la mer Morte I: Grammaire* (Instruments pour l'étude des langues de l'Orient ancien 5; Lausanne: Zèbre, 2004). See also her other publications: *Textes araméens de la Mer Morte: Édition bilingue, vocalisée et com-*

pects (David Hamidović) of the Qumran Scrolls.<sup>58</sup> Other young scholars

*mentée* (Langues et cultures anciennes 5; Bruxelles: Safran, 2005); "À propos de l'araméen à Qoumrân," in Laperrousaz, *Qoumrân et les manuscrits de la mer Morte; un cinquantenaire*, 175-204; "Some Observations on Qumran Aramaic: The 3rd Fem. Sing. Pronominal Suffix," in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years, 739-45*; "Observations sur l'araméen de Qumrân: La question de l'araméen littéraire standard reconsidérée," in Dlugosz and Ratajczak, *Józef Tadeusz Milik*, 51-62; "Note sur \*d et la (non-)dissimilation des pharyngales en araméen: À propos d'un chaînon manquant découvert à Qumrân," in Christian-Bernard Amphoux, Albert Frey and Ursula Schattner-Rieser, eds., *Études sémitiques et samaritaines offertes à Jean Margain* (Lausanne: Zèbre, 1998), 95-100; "J. T. Milik's Monograph on the Testament of Levi and the Reconstructed Aramaic Text of the Prayer of Levi and the Vision of Levi's Ascent to Heaven from Qumran Caves 4 and 1," *QC* 15 (2007): 139-55; "Remarques préliminaires sur le Testament de Lévi, monographie inachevée de J.T. Milik et quelques restitutions du document araméen supposé original (4Q213a frag. 1-2)," *The Polish Journal of Biblical Research* 6 (2007): 113-21; translations in Berthelot, Legrand and Paul, *Torah: Genèse*, 257-69, 319-87, 424-85, 541-51; "La bibliothèque de Qumrân," *Tsafon* 56 (2008-2009): 43-60; "L'apport de la philologie araméenne et l'interprétation des archaïsmes linguistiques pour la datation des textes araméens de Qumrân," in Berthelot and Stökl Ben Ezra, *Aramaica Qumranica*, 101-23.

<sup>57</sup> Michel Langlois, *Le premier manuscrit du Livre d'Hénoch à Qumrân: Étude épigraphique et philologique des fragments araméens de 4Q201* (LD hors série; Paris: Cerf, 2008); "Les manuscrits araméens d'Hénoch: Nouvelle documentation et nouvelle approche," in Lemaire and Mimouni, *Qoumrân et le judaïsme*, 111-21; translations in Berthelot, Legrand and Paul, *Torah: Genèse*, 13-247, and Berthelot and Legrand, *Torah: Exode – Lévitique – Nombres*, 67-69, 197-201; (with Laurent Héricher and Estelle Villeneuve, eds.) *Qumrân: Le secret des manuscrits de la mer Morte* (Paris: BNF, 2010); "Shemihazah et compagnie(s): Onomastique des anges déchus dans les manuscrits araméens du livre d'Hénoch," in Berthelot and Stökl Ben Ezra, *Aramaica Qumranica*, 145-80.

<sup>58</sup> David Hamidović, *Les traditions du Jubilé à Qumrân* (Orientis sémitiques; Paris: Geuthner, 2007); "Le Livre des Jubilés et 'Pseudo-Jubilés' à Qumrân," in Lucien-Jean Bord and David Hamidović, eds., *Jubilé... Jubilés: Actes du colloque tenu à Angers les 1-2-3 mars 2000* (Paris: Cariscrypt, 2001), 55-91; "4Q279, 4QFour Lots: Une interprétation du Psaume 135 appartenant à 4Q421: 4QWays of Righteousness," *DSD* 9 (2002): 166-86; "Un théonyme inédit à Qumran: 'Elyhwh?'," *De Kêmi à Birit Nari, Revue internationale de l'Orient ancien* 1 (2003): 112-16; "La destruction des nations' selon les écrits de Qumrân: Essai sur la représentation de l'autre," in Jean Riaud, ed., *Étrangers et exclus dans le monde biblique: Colloque international, Angers, les 21 et 22 février 2002* (Théolarge; Angers: les Éd. de l'UCO, 2003), 159-72; "Les répartitions des temps, titre du *Livre des Jubilés* dans les manuscrits de Qoumrân," in Grappe and Ingelaere, *Le temps et les temps*, 137-45; "À la frontière de l'altérité, le statut de l'étranger-résident GR dans les milieux esséniens," in Jean Riaud, ed., *L'étranger dans la Bible et ses lectures* (Paris: Cerf, 2007), 261-304; "La Halakha chez les Esséniens et son rôle dans la question messianique," *REF* 2167 (2008): 345-65; "Do Qumran Inscriptions Show Hellenization of Qumran Residents?," in Wolfgang Ahrens et al., eds., *Names in Multi-Lingual, Multi-Cultural and Multi-Ethnic Contact: Proceedings of the 23<sup>rd</sup> International Congress of Onomastic Sciences* (Toronto: York University, 2009): 465-72; "Le retour au temple de Jérusalem (4Q173a olim 4Q173 5?)," *RevQ* 24 (2009): 283-6; "A. Caquot, traducteur du livre éthiopien des *Jubilés*," in Riaud and Chaieb, *L'oeuvre d'un orientaliste*, 127-37; "The First Prayer of Festival Prayers (1Q34 + 1Q34bis, 4Q508, 4Q509): A Prayer for the Beginning of the Quarter?," in Daniel K. Falk et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana* (STDJ 91; Leiden, 2010), 259-75; "L'eschatologie essénienne dans la littérature apocalyptique: Temporalités et limites chronologiques," *REF* 169

pursue the study of the Qumran texts as part of a more general investigation into Hellenistic and Roman Judaism. They include Katell Berthelot,<sup>59</sup> Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra<sup>60</sup> and Christophe Batsch.<sup>61</sup>

After being in the foreground during the first phase of Qumran research, French scholarship is still very vital: a new generation of junior scholars seems ready to forge ahead into scientific exploitation of this huge epigraphic discovery.

---

(2010): 37-55; "De la prohibition aux croyances et pratiques magiques de la communauté de Qumrân," in Jean-Marie Durand and Antoine Jacquet, eds., *Magie et divination dans les cultures de l'Orient* (Cahiers de l'Institut du Proche-Orient Ancien du Collège de France 3; Paris: Maisonneuve, 2010), 87-107; translations in Berthelot and Legrand, *Torah: Exode – Lévitique – Nombres*, 81-149.

<sup>59</sup> Katell Berthelot, "La notion de *GR* dans les textes de Qumran," *RevQ* 19 (1999): 171-216; "La place des infirmes et des 'lépreux' dans les textes de Qumrân et les évangiles," *RB* 113 (2006): 211-41; "Guérison et exorcisme dans les textes de Qumrân et les évangiles," in Pascal Poulhol, Françoise Gaide and Mireille Loubat, eds., *Guérisons du corps et de l'âme: Approches pluridisciplinaires* (Textes et documents de la Méditerranée antique et médiévale; Aix-en-Provence, Université de Provence, 2006), 135-48; "4QMMT et la question du canon de la Bible hébraïque," in García Martínez, Steudel and Tigchelaar, *From 4QMMT to Resurrection*, 1-14; (avec André Paul) "Bulletin de judaïsme ancien," *RSR* 93 (2005): 597-618; "Bulletin de judaïsme ancien," *RSR* 95 (2007): 595-615; "Les titres des livres bibliques: Le témoignage de la bibliothèque de Qumrân," in Hilhorst, Puech and Tigchelaar, *Flores Florentino*, 127-40; "References to Biblical Texts in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran," in Berthelot and Stökl Ben Ezra, *Aramaic Qumranica*, 183-203.

<sup>60</sup> Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, "Old Caves and Young Caves: A Statistical Reevaluation of a Qumran Consensus," *DSD* 14 (2007): 313-33; "Further Reflections on Caves 1 and 11: a Response to Florentino García Martínez," in Charlotte Hempel, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Text and Context* (STDJ 90; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 211-23; "Palaeographic Observations Regarding 1Q5: One or Several Scrolls?," in Falk, *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited*, 247-57; "Messianic Figures in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran," in Berthelot and Stökl Ben Ezra, *Aramaica Qumranica*, 515-44.

<sup>61</sup> Christophe Batsch, "Le 'pacifisme des Esséniens': Un mythe historiographique," *RevQ* 21 (2004): 457-678; "Questions actuelles sur les manuscrits de Qumrân: Introduction, critique textuelle, interprétation, littératures connexes (Paris, France, November 2006 - June 2007)," *Hen* 29 (2007): 409-11; "Melki Sedeq n'est pas un ange: Une relecture du peshet thématique 11Q13 (11QMelkisedeq) II," in Bar-Asher and Tov, *Festschrift for Deborah Dimant, Meghillot* 5-6 (2007), 3\*-16\*; translations in Berthelot, Legrand and Paul, *Torah: Genèse*, 249-55, 389-97; "Priest in Warfare in Second Temple Judaism: 1QM, or the *Anti-Phinehas*," in Falk, *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited*, 165-78.





## DEAD SEA SCROLLS SCHOLARSHIP IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

GEORGE J. BROOKE

### *The Beginnings of Dead Sea Scrolls Research 1948-1970<sup>1</sup>*

In their assessment of Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship in the United Kingdom, in the Society of Biblical Literature volume that marked the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the discovery of cave 1, Florentino García Martínez and Julio Trebolle Barrera noted how members of two universities have played the most active roles in research on the Scrolls: Manchester and Oxford.<sup>2</sup> It is convenient to divide the study of the Scrolls in the United Kingdom into two periods and to focus on Manchester and Oxford, whilst not forgetting some important contributions from scholars at other places.

If one is to begin the narrative with the scholar who was the first to see and work with actual fragments, then the story of Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship in the United Kingdom really starts with Meir Wallenstein, Lecturer in Medieval and Modern Hebrew at the University of Manchester. Wal-

---

<sup>1</sup> Complete bibliographies are not cited for each scholar mentioned; these can be recovered from the standard bibliographical research tools: Christoph Burchard, *Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer* (BZAW 76; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1959); *Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer II* (BZAW 89; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1965); William S. LaSor, *Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls 1948-1957* (Fuller Theological Seminary Bibliographical Series 2; Fuller Library Bulletin 31; Pasadena: Fuller Theological Seminary, 1958); Bastiaan Jongeling, *A Classified Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1958-1969* (STDJ 7; Leiden: Brill, 1971); Florentino García Martínez and Donald W. Parry, *A Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1970-95* (STDJ 19; Leiden: Brill, 1996); Avital Pinnick, *The Orion Center Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls (1995-2000)* (STDJ 41; Leiden: Brill, 2001); Ruth A. Clements and Nadav Sharon, *The Orion Center Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls (2000-2006)* (STDJ 71; Leiden: Brill, 2007); and the ongoing listings in *Revue de Qumrân* and on the Orion Center website. Also useful is Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *A Guide to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, revised and expanded ed., 2008).

<sup>2</sup> Florentino García Martínez and Julio Trebolle Barrera, "Qumran Scholarship: A European Perspective," in Robert A. Kugler and Eileen M. Schuller, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty* (SBLEJL 15; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 129-41 (138-39).



lenstein was an expert on the *piyyutim*;<sup>3</sup> as soon as he learnt that Eliezer Sukenik had acquired a scroll with Jewish poetry in it,<sup>4</sup> he was determined to discover more first hand. Wallenstein had wondered whether the scroll might contain Hebrew poems akin to some that had come from the Cairo Genizah. It was not long before he knew otherwise. He spent part of the summer of 1949 in Jerusalem working from time to time with Sukenik, and the first translations published in England of small parts of the *Hodayot* appeared in the *Manchester Guardian* in some semi-popular articles.<sup>5</sup> Wallenstein's interest in the *Hodayot* was to last for a decade. In 1950 he produced a booklet<sup>6</sup> with plates, transcription, translation and notes of 1QH<sup>a</sup> X, 22-32 and XI, 20-33.<sup>7</sup> There were also some articles on 1QH<sup>a</sup> XIII, 7-17 and XIII, 22-XV, 8,<sup>8</sup> and a longer study on what he called the "Submission in Suffering Hymn,"<sup>9</sup> 1QH<sup>a</sup> XVI, 5-XVII, 36.

Other members of the Department of Near Eastern Studies at Manchester were not slow to enter the scholarly debate about the Scrolls in the 1950s. Pinkas R. Weis commented on the date of the *Pesher of Habakkuk*, associating it closely with the Karaites.<sup>10</sup> From 1952 onwards Arie Rubinstein wrote a string of studies, mostly published in *Vetus Testamentum*, on lexical, grammatical and interpretative aspects of the Scrolls.<sup>11</sup> When

<sup>3</sup> Wallenstein was awarded his Ph.D. for a thesis entitled *Ancient Hebrew Poetry as Illustrated by a Ms. of the XVII Century from the Cairo Genizah* (Ph.D. diss., University of Manchester, 1938); he subsequently published several short studies on Hebrew poetry.

<sup>4</sup> He reviewed Sukenik's *Megilloth Genuzoth* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1948) (Hebrew) in the *Manchester Guardian*, 5<sup>th</sup> January 1949.

<sup>5</sup> Notably, Meir Wallenstein, "The Hymns of the Judean Scrolls," *Manchester Guardian*, 12<sup>th</sup> November 1949.

<sup>6</sup> Meir Wallenstein, *Hymns from the Judean Scrolls* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1950).

<sup>7</sup> The column and line numbers are cited according to Hartmut Stegemann, Eileen M. Schuller and Carol Newsom, *1QHodayot<sup>a</sup> with Incorporation of 1QHodayot<sup>b</sup> and 4QHodayot<sup>a-f</sup>* (DJD XL; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009).

<sup>8</sup> Meir Wallenstein, "Some Lexical Material in the Judean Scrolls," *VT* 4 (1954): 211-14; "A Hymn from the Scrolls," *VT* 5 (1955): 277-83; "A Striking Hymn from the Dead Sea Scrolls," *BJRL* 38 (1955-1956): 241-65.

<sup>9</sup> Meir Wallenstein, *The Nezer and the Submission in Suffering Hymn from the Dead Sea Scrolls: Reconstructed, Vocalized and Translated with Critical Notes* (Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul 2; Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut in het Nabije Oosten, 1957).

<sup>10</sup> Pinkas R. Weis, "The Date of the Habakkuk Scroll," *JQR* 41 (1950-1951): 125-54. Weis was also in conversation with John M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," *JBL* 75 (1956): 175; and he is thanked for his advice by Preben C. H. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction* (STDJ 1; Leiden-Grand Rapids: Brill-Eerdmans, 1957), ix.

<sup>11</sup> E.g., Arie Rubinstein, "A Finite Verb Continued by an Infinitive Absolute in Biblical Hebrew," *VT* 2 (1952): 362-7; "Notes on the Use of the Tenses in the Variant Readings of the Isaiah Scroll [1QIs<sup>a</sup>]," *VT* 3 (1953): 92-95.

Preben Wernberg-Møller arrived in Manchester in 1954 to join the Department, the publications that he had already begun while a doctoral student at Oxford continued.<sup>12</sup> In 1953 Wernberg-Møller had been working on his doctorate on the *Community Rule*<sup>13</sup> under the supervision of Godfrey R. Driver when Gerald Lankester Harding had asked Driver for nominations to the team being put together to work especially on the fragments from cave 4. Together with others, Driver had suggested Wernberg-Møller, but when Harold Rowley had later that summer offered him a post at Manchester, Driver seems to have convinced him that it would be in his best interests to take the lectureship in Manchester rather than go to Jerusalem. As a result he became Lecturer in Semitic Languages and Literatures in Manchester's Department of Near Eastern Studies in 1954. He eventually returned to Oxford as Reader in Semitic Philology in 1968.<sup>14</sup> Back in Oxford, Wernberg-Møller almost entirely moved away from any further involvement in Scrolls research. Of another member of the same Department at Manchester, John Allegro, some more detailed discussion follows below.

Although several of the junior members of the Department entered the discussion of the Scrolls with alacrity, it was the prolific head of Department of Near Eastern Studies at Manchester, Harold Rowley (1890-1969), who spoke out on the widest range of topics. Rowley's irrepressible desire to master the whole of the secondary literature in Old Testament studies and related areas led him to an immediate interest in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Rowley had been trained in Bristol and Oxford, the First World War preventing him from studying in Germany as he had intended. He then took an active role in Baptist ministry and mission. After seven years teaching Old Testament in Chinese at the Shantung Christian University in China, Rowley returned to Britain, becoming in 1930 Lecturer in Semitic Languages in University College, Cardiff, then in 1935 a full professor in the University College of North Wales, Bangor. In 1945 he became first Professor of Semitic Languages and Literatures, and then from 1949 Professor of Hebrew Language and Literature in the Department of Near Eastern Stud-

<sup>12</sup> E.g., Preben C. H. Wernberg-Møller, "Observations on the interchange of  $\vartheta$  and  $\eta$  in the Manual of Discipline (DSD)," *VT* 3 (1953): 104-7; "Notes on the Manual of Discipline (DSD) I 18, II 9, III 1-4, 9, VII 10-12, and XI 21-22," *VT* 3 (1953): 195-202; " $\$dq$ ,  $\$dyq$  and  $\$dwq$  in the Zadokite Fragments (CDC), the Manual of Discipline (DSD) and the Habakkuk-Commentary (DSH)," *VT* 3 (1953): 310-15.

<sup>13</sup> Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline*.

<sup>14</sup> Godfrey R. Driver retired from his personal chair in 1962. He was then replaced by John Emerton as Reader in Semitic Philology. When Emerton was appointed Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge in 1968, Wernberg-Møller replaced him in Oxford.

ies at the University of Manchester, a post he retired from in 1959. Rowley was committed both to the insights of historical critical scholarship and to how they could be used by Christian ministers. In discerning that the continuities between Jesus and the New Testament authors and their forebears had to be traced historically, not just theologically, he wrote on Judaism in the late Second Temple period, especially on the book of Daniel and on apocalyptic,<sup>15</sup> subjects that were not particularly fashionable for his time. The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls was archaeological material of the sort that could help paint this historical picture and “Rowley welcomed the discoveries enthusiastically,”<sup>16</sup> and wrote and lectured widely on them in both academic and popular formats.

Alongside his concerns with the implications of Daniel for the history of faith, Rowley studied the *Damascus Document* for a series of lectures delivered in Leuven in March 1952, producing a volume on it that same year:<sup>17</sup> chapter 1 amassed all the arguments for the dating of the Scrolls; chapter 2, entitled “The Battle of the Scrolls,” considered all the evidence for linking the sect of the *Damascus Document* and that of the recently found scrolls;<sup>18</sup> chapter 3 was Rowley’s version of the history of the sect as precursors in the period of the Maccabean revolt of the later Essenes.<sup>19</sup> Rowley’s interest in Jewish apocalyptic resurfaced in his 1957 Ethel M. Wood Lecture at the University of London.<sup>20</sup> In the lecture he set the major cave 1 sectarian compositions and the *Damascus Document* alongside parts of *1 Enoch*, the book of *Jubilees*, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, the *Sibylline Oracles* and the *Psalms of Solomon*. His purpose was to argue that the traces of sectarian influence from the Scrolls in such compositions indicated that an

<sup>15</sup> E.g., Harold H. Rowley, *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel: A Survey of Current Opinions* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1935); *The Relevance of Apocalyptic: A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to Revelation* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1944; 2d ed., 1947; 3d ed., 1953).

<sup>16</sup> Ronald E. Clements, “The Biblical Theology of Harold H. Rowley, 1890-1969: A Critical Essay,” *Baptist History and Heritage* (2003): 6.

<sup>17</sup> Harold H. Rowley, *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1952). Chapters 1 and 2 have such detailed notes that they are almost all that needs to be read by anyone interested in the academic discussion of the Scrolls up until 1952.

<sup>18</sup> The chapter ended with an appreciative but forceful two-page critique of the views of Pinkas R. Weis.

<sup>19</sup> A summary of Rowley’s views appeared the same year: Harold H. Rowley, “The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *ExpTim* 63/12 (1952): 378-84. For Rowley, the Teacher of Righteousness was to be identified with Onias III and the Wicked Priest with Menelaus.

<sup>20</sup> Harold H. Rowley, *Jewish Apocalyptic and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (The Ethel M. Wood Lecture, 12th March 1957; London: The Athlone Press, 1957).

early second century date for the chief protagonists in the Scrolls was still the most likely option. He strongly advocated the view that there was no crucifixion of the Teacher of Righteousness in the Scrolls in order to make very clear his disagreement with his junior colleague John Allegro.<sup>21</sup> He had already done this for his academic colleagues in the previous year in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*.<sup>22</sup> In firmly presenting something much more like the emerging consensus view of the relationship between the Scrolls and the time of Jesus, Rowley wrote several essays in the area of the Scrolls and the New Testament, notably one on John the Baptist for the memorial volume for Thomas Walter Manson, the Manchester Rylands Professor who had died in post in 1958,<sup>23</sup> and another on Christian origins.<sup>24</sup> In addition Rowley was the only contributor to Godfrey R. Rolles Driver's Oxford University Press Festschrift to write on the Scrolls.<sup>25</sup>

Amongst those associated with the Dead Sea Scrolls at Manchester, John Allegro (1923-1988)<sup>26</sup> has been certainly the most well known and most widely read. Allegro had returned from naval service in the Second World War intending to offer himself for ministry in the Methodist church, but his scepticism soon set him on another course. He studied in Rowley's department and received top honours in his degrees in oriental studies in

<sup>21</sup> Rowley was known worldwide for his balanced presentation of the views of others, but in matters to do with the Scrolls he was an advocate of their appropriate use for providing the sectarian milieu of which John the Baptist, Jesus and early Christianity were a part: see George W. Anderson, "Harold Henry Rowley 1890-1969," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 56 (1970): 309-19 (esp. 314).

<sup>22</sup> Harold H. Rowley, "4QpNahum and the Teacher of Righteousness," *JBL* 75 (1956): 188-93.

<sup>23</sup> Harold H. Rowley, "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Sect," in Angus J. B. Higgins, ed., *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of T.W. Manson* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959), 218-29. Rowley's contribution was the only one to discuss the Scrolls.

<sup>24</sup> Harold H. Rowley, "The Qumran Sect and Christian Origins," *BJRL* 44 (1961-1962): 119-56; reprinted in *From Moses to Qumran: Studies in the Old Testament* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1963), 239-79.

<sup>25</sup> Harold H. Rowley, "Notes on the Aramaic of the Genesis Apocryphon," in David Winton Thomas and William D. McHardy, ed., *Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to Godfrey Rolles Driver in Celebration of his Seventieth Birthday 20 August 1962* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), 116-29. Rowley argues that the Aramaic of 1QapGen is more recent (later) than the Aramaic of Daniel.

<sup>26</sup> Much of the story of Allegro's involvement with the Scrolls is available through the presentation of his correspondence from the 1950s and 1960s in his daughter's biography of him: Judith A. Brown, *John Marco Allegro: The Maverick of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005). A website with much interesting material for the history of scholarship on it is dedicated to John Allegro; see [www.johnallegro.org](http://www.johnallegro.org). Some of Allegro's correspondence was combined with the theories of Robert H. Eisenman by the journalists Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1991).

1951 and 1952. Shortly after he had begun doctoral studies in Manchester, he decided to move to Oxford to study with Godfrey R. Driver. Alongside his principal research on Hebrew dialects, Driver set him to work on constructing entries for the proposed revision of the famous lexicon that Driver's father had been partly responsible for.<sup>27</sup> Allegro was given the task of working through all the published information on the Dead Sea Scrolls to create lexical information on index cards for his supervisor.<sup>28</sup> In the summer of 1953 when Gerald Lankester Harding asked Godfrey R. Driver to nominate some people for work on the cave 4 fragments, after Wernberg-Møller, Driver recommended Allegro; then after John Emerton was unable to find time and financial support, the following year he recommended John Strugnell.

Like Wernberg-Møller, Allegro had been tentatively offered a job by Rowley at Manchester to start in 1954, which had already put him in two minds about completing his doctoral studies, not least because he and his wife had never been able to sell their house in Manchester and had been living apart for frequent stretches. However, when Rowley endorsed Allegro's nomination,<sup>29</sup> this seems to have confirmed his initial enthusiasm. Harding confirmed his appointment so that he joined the international editing team in Jerusalem in October 1953. He was assigned a number of parabiblical manuscripts and *pesharim* that had been found in cave 4 in 1952. The principal fragments of most of these manuscripts he published in preliminary articles in learned journals. His collection of principal editions was published by the Clarendon Press in 1968, the last volume to carry the name

---

<sup>27</sup> Francis Brown, Samuel R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic based on the Lexicon of William Gesenius as Translated by Edward Robinson* (London: Oxford University Press, 1907; reprinted with corrections several times).

<sup>28</sup> Godfrey R. Driver's 1951 preface to the first corrected revision of *BDB* noted as follows: "I may add, for the information of all those who use this dictionary, that a supplement to contain as much as possible of the new information or discoveries made available since its original publication is in course of preparation." Despite the work of Allegro and others, the supplement never appeared.

<sup>29</sup> In 1954 Rowley was also instrumental in securing a donation from Mark Radiven of £1,000 as part of Manchester's contribution to the purchase of fragments of scrolls. Rowley dedicated his booklet *The Dead Sea Scrolls and their Significance* (London: Independent Press, 1955) to Radiven; in the second edition of 1961 Rowley noted that the Jordanian government had decided to keep all the fragments together and so no scrolls had ever arrived in Manchester. In the Allegro photograph archive, one image is marked by Allegro as a picture of at least some of Manchester's fragments: George J. Brooke with Helen K. Bond, *The Allegro Qumran Collection: Supplement to The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche* (Leiden: Brill and IDC, 1996), Fiche 27, image C4: the picture contains a picture of 4Q61 together with eighteen other fragments.

of Jordan in the series title.<sup>30</sup> By 1966, when the volume was completed, Allegro had lost interest in the Scrolls. Although it contained many corrections and adjustments of his preliminary publications, many provided by Allegro's Manchester colleague, Arnold Anderson,<sup>31</sup> it was nevertheless a presentation of the bare essentials and was not altogether well received. John Strugnell wrote a lengthy review article that quickly became essential reading alongside the principal edition.<sup>32</sup> In 1954 Allegro took up an appointment as Lecturer in Comparative Semitic Philology at the University of Manchester.

Allegro was a great populariser of complex topics and his best-selling Penguin volume on the Dead Sea Scrolls is a masterpiece of enthusiastic clarity. It was largely written with the endorsement of the Scrolls team in Jerusalem; its first print run in Britain of 40,000 copies sold out in less than three weeks. He wrote several other books that tried to put some of the significance of the Scrolls in the public domain; some of these were illustrated with his photographs, many of which have been republished many times.<sup>33</sup> In addition to popular books, Allegro also gave many public lectures and several broadcasts. One set of these, which he wrote for BBC local radio, hinted that the crucifixion of Jesus was prefigured by the death, probably by crucifixion, of the Teacher of Righteousness. The other members of the editorial team learnt about these broadcasts and, so it seems, largely with the prodding of Patrick Skehan, wrote a letter to the London *Times* distancing themselves from Allegro; the letter was printed in March 1956. Furthermore these hints in the broadcasts further upset Harold Rowley, his Head of Department, who thereafter seems to have stood in Allegro's way.

Once the advice of Harold James Plenderleith of the British Museum had been received, that there was nothing to be done apart from cutting the copper rolls into strips, Allegro was instrumental in having the Jordanian Department of Antiquities send the two rolls of the *Copper Scroll*, one roll at a time, to Manchester for opening. In 1955 arrangements for the opening of the first roll had not proceeded entirely smoothly. Allegro's first enquiries in the University of Manchester's Department of Metallurgy had

<sup>30</sup> John M. Allegro with the collaboration of Arnold A. Anderson, *Qumrân Cave 4.I (4Q158-4Q186)* (DJDJ V; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).

<sup>31</sup> Anderson also had a minor interest in the Scrolls: Arnold A. Anderson, "The Use of 'Ruah' in 1QS, 1QH and 1QM," *JSS* 7 (1962): 293-303. This was the issue published in honour of Godfrey Rolles Driver.

<sup>32</sup> John Strugnell, "Notes en marge du Volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,'" *RevQ* 7 (1970): 163-276.

<sup>33</sup> Allegro's Qumran photographs have been catalogued and published by Brooke with Bond, *The Allegro Qumran Collection*.

been met with some caution, which Allegro seems to have taken as lack of interest. Through a meeting with the Principal of the Manchester College of Technology, he raised the possibility that the scroll might be opened there; the response this time was overt enthusiasm and from then on arrangements were made with the Manchester College of Technology. The first roll arrived there in the summer of 1955, and after some delay the second in early 1956. But things were not happy in Manchester for Allegro. When Henry Wright Baker gave a presentation on the *Copper Scroll* in the Rylands Library in Manchester on 1<sup>st</sup> March 1956, a talk which was eventually republished in the principal edition of the *Copper Scroll*, Allegro was excluded and, even more surprisingly, Wright Baker made absolutely no mention of Allegro's role in the whole matter.<sup>34</sup> It seems that the combination of Allegro arranging for the *Copper Scroll* to be opened at the College of Technology rather than at the university, together with his constant requests to Rowley for funds to travel to Jerusalem to work on his scrolls had annoyed his Head of Department who did not like to be upstaged by a colleague over thirty years his junior. In addition there was the matter of the three broadcasts on BBC local radio on the 16<sup>th</sup>, 23<sup>rd</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> January 1956 in which Allegro made some mildly semi-provocative statements about the possible crucifixion of the Teacher of Righteousness and the expectation of his resurrection as foreshadowing the death and resurrection of Jesus.<sup>35</sup> Allegro seems to have refused to show Rowley photographs of the unpublished fragments of *Pesher Nahum* on which his views were largely based until they had been published.<sup>36</sup> When these talks were reported in the United States and elsewhere, Rowley's mailbox was full of anxious correspondence. Clearly by February 1956 relations between the two men had gone very sour and Rowley seems to have colluded with de Vaux and others to marginalize Allegro both at home and in relation to the Scrolls team in Jerusalem.

<sup>34</sup> Henry Wright Baker, "Notes on the Opening of the 'Bronze' Scrolls from Qumran," *B/JRL* 39 (1956): 45-56; reprinted in a slightly revised form as "Notes on the Opening of the Copper Scrolls from Qumrân," in Maurice Baillet, Józef T. Milik and Roland de Vaux, eds., *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân* (DJD III; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 203-11.

<sup>35</sup> Allegro's particular readings and his combination of evidence from manuscripts produced the kind of general synthesis as follows: "At the end of this period of suffering, the Sect looked forward to a blessed release. Additional evidence now supports the idea that they expected the return of their priestly Master, glorified as the Messianic Priest of Israel. He would awaken from his tomb and lead the faithful from Qumran to the New Jerusalem, and there inaugurate an era of peace and plenty for a cleansed mankind, sharing its joys with the host in heaven."

<sup>36</sup> John M. Allegro, "Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect," *JBL* 75 (1956): 89-95.



In fact in spite of his personal difficulties within the department at Manchester, Allegro seems to have tried hard at the outset with his colleagues in the international team and with Gerald Lankester Harding, the Director of the Jordanian Department of Antiquities. It was with Lankester Harding that he had the most detailed correspondence about the *Copper Scroll* and to whom he sent his transcription and translation of the scroll so that an official announcement could be made by the Department of Antiquities at the earliest opportunity. Allegro did much to follow directions coming from Jordan despite his increasing sense of frustration. This is attested by his Pelican book; apart from a couple of mentions, he refrained from writing a chapter on the *Copper Scroll* with information based on his own translation; instead, once he was assured that there would be an official announcement about the scroll from Harding, he added an appendix to the book which only described the history of the project of opening the scroll and the comment that it was “indeed an inventory of the Sect’s most treasured possessions, buried in various locations. Further information must wait on the release and publication of the whole text, a task entrusted by Father de Vaux, as head of the expedition which found the cave, to Józef Milik of the École Biblique in Jerusalem.”<sup>37</sup> As the member of the team present at its excavation, Józef Milik was assigned the job of preparing the principal edition of the *Copper Scroll*. Once Milik had published the major part of his views including a complete translation in the *Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan*,<sup>38</sup> Allegro gave the green light to his publishers to release his own book on the scroll.<sup>39</sup> Milik’s principal edition followed in due course, but there was a long-standing resentment against Allegro who was thought to have produced a rival edition that was not in the spirit of collegial cooperation.<sup>40</sup> In fact, in most recent work on the *Copper Scroll* there has been acknowledgement of the value of several of Allegro’s readings and his view that the treasure was real is now the majority opinion amongst scholars—not that any has ever been found in the modern period.

<sup>37</sup> Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 184.

<sup>38</sup> Józef T. Milik, “The Copper Document from Cave III of Qumran: Translation and Commentary,” *Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan* 4-5 (1960): 137-55.

<sup>39</sup> John M. Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll* (New York-London: Doubleday-Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1960); a second edition was published in 1964 (New York: Doubleday, 1964) without the transcription, transliteration or accompanying notes. Both editions were dedicated to King Hussein of Jordan.

<sup>40</sup> The continuing resentment found expression, e.g., in Émile Puech, “Quelques résultats d’un nouvel examen du Rouleau de Cuivre (3Q15),” *RevQ* 18 (1997): 163-90. On p. 164 he calls Allegro’s 1960 book “une édition pirate.”



Despite numerous frustrations, some of which were partly of his own making, Allegro was not one to be put off by his colleagues. He played a part in the visit of the Dead Sea Scrolls to Britain in 1965-1966, particularly to the John Rylands Library in Manchester (February-March 1966) after they had been at the British Museum.<sup>41</sup> It was Allegro's desire to make things public as quickly as possible together with his tendency to reach conclusions too hastily that put his status in the international team at risk. In addition Allegro's unchecked enthusiasms in Semitic philology and his retrojection of a mythical Jesus into the first century BCE took him in directions that resulted in him resigning from the University of Manchester in 1970 and thereafter he did little work on the Scrolls.<sup>42</sup> He might well have left the university sooner but for the concern expressed by Frederick Bruce who invited him to move from the Department of Near Eastern Studies in the Faculty of Arts to join other colleagues teaching Old Testament in the Faculty of Theology.<sup>43</sup> It was in that context that the cooperation with Arnold Anderson on Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan V took place. Bruce's sense of openness had prevented John Allegro from leaving the university, but Allegro nevertheless resigned in 1970, anticipating the response to his *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross*.<sup>44</sup>

When Frederick Fyvie Bruce (1910-1990) was appointed to the Rylands Chair of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis in 1959 to replace the much-lamented Thomas Walter Manson who had died in post, Manchester acquired yet another voice on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Educated at the Universities of Aberdeen, Cambridge and Vienna, Bruce was a classicist by training and a university lecturer, but after appointment as the first Head of the Department of Biblical History and Literature at Sheffield University in 1947, his output of studies on both the Old Testament and especially the New was prodigious. He became one of the most prolific biblical scholars

<sup>41</sup> Allegro contributed the translation of *Pesher Nahum* to the exhibition catalogue.

<sup>42</sup> He published 4Q341 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Myth* (Newton Abbot: Westbridge Books, 1979), 235-40. Milik had swapped this fragment with Allegro in return for what Allegro had originally published as *Patriarchal Blessings*, but which Milik now knew to belong together with some other fragments as part of a *Commentary on Genesis*. For other studies of this fragment, see George J. Brooke, "4Q341: An Exercise for Spelling and for Spells?" in Piotr Bienowski, Christopher B. Mee and Elizabeth A. Slater, eds., *Writing and Ancient Near Eastern Society: Papers in Honour of Alan R. Millard* (LHBOTS 426; London: T&T Clark International, 2005), 271-82.

<sup>43</sup> See, e.g., Peter S. Oakes, "F.F. Bruce and the Development of Evangelical Biblical Scholarship," *BJRULM* 86 (2004): 99-124 (123).

<sup>44</sup> John M. Allegro, *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross: A Study of the Nature and Origins of Christianity within the Fertility Cults of the Ancient Near East* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1970; revised ed., London: Abacus, 1973).

of his generation and produced over fifty books and a steady stream of articles, including many that have stood the test of time.<sup>45</sup> His book *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls* was reprinted several times; it is a very clear and balanced introduction to discoveries and the range of interpretations to which they were giving rise in the mid-1950s. His study, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, is a masterly survey of what could sensibly be said just ten years after the first scrolls had been discovered. His own assessment of the data about the Teacher of Righteousness set him in the time of Alexander Jannaeus, just as had John Allegro on the basis of the *Pesher of Nahum*, though Bruce remained tentative in his conclusions and open to other possibilities.<sup>46</sup> Amongst his less well-known writings on the Scrolls, his two articles on the relationship between the Scrolls and the Old and New Testaments remain highly insightful presentations.<sup>47</sup>

Bruce's major work on the Scrolls was completed before he came to Manchester, but he had a remarkable memory and kept them in mind throughout his career. In one of the three Festschriften that he received, one of his doctoral students recalls the time "when he [the student] made an error in the transcription of the unpointed Hebrew of a phrase from the Dead Sea Scrolls. Citing the passage in full from memory, the Professor drew attention to the error with the gentle remark 'You will remember the whole text runs like this ...'."<sup>48</sup> This competence in the knowledge of the primary sources from antiquity was greatly respected internationally, and he had a reputation for fairness in treating the ideas of others. That respect is exemplified in the way that he was asked to be the section editor for the Dead Sea Scrolls for the *Encyclopedia Judaica*; he wrote nineteen well-balanced articles himself.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>45</sup> For an overall picture see Ian H. Marshall, "Frederick Fyvie Bruce 1910-1990," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 80 (1993): 245-60; Oakes, "F.F. Bruce and the Development of Evangelical Biblical Scholarship," 99-124.

<sup>46</sup> Frederick F. Bruce, *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Paternoster Press, 1956); *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Exegetica III/1; Den Haag-Grand Rapids: van Keulen-Eerdmans, 1959); *The Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran Texts* (Tyndale Lecture in Biblical Archaeology 1956; London: Tyndale Press, 1957).

<sup>47</sup> Frederick F. Bruce, "Qumran and the New Testament," *Faith and Thought* 90 (1958): 92-102; "Qumran and the Old Testament," *Faith and Thought* 91 (1959-1960): 9-27.

<sup>48</sup> Retold by Donald A. Hagner and Murray J. Harris, "Frederick Fyvie Bruce: Two Appreciations," in *Pauline Studies: Essays Presented to Professor F. F. Bruce on his 70<sup>th</sup> Birthday* (Exeter-Grand Rapids: Paternoster Press-Eerdmans, 1980), xviii-xxi (xx).

<sup>49</sup> "Copper Scroll," "Dead Sea Scrolls," "Ein Feshkha," "Kittim," "Lies, Man of," "Lies, Prophet of," "Lion of Wrath," "Murabba'at," "Pesher," "Qumran," "Seekers after Smooth Things," "Serekh," "Shapira Fragments," "Sons of Light," "Teacher of Righteousness," "War Scroll," "Wicked Priest," "Yahad," "Zadokite Work," in Cecil Roth and Geoffrey Wigoder, eds., *Encyclopedia Judaica*, 16 volumes (Jerusalem: Keter, 1971).

From the outset Manchester was a hive of activity in several different areas of Scrolls scholarship and the home of the first British member of the cave 4 editorial team. There was also much interest in the Scrolls in Oxford, but the first three major names that were associated with the Dead Sea Scrolls there, from the news of their first discoveries onwards, were particularly exercised with reconstructing the history of the movement behind the sectarian compositions. One of the three was Chaim Rabin (1915-1996) who was the Cowley Lecturer in Hebrew at Oxford from 1942-1956; in 1956 he was appointed as Professor of Hebrew at the Hebrew University, a chair that he occupied until his retirement in 1984. Rabin published two books on the Scrolls. The first was completed in 1953, a new edition and commentary on the *Zadokite Documents (Damascus Document)*.<sup>50</sup> This insightful work was dedicated to the memory of Herbert H. Danby (1889-1953) who had been Oxford's Regius Professor of Hebrew, "to whose encouragement this book owes its existence." The text was a new collation from photographs lent to him by Godfrey R. Driver and other images.<sup>51</sup> Rabin was convinced that the Admonition of the *Damascus Document* was a mosaic of scriptural quotations and allusions, not a proper history of the sect, and that most of the regulations in the Laws closely resembled rabbinic law, with any differences readily accounted for by the divergences amongst the Tannaim themselves. On the latter point, one can see that he already had in mind his association of the sect behind the Scrolls with an early form of Pharisaism. The commentary with its multiple cross-references to the *Community Rule* and other sectarian texts as known at the time, quickly sold out and a second edition was published in 1958.

Rabin's second book was a collection of lectures, *Qumran Studies*,<sup>52</sup> seven of which were first delivered in Durham and one in Manchester; though this book was finished while Rabin was still at Oxford in September 1956, it appeared the following year. Amongst other things it shows his Oxford affiliation through its dedication to Godfrey R. Driver. As is well known, Rabin's opinion was that the Essene setting for the Scrolls had taken hold too quickly without adequate alternatives being considered. He himself proposed that the Scrolls might be associated rather with Pharisaism,

---

<sup>50</sup> Chaim Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents: I. The Admonition; II. The Laws* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954; 2d ed. 1958).

<sup>51</sup> Driver is also thanked for "a great deal of advice and instruction, for looking through my translation, and for the notes incorporated in the Addenda." Driver's notes run to nearly four closely printed pages.

<sup>52</sup> Chaim Rabin, *Qumran Studies* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957; reprinted New York: Schocken Books, 1975).

developing the work on the *Damascus Document* undertaken by William Hayes Ward and Louis Ginzberg. Rabin tried to distinguish Pharisaism from its later representation in rabbinic literature and he suggested that the Qumran community “continues the *haburah* of the first century BCE, an organization within which people could trust each other in matters of tithing of produce, ritual purity of food, and other halakhic matters affecting everyday contact between individuals. The Qumran community—in this view—represents the old *haburah* more faithfully than does the ‘rabbinic’ community of the Tannaitic period, because the latter had made extensive concessions in halakhic matters in order to enable non-Pharisees to share in its life.”<sup>53</sup> Rabin’s theory required a dating of the Qumran sect in the first century CE; he viewed it as the minority continuation of the Pharisaic group that might have occupied the Qumran site at the time of the persecution of the Pharisees by John Hyrcanus. The admiration of Godfrey Driver was obviously mutual: David Patterson, the founding first president of the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies and Rabin’s successor as Cowley Lecturer, recalled in his obituary of Rabin how Godfrey R. Driver had once said to him that he considered Chaim Rabin to be the cleverest man he had ever met.

A second historical approach at Oxford was to be found in the work of Cecil Roth (1899-1970). He was Reader in Jewish Studies at Oxford from 1940 until 1965. In 1958 he published *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls*.<sup>54</sup> It was reprinted as a paperback for distribution in North America in 1965. Having first presented his ideas at seminars in Manchester and at Strasbourg in early 1957, he turned them into a short book in which he advocated that the circumstances of the First Jewish War best accounted for what was indicated in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Roth stated at the outset that “it must however be clearly realised that the thesis here presented does not depend on names but on the entire circumstances of the time. Whether Menahem ben Judah or his kinsman Eleazar ben Jair was the Teacher of Righteousness of the Qumran sect is of slight significance. What is important is that the sect was identical with the Zealots whom they led and inspired, and that the Qumran literature throws new light on the history of the Jewish Revolution of 66 and the great struggle against

<sup>53</sup> Rabin, *Qumran Studies*, viii.

<sup>54</sup> Cecil Roth, *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958; New York: Philosophical Library, 1959); reprinted with a new introduction and three additional appendixes as *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Historical Approach* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1965).

Rome that ensued.”<sup>55</sup> In the introduction, Roth expresses his gratitude to Godfrey Driver for accepting his views, saving him from some blunders and encouraging him “to persevere in a field not wholly my own.”<sup>56</sup> In the book and in a large number of articles on similar topics, it is not difficult to see what might have stimulated Driver to his own similar but more refined historical reconstruction.<sup>57</sup>

Godfrey Driver himself had taken a close interest in the Dead Sea Scrolls from the outset, publishing a sequence of popular articles in the press as well as academic papers. His 1950 lecture presented to the Friends of Dr. Williams’s Library received very wide notice,<sup>58</sup> introducing readers to the physical characteristics of the discoveries and some of the key palaeographical and linguistic features of the Scrolls. His interest may well have been stimulated largely by his lexicographical passions. His ongoing and eventually unfulfilled responsibility for updating the famous dictionary (*BDB*) of which his father had been co-compiler had led him to collect all new extant forms of Hebrew. The Dead Sea Scrolls provided him with a rich mine to quarry for the revisions of the lexicon.

Beyond his linguistic and lexicographical concerns, Driver developed his own historical theories about the sect behind the Scrolls in dialogue with his colleague Cecil Roth.<sup>59</sup> These ideas were presented as the Cadbury Lectures at the University of Birmingham in 1958 and were eventually published in a much-expanded form in a substantial book.<sup>60</sup> He argued that the Qumran sect should be identified as Zealots and that the “Rightful Teacher” was none other than Menahem, a messianic pretender who had been killed by a certain Eleazar (who became Driver’s Wicked Priest) in 66 CE (cf. Josephus, *J.W.* 2.433–440). In this theory, although some of the sectarian literature, such as the *Community Rule*, was to be dated to before the First Jewish War (66–70 CE), much of it could only have been composed after it, reflecting the circumstances of the time. He set the *Damascus Document* in the period shortly before the Second Jewish War (132–135 CE). Driver also argued that

<sup>55</sup> Roth, *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, viii.

<sup>56</sup> Roth, *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vii.

<sup>57</sup> Both Roth and Driver were strongly criticised by Harold H. Rowley, “The Qumran Sectaries and the Zealots: An Examination of a Recent Theory,” *VT* 9 (1959): 379–92.

<sup>58</sup> Godfrey R. Driver, *The Hebrew Scrolls from the Neighbourhood of Jericho and the Dead Sea* (Friends of Dr. Williams’s Library Fourth Lecture, 1950; London: Oxford University Press, 1951). Driver initially wanted to date the Scrolls well into the third century CE or later, a view he later modified considerably.

<sup>59</sup> The initial plan was for a joint publication, but Driver’s contribution was delayed and so Roth published his historical perspective independently.

<sup>60</sup> Godfrey R. Driver, *The Judaean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965).

the caves served as a *genizah* and that the manuscripts were put in them to take them out of circulation in a time when scriptural texts were being standardized and heterodox ideas discouraged. Few nowadays would seek to defend any of Driver's proposals, but his book is a mine of information on what could be known about the Jewish movements of the time and many other topics. To read his book is to work through a methodological control on the current dominant ideas for reconstructing the history of the traditions preserved in the sectarian compositions and the histories of the movements that copied and preserved them.

Driver was the senior Semitics scholar in Britain in the years after the Second World War. He was a reference point for many of his peers. He produced important monographs on several Semitic languages and textual editions as well.<sup>61</sup> On behalf of the British Academy it was Driver who wrote the introduction to the published form of de Vaux's 1959 Schweich Lectures.<sup>62</sup> In addition, it had been Driver who was the first to be approached by Lankester Harding in the summer of 1953 for nominations for British representatives for the team being put together to work on the cave 4 fragments. Driver recommended Wernberg-Møller, Emerton,<sup>63</sup> Allegro and, later, in 1954, John Strugnell, to join the international scrollerly team.

Whilst still considering the contribution of Oxford to the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls, it is important to say a little about John Strugnell (1930-2007) at this juncture. He had gone up to Jesus College, Oxford, in 1948, reading first *Literae Humaniores* (Classics with ancient history) and then Oriental studies, graduating with the top honours classification in the former. Between 1952 and 1954, when he was studying Semitic languages (Hebrew with Aramaic and Syriac) in the Faculty of Oriental Studies, he was taught by Driver and Rabin. He had intended to move to Cambridge in 1954 to his denominational college to begin studies in theology, but in the spring of 1954 Driver encouraged him to fill the remaining place in the Jerusalem team to represent the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem.

<sup>61</sup> The breadth and depth of Driver's knowledge and productivity is well captured by one of his pupils, John A. Emerton, "Godfrey Rolles Driver 1892-1975," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 63 (1977): 345-62.

<sup>62</sup> Roland de Vaux, *L'Archéologie et les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1959; London: Oxford University Press, 1961), v-vi.

<sup>63</sup> In the autumn of 1953 John Emerton had just begun an appointment as Lecturer in Hebrew and Aramaic at Durham University. Although he was able to obtain a term's leave for the summer of 1954, he could offer Harding only twenty financially supported weeks to be in Jerusalem. Harding seems not to have been impressed and so looked elsewhere for another British worker to join Allegro.

He arrived in Jerusalem in July 1954, less than two months after his twenty-fourth birthday. After two years in Jerusalem he took a one-year post at the Oriental Institute in Chicago from 1956 to 1957; then he returned to Jerusalem for a further three years. In 1959 he visited Oxford again for the meeting of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament when he gave a paper on the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*.<sup>64</sup> Those five years in Jerusalem were the time when he laid the foundations that enabled his obituary in the *Times* to carry the caption with much justification: "Strugnell: he knew more about the Dead Sea Scrolls than anyone else."<sup>65</sup> In 1960 he took a position at Duke University and in 1966 he accepted appointment as Professor of Christian Origins at Harvard Divinity School, retiring in 1991. Strugnell was Editor-in-Chief of the Scrolls project from 1984 until 1990.<sup>66</sup>

Rabin, Roth and Driver dominated the Oxford Scrolls scene in the first fifteen years after the initial discoveries. None of their leading ideas have stood the test of time. In those same years Oxford University Press's Clarendon imprint became the home of the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series. Although Harding had approached Cambridge, Manchester and Oxford, it had been Oxford University Press that had engaged with the possibilities of publishing the manuscripts with the greatest enthusiasm. Although apparently there were problems and misunderstandings almost from the outset, the printing and publication of all forty volumes in the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series in England is in itself a significant British contribution to the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In 1965, Geza Vermes was appointed as Roth's successor. We will return to his many achievements while at Oxford in relation to the Dead Sea Scrolls in the next section, but his contribution to the DJD publication process through his association with the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies can be mentioned here.

While the story at Oxford has been long and continuous from the outset, though continued currently really only through the ongoing efforts of Geza Vermes, the story at Cambridge was very different. One might put this down to Oxford's "royalist" tendency to embrace enthusiastically the possibilities of the humanities, whereas Cambridge has a longstanding "puritan" scepticism about texts and their meanings. For the Scrolls this was

<sup>64</sup> John Strugnell, "The Angelic Liturgy at Qumrân: 4QSerek Šîrôt 'Ôlat HaŠŠabbât," in *Congress Volume: Oxford 1959* (VTSup 7; Leiden: Brill, 1960), 318-45.

<sup>65</sup> "John Strugnell," *The Times* (29th December 2007): 77.

<sup>66</sup> For further details on his contribution see John J. Collins, "In memoriam *John Strugnell*," *RevQ* 23/91 (2008): 309-11.



voiced in the 1950s most vociferously by Jacob Leon Teicher, lecturer in rabbinics, who, as editor of the *Journal of Jewish Studies*, contributed an article to his own journal in which he argued that the Scrolls belong to the Jewish Christian Ebionites and that the Teacher of Righteousness should be identified with Jesus.<sup>67</sup> He maintained his position in several other studies, arguing not least that Josephus' Essenes had never existed; rather Josephus' descriptions of them are a composite picture "the main traits of which are derived from the observations made by an outsider of the early Christian communities. Hence the undeniable similarity between the Essenes, the early Christians and the sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls."<sup>68</sup>

During the first generation of Qumran studies, the Cambridge scholar who was most assiduous in taking the Scrolls seriously was David Winton Thomas (1901-1970), a former pupil of Godfrey R. Driver, who became the Cambridge Regius Professor of Hebrew (1949-1968). At an early stage he contributed an essay on textual criticism to the 1951 volume produced by the Society for Old Testament Study in which he incorporated some comments on the Isaiah scroll.<sup>69</sup> Winton Thomas went on to be the editor of Isaiah for the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. His work was published in 1968; until more recent times his edition, more than anything else, has kept the *Great Isaiah Scroll* on the agenda of the text criticism of Isaiah. He also wrote occasional articles concerned with the Scrolls and related matters.<sup>70</sup>

For the study of the Scrolls until 1970, other British institutions were also home to scholars who have had significant interests in the Dead Sea Scrolls. At the University of London, Solomon Birnbaum (1891-1990) taught Yiddish and Hebrew palaeography. His opinions on the dates of the manuscripts from the Qumran caves were very widely cited while there was still some ongoing dispute about when they were penned.<sup>71</sup> Naph-

<sup>67</sup> Jacob L. Teicher, "The Dead Sea Scrolls—Documents of the Jewish-Christian Sect of Ebionites," *JJS* 2 (1950-1951): 67-99.

<sup>68</sup> Jacob L. Teicher, "Priests and Sacrifices in the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Question of Method in Historical Research," *JJS* 5 (1954): 93-99 (99).

<sup>69</sup> David Winton Thomas, "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," in Harold H. Rowley, ed., *The Old Testament and Modern Study: A Generation of Discovery and Research* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), 238-63 (239-42).

<sup>70</sup> David Winton Thomas, "The Dead Sea Scrolls," *Antiquity* 33 (1959): 189-94; "בליעל in the Old Testament," in John N. Birdsall and Robert W. Thomson, eds., *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey* (Fredburg, 1963), 11-19; "The Dead Sea Scrolls," *St Catherine's Society Magazine* (1966): 63-66; "Sgroliaur Mor Marw," *Y Cymro* (13th October 1966): 19.

<sup>71</sup> Solomon A. Birnbaum, "The Date of the Isaiah Scroll," *BASOR* 113 (1949): 33-35; "The Dates of the Cave Scrolls," *BASOR* 115 (1949): 20-22; "The Date of the Habakkuk Cave Scroll," *JBL* 68 (1949): 161-8; "The Date of the Covenant Scroll," *PEQ* 81 (1949): 140-47; "How Old Are the Cave Manuscripts? A Palaeographic Discussion," *VT* 1 (1951):



tali Wieder (1905-2001) taught at Jews College, the smallest constituent part of the University of London, before retiring to Israel in 1972; he produced several articles on the Scrolls, culminating in his study *The Judean Scrolls and Karaism*.<sup>72</sup> At the British Museum, Grace Crowfoot and Harold Plenderleith provided various technical opinions,<sup>73</sup> and Jacob Leveen wrote popular articles for the press.<sup>74</sup> At the University College of North Wales, Bangor, Bleddyn Roberts produced a valuable, but seldom cited, set of publications on the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible in which the Dead Sea Scrolls played an important part, as soon as he learnt about them.<sup>75</sup> He was convinced from the outset that the sectarians were a "Bible party," an apocalyptic group prepared for the "fulfilment" of the word of God.<sup>76</sup> The Winton Thomas Festschrift contained a study on "Bible Exegesis and Fulfilment in Qumran" by Bleddyn Roberts.<sup>77</sup> At the University of Nottingham, Robert Leaney produced a popular introduction,<sup>78</sup> a substantial and accessible commentary on the *Community Rule*<sup>79</sup> that was a rare overview of the teaching of the Qumran community intended especially to encourage students of the New Testament to reach into the Jewish context of the early Christian writings, and several detailed academic studies that have remained worth consulting by New Testament scholars.<sup>80</sup> At the University of Leeds, Ronald Reed, a leather and parchment expert, was consulted

---

91-109; *The Qumrân (Dead Sea) Scrolls and Palaeography* (BASORSup 13-14; New Haven: ASOR, 1952).

<sup>72</sup> Naphtali Wieder, *The Judean Scrolls and Karaism* (London: East and West Library, 1962; 2d rev. ed.: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2005)

<sup>73</sup> E.g., Grace M. Crowfoot, "Linen Textiles from the Cave of Ain Feshkha in the Jordan Valley," *PEQ* 83 (1951): 5-31; "The Linen Textiles," in *Qumran Cave I* (DJD I; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 18-38; Harold J. Plenderleith, "Technical Note on Unwrapping of Dead Sea Scroll Fragments," in DJD I, 39-40.

<sup>74</sup> E.g., Jacob Leveen, "Newly Found Hebrew Scrolls from Palestine," *Listener* 42 (7th December 1949): 322-3.

<sup>75</sup> See notably Bleddyn J. Roberts, *The Old Testament Texts and Versions* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1951); "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Old Testament Scriptures," *BJRL* 36 (1953-1954): 75-96.

<sup>76</sup> Bleddyn J. Roberts, "Some Observations on the Damascus Document and the Dead Sea Scrolls," *BJRL* 34 (1951-1952): 366-87 (387).

<sup>77</sup> Bleddyn J. Roberts, "Bible Exegesis and Fulfilment in Qumran," in Peter R. Ackroyd and Barnabas Lindars, eds., *Words and Meanings: Essays Presented to David Winton Thomas on his Retirement from the Regius Professorship of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge, 1968* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 195-207.

<sup>78</sup> Alfred R. C. Leaney, ed., *A Guide to the Scrolls* (Nottingham Studies on the Qumran Discoveries; London: SCM Press, 1958).

<sup>79</sup> Alfred R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning* (NTL; London-Philadelphia: SCM Press-Westminster Press, 1966).

<sup>80</sup> E.g., Alfred R. C. Leaney, "The Experience of God in Qumran and in Paul," *BJRL* 51 (1969): 431-52; "The Johannine Paraclete and the Qumran Scrolls," in James

about the skin of the Scrolls, being sent uninscribed fragments by several parties. He published several studies, with his colleague Donald Burton and his student John Poole, using the deterioration of collagen chains, exposed through shrinkage, as a means for dating the Scrolls.<sup>81</sup> The "Reed" fragments are now in the John Rylands University Library at Manchester. Also at Leeds was John Bowman, the expert in Samaritan studies, who had an interest in the Scrolls.<sup>82</sup> Shemaryahu Talmon was lecturer in Hebrew in Bowman's Department of Semitic Languages and Literatures at Leeds University when he wrote his oft-cited study on the Day of Atonement in the *Pesher of Habakkuk*.<sup>83</sup>

And then there was King's College, Newcastle, part of Durham University, which was in the early 1960s to become Newcastle University. Personal circumstances led Geza Vermes to move from Paris to England in March 1957. The arrival in Britain of a leading young exponent of the Scrolls was what Vermes himself has called a "providential accident,"<sup>84</sup> but one which has provided for stability and breadth in British Scrolls scholarship up to the present. His search for an academic position took him to Newcastle where a very small Department of Divinity employed him to teach Old Testament and biblical history. Although most of his publications up until then had been on the Scrolls, Vermes's first publications in English were on various topics related more broadly to early Jewish scriptural interpretation.<sup>85</sup> By the summer of 1959 he had completed a set of essays on narrative interpretation in early Jewish literature; these were published as a book in

---

H. Charlesworth, ed., *John and Qumran* (London: Chapman, 1972; reprinted: New York: Crossroad, 1990), 38-61.

<sup>81</sup> Donald Burton, John B. Poole and Ronald Reed, "A New Approach to the Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Nature* 184 (1959): 533-4; John B. Poole and Ronald Reed, "The 'Tannery' of 'Ain Feshkha,'" *PEQ* 93 (1961): 114-23; "The Preparation of Leather and Parchment by the Dead Sea Scrolls Community," *Technology and Culture* 3 (1962): 1-26; Ronald Reed and John B. Poole, "A Study of Some Dead Sea Scroll and Leather Fragments from Cave 4 at Qumran, Part I: Physical Examination," *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical Society: Scientific Section* 9/1 (1962): 1-13; "A Study of Some Dead Sea Scroll and Leather Fragments from Cave 4 at Qumran, Part II: Physical Examination," *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical Society: Scientific Section* 9/6 (1964): 171-82.

<sup>82</sup> John Bowman, "Contact between Samaritan Sects and Qumran?" *VT* 7 (1957): 184-9; "Did the Qumran Sect Burn the Red Heifer?" *RevQ* 1 (1958-1959): 73-84; "Is the Samaritan Calendar the Old Zadokite One?" *PEQ* 91 (1959): 23-37.

<sup>83</sup> Shemaryahu Talmon, "Yom Hakkippurim in the Habakkuk Scroll," *Bib* 32 (1951): 549-63.

<sup>84</sup> Geza Vermes, *Providential Accidents: An Autobiography* (London: SCM Press, 1998).

<sup>85</sup> Geza Vermes, "The Symbolical Interpretation of Lebanon in the Targums," *JTS* 9 (1958): 1-12; "Baptism and Jewish Exegesis: New Light from Ancient Sources," *NTS* 5 (1958): 308-19; "The Torah is a Light," *VT* 9 (1958): 436-8.

1961,<sup>86</sup> the most well-known aspect of which was his coining of the term “Rewritten Bible” to describe haggadic development. Vermes’s translation of André Dupont-Sommer’s work into English appeared in the same year,<sup>87</sup> and he was well under way with work on his own translation of Qumran texts, the first edition of which appeared in 1962.<sup>88</sup> In 1965 Vermes was appointed as Reader in Jewish Studies at Oxford to replace Cecil Roth.

This section on the study of the Scrolls in the United Kingdom would be entirely incomplete without reference to activity in Scotland. There by far the most significant voice in the first generation of Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship was that of Matthew Black (1908-1994) who had studied with William Baron Stevenson in Glasgow and Paul Kahle<sup>89</sup> in Bonn in the 1930s.<sup>90</sup> He moved from being Professor of Biblical Criticism and Biblical Antiquities at Edinburgh (1952-1954) to become Principal of St Mary’s College and Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism at the University of St. Andrews (1954-1973). The work which established Black’s academic reputation was *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*,<sup>91</sup> but he contributed an article on the dating of the Scrolls to the very first issue of the *Journal of Jewish Studies*,<sup>92</sup> and published extensively on the Scrolls thereafter. His most significant work was his book, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, based on his Morse Lectures delivered at Union Theological Seminary in New York in 1956; in this work Black subscribed to the theory identifying the Qumran community as Essene, outlined some aspects of

---

<sup>86</sup> Geza Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (StPB 4; Leiden: Brill, 1961; 2d rev. ed., 1973).

<sup>87</sup> André Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1961).

<sup>88</sup> Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1962); in its multiple editions this has become the standard English translation of the Scrolls. The most recent version, in effect the revised fifth edition is *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Penguin Classics; London: Penguin Books, revised 2004).

<sup>89</sup> It should be noted that Paul Kahle (1875-1964) was also living near Oxford at this time; he had fled Bonn in 1939 and worked in the Bodleian Library cataloguing manuscripts. He returned to Germany in the 1960s shortly before his death. In addition to several articles, mostly in German and published in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, note especially his study *Die hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag, 1951) in which he thanks several British scholars for their assistance.

<sup>90</sup> Vermes recalls how his acquaintance with Paul Kahle resulted in Kahle contacting Matthew Black about the possibility of a job for him; Black had just received a request from Newcastle asking for possible names and proposed Vermes as a candidate there: *Providential Accidents*, 124. Vermes contributed both to Kahle’s memorial volume and Black’s *Festschrift*.

<sup>91</sup> Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946; 2d ed., 1954; 3d ed., 1967).

<sup>92</sup> Matthew Black, “The Dating of the New Hebrew Scrolls on Internal Evidence,” *JJS* 1 (1949): 199.

the diversity of Jewish sectarianism and discussed the extent of the connection between the Scrolls and Christian origins, especially as these might have been provided by John the Baptist. Although he considered that the Qumran material added fresh possibilities for explaining some features of early Christianity, even implying that Jesus emerged from Jewish sectarianism rather than mainstream Judaism, Black always argued against there being any direct dependence of the latter on the former. He also edited and contributed to an oft-cited collection of essays by British and North American scholars, *The Scrolls and Christianity: Historical and Theological Significance*.<sup>93</sup> Black also worked extensively with the *Books of Enoch*, publishing an edition of the Greek texts in 1970, collaborating with Józef Milik on his preliminary edition, and producing his own translation and commentary in 1985.<sup>94</sup> Black's views were always cautious, judicious, and have proved to be long-lasting; for example, his view that the *Similitudes* of *1 Enoch* (= *1 Enoch* 37-71), though not found at Qumran, should nevertheless be considered as the basis of Son of Man Christology in the Gospels is widely respected and adopted.

### 1970 to the present

It is clear that the leading Dead Sea Scrolls scholar in the United Kingdom since 1970 has been Geza Vermes. Vermes arrived in Oxford in 1965. Though, at least in part, claimed by the Faculty of History, Vermes made his home in the Faculty of Oriental Studies. He engaged in a complex web of research interests that he was able to take forward highly successfully.

First, his interest in the Scrolls is best known to the widest public through his ever-growing translation of the Dead Sea Scrolls in English. But there were several other aspects to his Scrolls research activity as his extensive bibliography attests.<sup>95</sup> Notably, Vermes continued his interest in early Jewish

<sup>93</sup> Matthew Black, ed., *The Scrolls and Christianity: Historical and Theological Significance* (Theological Collections 11; London: SPCK, 1969). This volume contained summary essays by William F. Albright, Christopher S. Mann, Roland K. Harrison, Raymond E. Brown, John Pryke, Charles H. H. Scobie, Frederick F. Bruce and Max Wilcox.

<sup>94</sup> Matthew Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece* (PVTG 3; Leiden: Brill, 1970); Józef T. Milik with the collaboration of Matthew Black, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976); Matthew Black, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition* (SVTP 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985).

<sup>95</sup> In addition to the standard bibliographies, for items up to 1990 see "Bibliography of Geza Vermes," in Philip R. Davies and Richard T. White, eds., *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (JSOTSup 100; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 383-8.

biblical interpretation through particular attention to the non-scriptural Scrolls. There were significant articles and contributions to reference works that have remained important touchstones in the ongoing debates about the authority and use of the scriptures in the centuries before the fall of the Temple.<sup>96</sup> As an extension of his labours in revising the work of Emil Schürer he produced an introductory *vade mecum* to the Scrolls; this has been kept up to date through several editions.<sup>97</sup> From the time of the general release of the cave 4 and 11 materials in 1991, he has produced or encouraged a series of short studies on the newly available materials, especially by publishing swiftly items often promoted by the Forum for Qumran Research in the “Qumran Corner” of the *Journal of Jewish Studies* of which he has been the long-standing editor.<sup>98</sup> These short notes can be seen as the happy outcome of his campaigning over a period of fifteen years or more for the general release of the texts, work which was done sometimes very publicly as at the June 1987 symposium in London,<sup>99</sup> attended by both Frank Cross and John Strugnell, and sometimes more discreetly through his position in Oxford and his association with the Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies.<sup>100</sup> His appointment to the international editorial team found him as co-editor of most of the contents of DJD XXVI and one manuscript in DJD XXXVI.<sup>101</sup>

Second, in tandem with his concerns for the use of scripture in the Scrolls, he was continually enhancing his interest in Jewish biblical interpretation in antiquity. In this he was developing the field of comparative midrash, which his 1961 monograph, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* had played a part in stimulating, if not inaugurating. Most important, again as a touchstone of the discussion, was his contribution to the *Cambridge*

<sup>96</sup> See, especially, Geza Vermes, “The Qumran Interpretation of Scripture in Its Historical Setting,” *Annual of the Leeds University Historical Society* 6 (1969): 85-97; “Interpretation, History of, at Qumran and in the Targums,” *IDBSup* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), 438-43; “Biblical Exegesis at Qumran,” *ErIs* 20 (1989): 184-91; “Biblical Proof-Texts in Qumran Literature,” *JSS* 34 (1989): 493-508.

<sup>97</sup> Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (London: Collins, 1977; 2d ed., London: SCM Press, 1982; 3d rev. ed., 1994); revised again as *An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: SCM Press, 1999).

<sup>98</sup> Vermes took over the editorship of *JJS* with Volume 22.

<sup>99</sup> See *JJS* 39 (1988): 1-79.

<sup>100</sup> As described in his autobiography: Geza Vermes, *Providential Accidents*, 188-209.

<sup>101</sup> Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.XIX: Serekh ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (DJD XXVI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998); “4QSefer ha-Milhamah,” in Stephen J. Pfann et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD XXXVI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 228-46.

*History of the Bible*.<sup>102</sup> In addition there has been a significant flow of studies on aspects of scriptural interpretation in the targumim and elsewhere in rabbinic literature.<sup>103</sup> This activity has shown how important it is for what is newly available in the Dead Sea Scrolls to be compared with what has been known for some time in rabbinic literature but perhaps not appreciated adequately. The comparative exercise is mutually illuminating. Although the framework for the comparison might not endure, since it uses largely rabbinic terms that sometimes look out of place in the analysis of the Scrolls, the value of the contents of the comparisons cannot be gainsaid.

Third, in 1965 Vermes was asked to join the team revising the work of Emil Schürer. Instigated by Harold Rowley and taken up by Matthew Black, once Vermes became involved the project was restructured and the Roman historian, Fergus Millar, was brought into the team. Vermes and Millar undertook most of the work for Volume 1; others were involved with the remaining volumes more extensively. The result was the new revised Schürer, published in four volumes between 1973 and 1987, which is one of the standard reference works in the field,<sup>104</sup> even though it was completed before the general release of the unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls in 1991.

Fourth, Vermes has had a longstanding interest in Jesus and after his move to Oxford this developed apace. The interest seems to have been prompted in part by his interest in the supposedly titular phrase "Son of Man," but it soon widened as he sought to present a reasonable Jesus of history, a Jesus who was compatible with Jewish sources beyond the Gospels. The resulting Jewish Jesus was depicted as one of the holy miracle-workers of Galilee. Though some critics have found the approach too reductionist, Vermes has followed his approach through in a trilogy, covering both Jesus' activities and teaching as well as his religious context.<sup>105</sup> The first volume was dedicated to Paul Winter (1904-1969) whose work on the trial of Jesus

<sup>102</sup> Geza Vermes, "Bible and Midrash: Early Old Testament Exegesis," in Peter R. Ackroyd and Christopher F. Evans, eds., *The Cambridge History of the Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 1:199-231, 592.

<sup>103</sup> Several of these studies were collected together in Geza Vermes, *Post-Biblical Jewish Studies* (SJLA 8; Leiden: Brill, 1975).

<sup>104</sup> Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135)*. A New English Version, Revised and Edited by Geza Vermes and Fergus Millar; Literary Editor: Pamela Vermes; Organizing Editor: Matthew Black. Volume I (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973); with Matthew Black as a co-editor, Volume II (1979); with Martin Goodman as a co-editor, Volume III/1 (1986); Volume III/2 (1987).

<sup>105</sup> Geza Vermes, *Jesus the Jew* (London: Collins, 1973; 2d ed. 1983); *Jesus and the World of Judaism* (London: SCM Press, 1983); *The Religion of Jesus the Jew* (London: SCM Press, 1993).

seems to have acted as a model for Vermes's own approach.<sup>106</sup> Because of the Galilean focus, it is intriguing to see in these three volumes how little use is made of the sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls in producing the portrait of Jesus. The trilogy has been followed up in recent years by several volumes on the Gospels from the same historical perspective.<sup>107</sup>

With this range of interests, it is perhaps not entirely surprising that Vermes's doctoral students have for the most part taken to fields of research other than the Dead Sea Scrolls. Notable exceptions have been Jonathan Campbell, now at the University of Bristol,<sup>108</sup> and Timothy Lim, now at the University of Edinburgh.<sup>109</sup> Some of his students have nevertheless subsequently contributed much to Scrolls scholarship, in particular Philip Alexander of the University of Manchester.

Vermes was succeeded at Oxford by Martin Goodman, one of his former pupils and a leading Roman historian. With Vermes, Goodman had put together a volume of the classical sources on the Essenes,<sup>110</sup> and he had also been a major collaborator on the revised Schürer. Goodman has written little on the Dead Sea Scrolls, but one short study is cited often: in it he challenges the consensus view held by his teacher amongst others, and wonders whether it is right to link the Qumran community with the Essenes in the way that is commonly assumed.<sup>111</sup> It is likely that Goodman will make further revisionist forays into the world of Qumran studies, but Oxford University has yet to find a scholar who can offer the focus on the Scrolls that has been provided for over forty years by Vermes, though the appointment of Markus Bockmuehl in the Faculty of Theology augurs well for those concerned with the Jewish context of the New Testament in the Greco-Roman world. Bockmuehl's occasional studies on the

---

<sup>106</sup> Paul Winter, *On the Trial of Jesus* (SJ, Forschungen zur Wissenschaft des Judentums 1; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1961; 2d ed., revised and edited by Alec T. Burkill and Geza Vermes, 1974).

<sup>107</sup> Geza Vermes, *The Changing Faces of Jesus* (London: Allen Lane, Penguin Press, 2000); *The Passion* (London: Penguin Books, 2005); *The Nativity: History and Legend* (London: Penguin Books, 2006); *The Resurrection* (London: Penguin Books, 2008).

<sup>108</sup> His thesis was published as Jonathan G. Campbell, *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1-8, 19-20* (BZAW 228; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995).

<sup>109</sup> His thesis was published as Timothy H. Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997); co-supervised by John Ashton.

<sup>110</sup> Geza Vermes and Martin D. Goodman, *The Essenes According to the Classical Sources* (Oxford Centre Textbooks 1; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989).

<sup>111</sup> Martin D. Goodman, "A Note on the Qumran Sectarials, the Essenes and Josephus," *JJS* 46 (1996): 161-6; see also his essay "Constructing Ancient Judaism from the Scrolls," in Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 81-91.



Scrolls have been rigorous and innovative.<sup>112</sup> Another Oxford scholar also merits a mention: Peter J. Parsons, lecturer in papyrology and from 1989 Regius Professor of Greek, provided palaeographical analysis for two DJD volumes.<sup>113</sup>

If Oxford has been especially prominent in British Scrolls scholarship since the arrival of Vermes there in 1965, things have also developed at Manchester. After Allegro's departure, there was a period of quiet as far as the Scrolls were concerned. Upon Bruce's retirement in 1978, Geza Vermes was approached to fill the Rylands Chair, but the post was eventually occupied by Barnabas Lindars. He had a long-standing interest on the use of the Old Testament in the New, but also through an attempt to pose an alternative to Vermes's analysis, he engaged once again with the problems surrounding the use of the epithet "Son of Man" and wrote several studies on passages of *1 Enoch*.<sup>114</sup> Between Bruce's departure and the arrival of George Brooke in 1984, Lindars was the principal voice on the Scrolls in Manchester. Before Lindars retired in 1990 he collaborated with Brooke in hosting a symposium on the Scrolls and the Septuagint. The Septuagint had been one of his long-standing academic interests and he recognized the importance of the Scrolls for the reinvigoration of Septuagint studies.<sup>115</sup> When the United Kingdom government announced in 1983 that funds would be released to create some new university posts, Lindars and his colleagues in Biblical Studies put in a bid for a position specializing in

<sup>112</sup> E.g., Markus Bockmuehl, "Redaction and Ideology in the *Rule of the Community* (1QS/4QS)," *RevQ* 18 (1998): 541-60; "1QS: Salvation at Qumran," in Donald A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien and Mark A. Seifrid, eds., *Justification and Variegated Nomism. Volume I: The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (WUNT 140; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 381-414; "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of Biblical Commentary," in Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz, eds., *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity* (STDJ 84; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 3-29.

<sup>113</sup> Peter J. Parsons, "The Scripts and Their Date," in Emanuel Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)* (DJD VIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 19-26; "The Palaeography and Date of the Greek Manuscripts," in Patrick W. Skehan, Eugene Ulrich and Judith E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4.IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD IX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 7-13.

<sup>114</sup> Barnabas Lindars, "Re-Enter the Apocalyptic Son of Man," *NTS* 22 (1975-1976): 52-72; "A Bull, a Lamb, and a Word: 1 Enoch 90,38," *NTS* 22 (1975-1976): 483-6; "Enoch and Christology," *ExpTim* 92 (1980): 295-9; "The New Look on the Son of Man," *BJRL* 63 (1981): 437-62; cf. his volume *Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels in the Light of Recent Research* (London: SPCK, 1983).

<sup>115</sup> The papers were published as George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars, eds., *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester, 1990)* (SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).



early Jewish literature. Success with the bid resulted in the appointment of George Brooke at Manchester in 1984.<sup>116</sup>

Although he had intended to study Akkadian and Ugaritic under the supervision of Loren Fisher at Claremont in the 1970s, Fisher's sudden early retirement caused Brooke to change field. Having sat in Verme's lectures on the Scrolls as an undergraduate at Oxford, a transfer to study at Claremont with William Brownlee seemed like a very positive step. At that time Brownlee was working on the exegetical strategies of the *Pesher of Habakkuk*<sup>117</sup> and he set Brooke to work on the so-called *Florilegium* (4Q174).<sup>118</sup> This research highlighted the various kinds of exegetical moves that were being made by those interpreting the law, prophets and psalms referred to in the fragments assigned to the manuscript. Brooke demonstrated that early Jewish exegesis was far from arbitrary; rather, it was a highly skilled enterprise with recognized methods and reflecting particular didactic and liturgical settings. Brooke has had a long-standing interest in scriptural exegesis in the Scrolls and through such interests became the next Manchester scholar to publish principal editions of the Scrolls in the DJD series.<sup>119</sup> In addition, several of his students have undertaken research in similar areas.<sup>120</sup> As the interpretation of scripture is taking place in almost all the non-scriptural Scrolls found in the Qumran caves, so Brooke has had research interests that have engaged with the so-called biblical manuscripts, both in their own terms and as they contribute to a better understanding of the transmission of authoritative texts in the late Second Temple period. He has also written several studies on the relationship of the Scrolls and the New Testament.<sup>121</sup>

<sup>116</sup> For a survey of Brooke's Scrolls research, see Eileen M. Schuller, "George J. Brooke and the Dead Sea Scrolls," *BJRULM* 86 (2004): 175-96.

<sup>117</sup> Published as William H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk* (SBLMS 24; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979).

<sup>118</sup> Eventually published as George J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985; repr. Atlanta: SBL, 2006).

<sup>119</sup> George J. Brooke, "252. 4QCommentary on Genesis A," "253. 4QCommentary on Genesis B," "253a. 4QCommentary on Malachi," "254. 4QCommentary on Genesis C," "254a. 4QCommentary on Genesis D," in George J. Brooke et al., in consultation with James C. Vanderkam, *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD XXII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 185-236.

<sup>120</sup> E.g. Dwight D. Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT* (STDJ 14; Leiden: Brill, 1995); Julie A. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot* (STDJ 59; Leiden: Brill, 2006); Dorothy M. Peters, *Noah Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conversations and Controversies of Antiquity* (SBLEJL 26; Atlanta: SBL, 2008); Marcus K. M. Tso, *Ethics in the Qumran Community: An Interdisciplinary Investigation* (WUNT II/292; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), esp. 75-97.

<sup>121</sup> Some of which have been collected together in George J. Brooke, *The Dead Sea*

In addition to his own research interests Brooke has promoted other Scrolls activities. He has organized a series of international symposia which have also put Manchester back on the Scrolls map: on the *Temple Scroll* in 1987,<sup>122</sup> together with Lindars on the Scrolls and the Septuagint in 1990, and on the *Copper Scroll* in 1996.<sup>123</sup> The last of these was originally intended to coincide with the exhibition of the *Copper Scroll* itself at the Manchester Museum, but for various reasons the exhibition was delayed until the autumn of 1997. The eventual return of the *Copper Scroll* to Manchester just over forty years after its opening attracted about 40,000 people. Brooke also supervised the cataloguing of Allegro's photographs,<sup>124</sup> and has been largely responsible for several archive items in the John Rylands University Library.<sup>125</sup> In addition, he is one of the three founding editors of *Dead Sea Discoveries*, is part of the editorial board of *Revue de Qumrân*, was on the editorial committee responsible for the *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, and is a founding committee member of the International Organisation for Qumran Studies that meets triennially. In promoting the research of others he has set up close working relationships with the Dead Sea Scrolls Institute of Trinity Western University, British Columbia, and the Nordic Qumran Network.<sup>126</sup>

Since the general release of the unpublished Scrolls in 1991, Philip Alexander, on the staff of Manchester University since the mid-70s until 2010, has also played a very active role in Scrolls research. Part of this began while he was on loan from Manchester to the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies for three years as its second president.<sup>127</sup> But, subsequently, on return to Manchester he has played the major part with Geza Vermes

---

*Scrolls and the New Testament: Essays in Mutual Illumination* (London-Minneapolis: SPCK-Fortress Press, 2005).

<sup>122</sup> George J. Brooke, ed., *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll (Manchester, December 1987)* (JSPSup 7; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989).

<sup>123</sup> George J. Brooke and Philip R. Davies, eds., *Copper Scroll Studies* (JSPSup 40; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002; repr. London: T&T Clark International, 2004).

<sup>124</sup> George J. Brooke with Helen K. Bond, *The Allegro Qumran Collection: Supplement to The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche* (Leiden: Brill and IDC, 1996).

<sup>125</sup> Notably the "Reed" fragments, as described elsewhere, and the Brownlee archive (a set of unpublished letters and papers belonging to William H. Brownlee).

<sup>126</sup> See, e.g., George J. Brooke, "From Bible to Midrash: Approaches to Biblical Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls by Modern Interpreters," in Anders Klostergaard Petersen et al., eds., *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003-2006* (STDJ 80; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 1-19.

<sup>127</sup> E.g., Philip S. Alexander, "A Note on the Syntax of 4Q448," *JJS* 44 (1993): 301-2; Timothy H. Lim in consultation with Philip S. Alexander, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library*, Volume I (Oxford-Leiden: Oxford University Press-Brill, 1997).

in the publication of the cave 4 versions of the *Community Rule*, and also 4Q285.<sup>128</sup> In addition, Alexander has published a wide range of studies that have been influential in the re-evaluation of the scribal and redactional processes in the transmission of the manuscripts.<sup>129</sup> His essays and a monograph have also reconsidered various aspects of the life and thought of the community,<sup>130</sup> especially in relation to Jewish magic and mysticism.<sup>131</sup>

For a decade from 1994 Brooke and Alexander cooperated with Philip Davies at the University of Sheffield in the activities of the Manchester-Sheffield Centre for Dead Sea Scrolls Research. Davies's retirement from Sheffield without a replacement with similar interests formally brought the cooperation to an end. Many of the activities listed already can be assigned to the Centre, sometimes the event taking place in Manchester and then being published in Sheffield. In addition to the symposia and *Copper Scroll* exhibition, the cooperation produced the best-selling English introduction to the Scrolls that has more high quality colour photographs than any other book on the market.<sup>132</sup> But the contribution of Philip Davies to the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls deserves some detailed consideration quite apart from his cooperation with colleagues at Manchester. Davies has been a prolific author in several fields, notably ancient historiography, and several of his interests are discernible in his publications on the Scrolls. At the out-

<sup>128</sup> Alexander and Vermes, DJD XXVI; "4QSefer ha-Milhamah," Pfann et al., DJD XXXVI, 228-46. Brooke also contributed an edition of the Schøyen fragment (MS 1909) of 1QSb to DJD XXVI.

<sup>129</sup> E.g., Philip S. Alexander, "The Redaction History of *Serekh ha-Yahad*: A Proposal," *RevQ* 19 (1996): 437-56; "Literacy among Jews in Second Temple Palestine: Reflections on the Evidence from Qumran," in Martin F. J. Baasten and Willem T. van Peursen, eds., *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (OLA 118; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 3-24.

<sup>130</sup> Philip S. Alexander, "Physiognomy, Initiation, and Rank in the Qumran Community," in Hubert Cancik, Hermann Lichtenberger and Peter Schäfer, eds., *Geschichte—Tradition—Relexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*. Vol. 1. *Judentum* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 385-94; "Predestination and Free Will in the Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in John M. G. Barclay and Simon J. Gathercole, eds., *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment* (LNTS 335; London: T&T Clark, 2006), 27-49.

<sup>131</sup> Philip S. Alexander, "'Wrestling against Wickedness in High Places': Magic in the Worldview of the Qumran Community," in Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans, eds., *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (JSPSup 26; Roehampton Institute London Papers 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 318-37; "The Demonology of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:331-53; *Mystical Texts: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Related Manuscripts* (LSTS 61; Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 7; London: T&T Clark International, 2006).

<sup>132</sup> Philip R. Davies, George J. Brooke and Philip R. Callaway, *The Complete World of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2002; revised paperback edition, 2011). 80,000 copies in six languages have been sold to date.

set, building on his doctoral work under Matthew Black at St. Andrews, Davies produced first a detailed study on the redaction of the *War Scroll*.<sup>133</sup> Subsequently, partly influenced by Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, he tackled the complex issues of the editing of the *Damascus Document*,<sup>134</sup> arguing not least that CD disclosed evidence of a Qumranic redaction. In both works the premise was that most scholars working on the Scrolls seemed reluctant to apply to them the rigours of biblical criticism as those had developed over the previous century and been learnt by them in their training. Davies was acutely aware that many of the nuances of his own analysis could readily be checked and retained or discarded, if only the unpublished cave 4 materials could be made available. As a result he became vociferous in calling for the unpublished materials to be made available swiftly.

However, having tried his hand at explaining the multi-layered character of some of the key sectarian compositions, Davies also set to work to expose the layers of Qumran as an archaeological site and the varieties of the communities associated with it. These interests, which were always as much about appropriate methodology as they were contributions on the topics at hand, resulted in several valuable publications. On the archaeology he produced a volume that interacted with de Vaux's narrative sympathetically,<sup>135</sup> but he was not uncritical of what had been achieved and how it had been presented.<sup>136</sup> On the communities, how many there might have been and how they should be described historically, he has written voluminously; two collections of essays present some of his key ideas.<sup>137</sup> From a variety of angles Davies has tried to show that group identity tags cannot be transferred from one set of literary data to another without distortions and he has shown repeatedly that texts cannot be related to social realities in a direct and straightforward way.<sup>138</sup> Characteristic of his work is a tendency

<sup>133</sup> Philip R. Davies, *1QM: The War Rule from Qumran* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977).

<sup>134</sup> Philip R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the 'Damascus Document'* (JSOTSup 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983).

<sup>135</sup> Philip R. Davies, *Qumran* (Cities of the Biblical World; Guildford: Lutterworth Press, 1982). The volume was dedicated to de Vaux, "remembered with respect and great affection."

<sup>136</sup> E.g., Philip R. Davies, "How Not to Do Archaeology: The Story of Qumran," *BA* 51 (1988): 203-7; "Khirbet Qumran Revisited," in Michael D. Coogan, J. Cheryl Exum and Lawrence E. Stager, eds., *Scripture and Other Artifacts: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Honor of Philip J. King* (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1994), 126-42.

<sup>137</sup> Philip R. Davies, *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (BJS 94; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987); *Sects and Scrolls: Essays on Qumran and Related Topics* (South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 134; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

<sup>138</sup> Note especially Philip R. Davies, "Sects from Texts: On the Problems of Doing a Sociology of the Qumran Literature," in Jonathan G. Campbell, William J. Lyons and Lloyd

to insist on the fragmentation of already fragmentary data, the scrutiny of each element in close detail, before any overall synthesis or grand narrative is attempted.

Attention to detail is also the hallmark of the contribution to the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls by Michael Knibb, whose work has been characterized by a long-standing concern to see the Scrolls as part of a wider literary phenomenon in late Second Temple Palestinian Judaism.<sup>139</sup> Such is the hallmark of an oft-cited study on exile,<sup>140</sup> but it is particularly apparent in the many influential studies Knibb has contributed on the books of *1 Enoch*, from his textual edition and translation to his collected essays.<sup>141</sup> In addition, Knibb's work on the Scrolls has had two dominant features. The first has been an interest in how the rule books present in the Qumran library should best be understood. His analytical approach in these cases is visible in the precise and careful but also highly illuminating notes that he has provided to the various texts, especially the rule books, in *The Qumran Community*.<sup>142</sup> In the light of his astute, well-balanced and cautious approach he was an obvious choice as author for a range of articles on community organization and on the *Community Rule* for the *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*.<sup>143</sup> The second has been a concern for particular ideas represented variously in the Scrolls and related literature. In particular this has involved the study of messianism.<sup>144</sup> Interest in the Dead Sea Scrolls at

---

K. Pietersen, eds., *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8-10 September 2003* (LSTS 52; London: T&T Clark International, 2005), 69-82.

<sup>139</sup> See, e.g., Michael A. Knibb, *Jubilees and the Origins of the Qumran Community* (Inaugural Lecture; London: King's College, 1989).

<sup>140</sup> Michael A. Knibb, "The Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period," *HeyT* 17 (1976): 253-72; see also his related study, "Exile in the Damascus Document," *JSOT* 25 (1983): 99-117.

<sup>141</sup> Michael A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch. A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978); "1 Enoch," in Hedley F. D. Sparks, ed., *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), 169-319; *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions* (SVTP 22; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

<sup>142</sup> Michael A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200 2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

<sup>143</sup> Michael A. Knibb, "Community Organization in the Damascus Document," "Community Organization in Other Texts," "Rule of the Community," "Teacher of Righteousness," in Schiffman and VanderKam, *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*.

<sup>144</sup> E.g., Michael A. Knibb, "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls," *DSD* 2 (1995): 165-84; "Eschatology and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2.379-402.

King's College, London has been represented for a few years since Knibb's retirement by Lutz Doering; his breadth of learning reaches to the Scrolls in some aspects of Jewish halakhah,<sup>145</sup> a legal interest complemented by his specialist concerns with prophetic Jeremiah traditions.<sup>146</sup> Doering has replaced Loren Stuckenbruck at Durham University from 2009. Joan Taylor has in turn replaced Doering at Kings College.

If Knibb's talent at London was to set the Scrolls from the Qumran caves in a wider Jewish literary framework whilst allowing them to speak for themselves at the same time, in Cambridge there has been much valuable scholarship on Judaism in the Greco-Roman period but a notable silence on the significance of the Scrolls amongst senior scholars. Surprisingly this has not deterred some doctoral students from engaging with technical Scrolls work there.<sup>147</sup> But scholars at other British universities have engaged with the Scrolls in many ways. There are scholars busy with activities directly or indirectly related to the Dead Sea Scrolls at Bristol University where Jonathan Campbell<sup>148</sup> has tried to pioneer new approaches to the study of the Scrolls;<sup>149</sup> at Birmingham University where Charlotte Hempel represents the cutting edge of the study of the sectarian rule books<sup>150</sup> and has hosted an international conference;<sup>151</sup> at Hull University where Lester Grabbe has had an ongoing concern to contextualize the Scrolls and their

<sup>145</sup> Lutz Doering, *Sabbat: Sabbathalacha und -praxis im antiken Judentum und Urchristentum* (TSAJ 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999).

<sup>146</sup> E.g., Lutz Doering, "Jeremiah and the 'Diaspora Letters' in Ancient Judaism: Epistolary Communication with the Golah as Medium for Dealing with the Present," in Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange, eds., *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations* (SBLSymS 30; Atlanta: SBL, 2005), 43-72.

<sup>147</sup> E.g., Edward D. Herbert, *Reconstructing Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Method Applied to the Reconstruction of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>* (STDJ 22; Leiden: Brill, 1997); Paul Swarup, *The Self-Understanding of the Dead Sea Scrolls Community: An Eternal Planting, A House of Holiness* (LSTS 59; London: T&T Clark, 2006).

<sup>148</sup> Jonathan G. Campbell, *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1-8, 19-20* (BZAW 228; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995); *Deciphering the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Fontana, 1996; 2d ed., Oxford: Blackwell, 2002); *The Exegetical Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 4; London: T&T Clark International, 2004).

<sup>149</sup> Jonathan G. Campbell, William J. Lyons and Lloyd K. Pietersen, eds., *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8-10 September 2003* (Library of Second Temple Studies 52; London: T&T Clark International, 2005).

<sup>150</sup> Charlotte Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Traditions and Redaction* (STDJ 29; Leiden: Brill, 1998); *The Damascus Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 1; London: T&T Clark International, 2000).

<sup>151</sup> Charlotte Hempel, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context* (STDJ 90; Leiden: Brill, 2010).



collectors within the broader frame of Second Temple Jewish history;<sup>152</sup> at Christ Church University, Canterbury, where Brian Capper has attempted to describe what Essenism might have been like in the towns and villages of Judea;<sup>153</sup> at University College, London where Mark Geller and Sacha Stern have had some interest in the Scrolls;<sup>154</sup> and at the University of Derby where some of Davies's concerns with regard to the application of sociological method to the understanding of the Scrolls have been picked up and expounded by David Chalcraft.<sup>155</sup> In addition, from 1994 Loren Stuckenbruck, now at Princeton Theological Seminary, was at the University of Durham, first as lecturer in New Testament and from 2003 until 2009 as the first holder of the Brooke Foss Westcott Chair in Biblical Studies. Stuckenbruck has had long-standing interests in apocalyptic literature. For the Dead Sea Scrolls this has resulted in him making several contributions in relation to Enochic literature, notably a monograph on the *Book of Giants*,<sup>156</sup> the principal edition of the fragmentary manuscripts of that for DJD, published in 2000,<sup>157</sup> and a commentary on *1 Enoch* 91-108 for the de Gruyter series, *Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature*.<sup>158</sup> He has also participated in a project based in Durham on the book of Tobit.<sup>159</sup>

<sup>152</sup> E.g., Lester L. Grabbe, *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh* (London: Routledge, 2000).

<sup>153</sup> Brian Capper, "The Palestinian Cultural Context of Earliest Christian Community of Goods," in Richard J. Bauckham, ed., *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting* (The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting 4; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 323-56; "Community of Goods in the Early Jerusalem Church," *ANRW* 26.2: 1730-74; "With the Oldest Monks . . ." Light from Essene History on the Career of the Beloved Disciple," *JTS* 49 (1998): 1-55; "The New Covenant in Southern Palestine at the Arrest of Jesus," in James R. Davila, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001* (STDJ 46; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 90-116.

<sup>154</sup> Mark J. Geller, "Qumran's Teacher of Righteousness—A Suggested Identification," *Scripta Judaica Cracoviensia* 1 (2002): 9-19; Sacha Stern, *Calendar and Community: A History of the Jewish Calendar, Second Century BCE-Tenth Century CE* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001); "Qumran Calendars and Sectarianism," in Lim and Collins, *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 232-53.

<sup>155</sup> See David J. Chalcraft, ed., *Social-Scientific Old Testament Criticism* (The Biblical Seminar 47; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997); *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (London: Equinox, 2007).

<sup>156</sup> Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Text, Translation, and Commentary* (TSAJ 63; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997).

<sup>157</sup> Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "201 2-8; 203; 206 2-3; Appendixes 1-4," in Pfann et al., *DJD XXXVI*, 3-94.

<sup>158</sup> Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91-108: A Commentary* (CESTL; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007).

<sup>159</sup> Stuart Weeks, Simon J. Gathercole and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, eds., *The Book of Tobit: Texts from the Principal Ancient and Medieval Traditions with Synopsis, Concordances, and Annotated Texts in Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Syriac* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004).



Stuckenbruck's replacement by Lutz Doering confirms Durham's ongoing interest in the Scrolls and related literature. With colleagues there who are no strangers to the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls, such as John Barclay, an expert on Paul's theology and a leading Josephus scholar,<sup>160</sup> and Robert Hayward, an expert on targum,<sup>161</sup> the contextualization of the Qumran finds in the breadth of Jewish literature in antiquity looks set fair.

The torch of Scrolls scholarship has been carried in Scotland in three places. At St. Andrews, James Davila has been very active in promoting the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls<sup>162</sup> but usually in their wider contexts.<sup>163</sup> He has become well known for his use of the internet in encouraging scholarly dialogue and providing resources on Jewish and Christian texts from antiquity and has spread his interests to include Jewish and Christian Pseudepigrapha of all ages and some aspects of Jewish mysticism. Davila was promoted to a personal chair in Early Jewish Studies in 2008. In Edinburgh, Timothy Lim has taken the lead in several ways, especially with regard to his ongoing interest in scriptural interpretation in the Scrolls.<sup>164</sup> Not only has he promoted interest in the Scrolls through international symposia,<sup>165</sup> but also he has been at the centre of a number of projects.<sup>166</sup> Lim was promoted to a personal chair in Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Judaism

---

This essential compendium sadly misses the Tobit fragment in the Schøyen collection (MS 5234).

<sup>160</sup> Barclay is best known for his research on Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: *From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE-117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), and for *Flavius Josephus: Against Apion: Translation and Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 2006). When at Glasgow University (1984-2003), Barclay also edited a volume to accompany the 1998 Dead Sea Scrolls Exhibition there: John M. G. Barclay, ed., *Frequently Asked Questions on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Glasgow: Trinity St. Mungo Press, 1998).

<sup>161</sup> Robert C. T. Hayward, *Interpretations of the Name Israel in Ancient Judaism and Some Early Christian Writings: From Victorious Athlete to Heavenly Champion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

<sup>162</sup> See, e.g., James R. Davila, *Liturgical Works* (Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).

<sup>163</sup> James R. Davila, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001* (STDJ 46; Leiden: Brill, 2003).

<sup>164</sup> See, e.g., Timothy H. Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997); *Pesharim* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 3; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002); *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

<sup>165</sup> Timothy H. Lim et al., eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000); Timothy H. Lim, Hector L. MacQueen and Calum M. Carmichael, eds., *On Scrolls, Artefacts and Intellectual Property* (JSPSup 38; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

<sup>166</sup> Timothy H. Lim in consultation with Philip S. Alexander, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library*, 1 (Oxford-Leiden: Brill, 1997); Lim and Collins, *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*.

in 2005. In addition, at the International Christian College in Glasgow, until his premature death in 2008, Edward Herbert exercised an ongoing interest in the Scrolls.<sup>167</sup> All three scholars have been members of the international team of editors: based on his Harvard doctoral work, Davila produced the editions of Genesis for DJD XII,<sup>168</sup> Lim produced the editions of *Meditations on Creation*<sup>169</sup> and two other fragmentary compositions,<sup>170</sup> and Herbert contributed the edition of 11QEzekiel.<sup>171</sup>

Those without academic posts in Britain who have taken part in the discussion have included the good, the bad, and the strange. Amongst the good has been Joan Taylor, who moved to England from New Zealand in 2000 and whose studies have been carefully presented and full of wise nuance; she is now on the staff of King's College, London.<sup>172</sup> The highly improbable reconstructions of Robert Eisenman combined with information from the correspondence of John Allegro together with a very heavy dose of conspiracy theory puts the best-selling work of Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh on the bad list.<sup>173</sup> Amongst the strange are books like Robert Feather's *Copper Scroll Decoded*, which raised a good question about the value of the weights and measures used in the *Copper Scroll*, but then pursued a highly problematic line of argument linking the scroll to the treasures to Egypt in the time of Akenaten.<sup>174</sup>

<sup>167</sup> Edward D. Herbert, *Reconstructing Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Method Applied to the Reconstruction of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>* (STDJ 22; Leiden: Brill, 1997); Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov, eds., *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (London-New Castle: British Library-Oak Knoll Press, 2002).

<sup>168</sup> James R. Davila, "4QGen-Exod<sup>a</sup>-4QGen<sup>k</sup>," in Eugene Ulrich et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 4. VII: Genesis to Numbers* (DJD XII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 7-78.

<sup>169</sup> Timothy H. Lim, "Meditations on Creation," in Torleif Elgvin et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 4. XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1* (DJD XX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 151-8.

<sup>170</sup> Timothy H. Lim, "4Q Men of the People who Err," "4QText Mentioning Temple," in Pfann et al., DJD XXXVI, 249-58.

<sup>171</sup> Edward D. Herbert, "11QEzekiel," in Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar and Adam S. van der Woude, eds., *Qumran Cave 11. II: 11Q2-18, 11Q20-31* (DJD XXIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 15-28.

<sup>172</sup> Joan E. Taylor, *Jewish Women Philosophers of First-Century Alexandria: Philo's 'Therapeutae' Reconsidered* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); "The Classical Sources on the Essenes and the Scrolls Communities," in Lim and Collins, *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 173-99.

<sup>173</sup> Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1991).

<sup>174</sup> Robert Feather, *The Copper Scroll Decoded* (London: Thorsons, 2000); see also his over-enthusiastic combining of evidence in *The Secret Initiation of Jesus at Qumran: The Essene Mysteries of John the Baptist* (London: Watkins, 2006).

*The Present State of Scrolls Research in the UK and Future Prospects**Research on the Scrolls as Artefacts*

As in the first stage of Scrolls research scholars like Plenderleith and Reed offered advice on the actual fragmentary remains found in the Qumran caves, and as in the second phase scholars in England played a part in producing resources and tools for their study, so in the present and future there are some projects based in the United Kingdom that are contributing to the ongoing study of the Scrolls themselves.

Since 1997, the fragments that were variously sent from Jordan and Israel for analysis by Ronald Reed have been housed in the John Rylands University Library in Manchester. Though these fragments carry no writing they have become significant in two respects. First, it has become apparent that these fragments are amongst the very few that were never treated with any kind of substance. They are thus able to form part of the group of materials that can be used to act as analytical controls on the data produced from the scientific analysis of the fragments. The most significant contribution that these fragments might be able to make comes through the analysis of the chemical composition of the interior of the skin. It might be expected that material that has been left in caves in the Dead Sea region for hundreds of years would have relatively high levels of salts on their surfaces, but that proves no more than that the Scrolls have been in the caves for a long time. Assessment of the interior of the skin through synchrotron analysis is beginning to suggest that relatively high levels of bromides are also to be found within the skin and were thus probably either part of the animal's diet and inhalation or have seeped into the interior of the skin during its preparation, perhaps with water from sources local to the Dead Sea. The Reed fragments might thus help address the question of the association of the Scrolls with the Qumran site. Although many scrolls came to the caves from elsewhere, probably especially Jerusalem, so also at least some are likely to have been local products both in terms of being made locally from local animals and in terms of being written on, possibly at Qumran itself.

The Reed fragments are also likely to yield valuable information in terms of heritage conservation. When they first arrived in Leeds, Ronald Reed and his doctoral student John Poole photographed the fragments with an electron microscope. These images displayed the collagen strings in the skin. Reed himself was interested in how the state of collagen strings could be used as a dating technique to corroborate other methods of dating. But for

the purposes of conservation, it is now possible to take the same fragments fifty years later and attempt to observe the state of the collagen strings after fifty years of storage in Reed's home and the Rylands Library. On the basis of the comparison of the images it will be possible to see clearly what is happening to the skin since it left the caves and to suggest ways of stabilizing the collagen from further deterioration.<sup>175</sup> This might have wide-ranging ramifications for the conservation of leather and parchment of all kinds.

A second project concerned with the actual fragments is based at King's College, London. The Israel Antiquities Authority (IAA) has engaged the services of a team of digitization experts from King's to work through the fragments that are the IAA's responsibility, so that a complete digital record is available for research purposes.<sup>176</sup>

In addition, resources relating to the Scrolls or using them for wider purposes continue to be produced in Britain.<sup>177</sup>

### *Research on the Texts*

Two particular research interests have marked out the contribution of scholars interested in the Dead Sea Scrolls who have worked in the United Kingdom. The first of these has been the study of the two major rule books, the *Damascus Document* and the *Community Rule*. The presence of the medieval *Damascus Document* A and B copies in the University Library at Cambridge might have been partly responsible for stimulating this interest. Comparison with the *Community Rule* followed naturally.

The *Community Rule* has long held a key position in scholarship undertaken in the United Kingdom.<sup>178</sup> Preben Wernberg-Møller's Oxford doctoral dissertation completed under Godfrey Driver was the first volume to be published in the new series *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* (*STDJ*). In 1966, Robert Leaney of Nottingham University published a scholarly but accessible commentary on the *Community Rule* in the New

<sup>175</sup> See George J. Brooke, "The Historical Documents at the John Rylands University Library: The Reed Dead Sea Scrolls Collection," *e-Preservation Science* 3 (2006), 35-40; Ira Rabin et al., "The Ronald Reed Archive at the John Rylands University Library," *e-Preservation Science* 4 (2007), 9-12.

<sup>176</sup> This is currently the concern of Simon Tanner of King's Digital Consultancy Services, King's College, London.

<sup>177</sup> E.g., Collins and Lim, *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. The *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* edited by David J. A. Clines has attempted to incorporate as much lexicographical information from the Scrolls as possible; George J. Brooke has served on the editorial board of reference.

<sup>178</sup> The full bibliographical details for many of the items that are briefly mentioned here can be found in the notes to earlier sections of this paper.

Testament Library series. During his tenure at King's College, London, Michael Knibb carried forward this interest by publishing a fresh annotated translation of the *Rule*. Most distinctively it was the preparation of the edition of the cave 4 manuscripts of the *Community Rule* by Philip Alexander and Geza Vermes that brought the United Kingdom's contribution in relation to the *Rule* back into the limelight. For the *Damascus Document*, monographs have been produced by Harold Rowley, Chaim Rabin, Philip Davies and Charlotte Hempel. Since the publication of the cave 4 fragments of the *Community Rule* in 1998, the study of the *Damascus Document* and the *Community Rule* and associated compositions has been taken forward most especially by Charlotte Hempel. Her dissertation and subsequent research focus have made her a leading exponent of the rule books. With scholars still reacting to the ideas of Vermes, Alexander and Davies, and with the ongoing rule book research of Hempel, it seems that the *Community Rule*, the *Damascus Document*, and other rules will form a significant part of Scrolls research in Britain into the future.

A second major aspect of British Scrolls scholarship has been an ongoing interest in the interpretation of the Jewish scriptures in the Scrolls and beyond. In the 1950s this was the focus of research by Frederick Bruce in terms of the trajectory from scripture to the Qumran interpretation of it. Geza Vermes brought to England the significant dimension of trying to set the scriptural interpretation on the compositions found in the Qumran caves in the broader context of contemporary and later Jewish scriptural exegesis. His work in this direction had been particularly stimulated through interaction with Renée Bloch in Paris. Coincidentally, in the 1970s George Brooke engaged in doctoral studies with William Brownlee, a leading exponent of the *Pesher of Habakkuk*. Brooke's interests in the interpretation of scripture in the Scrolls have resulted in a long list of publications concerned variously with the form, content, genres, and methods of interpretation in the Scrolls. Overall Brooke has been concerned with trying to appreciate the strategies of interpretation in the Scrolls on their own terms, whilst his Manchester colleague Philip Alexander has continued to describe the transmission of authoritative scriptural texts and their interpretation in ways that show him to be building on and developing Vermes's insights.

Through his long career Vermes has continued his interest in Jewish scriptural exegesis and contributed several significant studies in the area that have built on the wider concerns and detailed analyses of his earlier articles of over sixty years ago. He has fostered an interest in scriptural interpretation in several of his doctoral students. Amongst them, five can be named

as having ongoing interests in the topic. Chief amongst the five is Philip Alexander, just mentioned, Verme's co-worker on the cave 4 manuscripts of the *Community Rule*. Over the years, Alexander has made and looks set to continue to make valuable contributions on the handling of the Jewish scriptures in the Scrolls and other Jewish literature. Two rabbinics specialists, Robert Hayward (Professor at Durham University) and Alexander Samely (Professor at Manchester University), have made significant advances in the understanding of the handling of Jewish tradition by the targumists and in other rabbinic literature, providing insights from those broader contexts that need to use the evidence from the Qumran caves as a point of continuity in the trajectories they discern. Together with Alexander, their ongoing work on literary typology will have important things to say about the Qumran literature. Two other scholars with Oxford doctorates have also often engaged with the interpretation of the scriptures in the Scrolls from Qumran. Jonathan Campbell worked on the scriptural traditions that resonate in the Admonitions of the *Damascus Document* and has since widened his interests to include other exegetical compositions from the Qumran caves. Timothy Lim began by juxtaposing Paul's interpretative assumptions and habits with those of the Qumran sectarians and has since worked on the *pesharim* in more detail. Most of these scholars are still actively engaged in research on scriptural interpretation in early Judaism in one form or another.

Overall, there has been a very rich history of research on the Scrolls in the United Kingdom. Twelve scholars active in Britain have been members of the international team responsible for parts of the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series; work on the primary data of the Scrolls continues in various ways, not least through the scientific analysis of the leather remains and the digitization of the whole collection. Whilst some of the early theories on the historical setting of the Scrolls by scholars at British universities have not stood the test of time, several of the early popular descriptions of the first years of scholarly discovery remain sound reading. In addition, research on the rule books, the *Damascus Document* and the *Community Rule* in particular, and the investigation of all aspects of scriptural interpretation, those two longstanding research interests of scholars working in Britain, look set to continue for the next generation with productive vigour.

## RESEARCH OF QUMRAN SCROLLS IN THE NETHERLANDS

EIBERT J. C. TIGCHELAAR\*

### *Introduction*

The history of Scrolls research in the Netherlands is primarily characterized by continuity, reflected in the lengthy careers of its two pioneers, Jan van der Ploeg and Adam van der Woude, and by their initiatives in establishing three major research tools: in 1957 the series *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah (STDJ)*, in 1961 the Groningen Qumran Institute, and in 1970 the *Journal for the Study of Judaism (JSJ)*. They were also instrumental in the publication of the Dutch lot of Qumran Scrolls from cave 11. In the 1990s all these initiatives were continued by a third scholar, who must be mentioned from the outset, namely Florentino García Martínez. This continuity somewhat blurs the boundaries between the two phases of research that transpired. In fact, for the Dutch situation the entire decade of the 1970s was a transitional period in Dutch Scrolls research, and we accordingly treat some parts of it at that time as belonging to the first phase.<sup>1</sup>

### *The First Phase (1947-1970)*

In a way, Dutch scholarship of the Scrolls began that very morning in late July 1947 in Jerusalem when Jan van der Ploeg went with Father Marmardji to St. Mark's Monastery at the request of Mar Athanasius Yeshue Samuel to take a look at some Hebrew manuscripts. The event has been recounted by

---

\* Thanks are due to Florentino García Martínez for his insight and feedback, to Wout van Bekkum, Mladen Popović and Jaap J. Tigchelaar, for providing me with literature and data when I was writing this article at Florida State University, to Karel Vriezen for information concerning his father, and Colin Womack, graduate student at FSU, for improving the English.

<sup>1</sup> For a brief overview of Scrolls research in the Netherlands, see also Florentino García Martínez and Julio Trebolle Barrera, "Qumran Scholarship: A European Perspective," in Kugler and Schuller, *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty*, 129-41 (136-38).



both van der Ploeg and Yeshue Samuel.<sup>2</sup> Apparently van der Ploeg was the first person to identify the *Great Isaiah Scroll* as a copy of the book of Isaiah. He was also shown the *Pesher of Habakkuk* scroll, where he believed he discovered a miscellany of biblical texts from the Minor Prophets and non-biblical texts, as well as the 1QS scroll. However, Yeshue Samuel wanted confirmation of his hope that these were scrolls from antiquity, which van der Ploeg, being no expert in the field, found hard to believe. He did offer to put Yeshue Samuel in touch with other scholars, but the bishop refused. According to van der Ploeg, the bishop did permit him to bring a Jewish scholar from Amsterdam to the monastery, but that scholar was unable to go there.<sup>3</sup>

*Johannes Petrus Maria van der Ploeg (1909-2004)*

Jan van der Ploeg entered the Dominican Order in Huissen (Netherlands) in 1926 at the age of 17, and subsequently studied theology and biblical studies, including Hebrew and Syriac, in Zwolle, Huissen, Le Saulchoir (Belgium) and at the Angelicum in Rome. In 1934 he completed his theological studies with a dissertation on the Deutero-Isaian servant songs, and started teaching Hebrew and an introduction to the Old Testament in Zwolle (1934) and subsequently Hebrew at the Dominican Albertinum in Nijmegen (1937). Early in his career he became interested in the Syrian Church, about which he published a book in 1942.<sup>4</sup> In 1946 he completed his biblical studies with the dissertation *Fondaments bibliques d'une sociographie d'Israël au temps des rois*. He spent the following year at the École Biblique in Jerusalem, where he took courses in Arabic and biblical archaeology. On his return to the Netherlands he resumed his teaching at the Albertinum. In 1951 he became Professor of Old Testament and He-

<sup>2</sup> Athanasius Yeshue Samuel, *Treasure of Qumran: My Story of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966), 151; Jan van der Ploeg, *The Excavations at Qumran: a Survey of the Judaean Brotherhood and its Ideas* (trans. Kevin Smyth; London: Longmans, 1958), 8-15.

<sup>3</sup> Ed Noort, "In Memoriam Johannes Petrus Maria van der Ploeg," in *Levensberichten en Herdenkingen 2006* (Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Édita, 2006), 48-54 (a more detailed version is online on <http://irs.ub.rug.nl/dbi/4715cc2676211>), reveals that the scholar whose name van der Ploeg did not give was Isaac Leo Seeligmann (1907-1982). At the time he was curator of the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana in Amsterdam, but in summer 1947 he was in Jerusalem for the First World Congress of Jewish Studies. In 1950 Seeligmann became Professor of Biblical Studies at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. On van der Ploeg, see also Herman Teule, "In Memoriam Prof. Dr J. P. M. van der Ploeg," *Nieuwsbrief voor het Oosters Christendom* 12 (December 2004): 4-5.

<sup>4</sup> Jan van der Ploeg, *Oud-Syrisch Monniksleven* (Leiden: Brill, 1942).

brew at the Catholic University of Nijmegen. Syriac was officially added to his chair in 1955. Van der Ploeg stayed in Nijmegen until his retirement in 1979.

As early as 1950 van der Ploeg started publishing reviews and articles on the Dead Sea Scrolls. These works include the first complete French translations of the *Community Rule* and the *War Scroll*,<sup>5</sup> as well as one of the first extensive overviews of the Scrolls and their contents, first in Dutch and then in English and German translation.<sup>6</sup> His stature in the field was acknowledged in 1956 when he became editor of the new series *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* (STDJ); in 1957 he presided over the ninth meeting of the “Journées Bibliques de Louvain.” This gathering was devoted for the first time to the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>7</sup> In 1958 he was accepted as a full member of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, with explicit reference to his expertise in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and in 1959 he published his monograph on the *War Scroll*.<sup>8</sup>

In his scholarly work, van der Ploeg was first of all a philologist, reluctant to launch or embrace grand theses, and in his exegetical work he preferred lexical studies to those of theological concepts. In one of his reviews he tellingly remarks that in the study of ancient texts things are rarely unambiguous, and few interpretations are absolutely certain. Nonetheless, in his own work, he did not hesitate to launch new views and interpretations, as in his work on the *War Scroll*, where he argued for its composite character.

In the 1950s he made repeated visits to the Middle East and the École Biblique (1950, 1953, 1956). So, not surprisingly, at the end of that decade van der Ploeg and his fellow Dominican, Roland de Vaux, who was President of the Board of Trustees of the Palestine Archaeological Museum, discussed the conditions for acquiring scrolls found in January 1956 in cave 11. At van der Ploeg's initiative, the Royal Netherlands Academy acquired publication rights to most of the cave 11 materials, and appointed him and van der Woude to unroll, transcribe, study and publish the materials. To

<sup>5</sup> Jan van der Ploeg, “Le ‘Manuel de discipline’ des Rouleaux de la Mer Morte,” *BO* 8 (1951): 113-26; “La Règle de la guerre, traduction et notes,” *VT* 5 (1955): 373-420.

<sup>6</sup> Jan van der Ploeg, *Vondsten in de Woestijn van Juda. De Rollen der Dode Zee* (Utrecht: Spectrum, 1957); *The Excavations at Qumran: a Survey of the Judaean Brotherhood and its Ideas; Funde in der Wüste Juda. Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer und die Bruderschaft von Qumrân* (trans. A. Schorn; Cologne: Bachem, 1959).

<sup>7</sup> The proceedings were published in Jan van der Ploeg et al., eds., *La secte de Qumrân et les origines du christianisme. Communications aux IXes Journées bibliques Louvain 1957* (RechBib 4; Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1959).

<sup>8</sup> Jan van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre. Traduit et annoté, avec une introduction* (STDJ 2; Brill: Leiden, 1959).

this end, van der Ploeg went to Jerusalem three times, in 1962, 1963, and 1966, accompanied by van der Woude on the first and last of these visits. In his articles, van der Ploeg repeatedly refers to Józef Milik, with whom he clearly discussed the cave 11 materials in Jerusalem. Below we consider the cave 11 acquisition and editions in more detail; here we just note that van der Ploeg and van der Woude published the *Targum of Job* (11QtgJob) in 1971, and that van der Ploeg independently published preliminary editions of other manuscripts, including 11Q11 (11QApocryphal Psalms), between 1965 and 1972.<sup>9</sup>

Yet van der Ploeg's biography and bibliography clearly show that the Scrolls were not his main concern, and that his personal and academic interests had shifted to other areas. In the 1960s and early 1970s his Hebrew Bible work was focused on the book of Psalms, resulting in an annotated translation (1963) and a thousand-page, two-volume commentary (1971-1974).<sup>10</sup> His personal interest lay not with the Psalms or the fragmentary scrolls, but with the piety and rites of Syriac Christianity, which he had first experienced in the 1930s. In 1963 he was ordained *chorepiskopos* of Amid (Diarbekir) by Ignatius Gabriel I Cardinal Tappouni, the Patriarch of Antioch. Thereafter his engagement was with the Catholics of the Syriac Rite in Kerala, India, whom he often visited. He started studying the collections of Syriac manuscripts in India, as well as Syriac manuscripts from Kerala in European collections, resulting in his volume on the subject.<sup>11</sup> In 1971, contrary to certain aspects of Vatican II, he founded, for the preservation of Roman Catholic life in the Netherlands, a conservative organization, over which he presided and whose journal he edited.

After 1971 few noteworthy events connect van der Ploeg to the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls. At the 1976 Journées Bibliques de Louvain, the second meeting devoted entirely to the Scrolls, Yigael Yadin read a paper on the *Temple Scroll*, and presented fragments from other copies of the *Temple Scroll*. Due to sickness, van der Ploeg could not attend Yadin's lecture, but later, during the colloquium, he presented a paper on four major fragments of 11Q20, which he entitled *halakha*. It was immediately clear that Yadin's additional fragments, which he had already included in his forthcoming book, were the same as those entrusted to van der Ploeg. A debate followed, but in the end it was thought to be in the interest of scholarship that Yadin

<sup>9</sup> For full bibliographical references see below.

<sup>10</sup> *Psalmen, uit de grondtekst vertaald en uitgelegd* (2 vols.; Roermond: Romen, 1971-1974).

<sup>11</sup> *The Christians of Saint Thomas in South India and their Syriac Manuscripts* (Placid Lecture Series 3; Bangalore: Dharmaram, 1983).

proceed with his publication.<sup>12</sup> One senses that this marked the end of van der Ploeg's concern for the Scrolls. At the end of his active academic career he published some of the smaller fragments from cave 11,<sup>13</sup> and in 1985 he entrusted the remaining unpublished non-biblical materials to the editorship of Florentino García Martínez.

In retrospect, van der Ploeg must be credited as the first Dutch scholar of the Dead Sea Scrolls. His strengths included strong philological competence, broad historical knowledge, and a critical view of both his own work and that of others. This academic attitude, as well as the personal and Dominican connection between de Vaux and van der Ploeg, eventually led to the acquisition of the Dutch lot of cave 11. The archives of the Royal Netherlands Academy show that van der Ploeg pleaded for swift publication of the cave 11 materials, and most of the Dutch manuscripts were indeed published fairly quickly. Also, the STDJ series that he founded developed into the most important series of the Scrolls scholarship. But his overall influence on Dutch Qumran research remained limited. He had few students<sup>14</sup> and later his own research moved elsewhere.<sup>15</sup> Eventually Dutch Qumran research became centered in Groningen.

---

<sup>12</sup> References to this event are found in Jan van der Ploeg, "Une *halakha* inédite de Qumrân," in Delcor, *Qumrân, sa piéte*, 107-13 (112-13); Yigael Yadin, "Le Rouleau du Temple," in Delcor, *Qumrân, sa piéte*, 115-19 (119 n. 2); *The Temple Scroll* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983), 1:ix; cf. also Adam Simon van der Woude, "Ein bisher unveröffentlichtes Fragment der Tempelrolle," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 89-92.

<sup>13</sup> Jan P. M. van der Ploeg, "Les manuscrits de la Grotte XI de Qumrân," *RevQ* 12 (1985): 3-15; "Fragments de Psaumes de Qumrân," in Zdzisław J. Kapera, ed., *Intertestamental Essays in Honour of Jozef Tadeusz Milik* (Krakow: Enigma, 1992), 233-7.

<sup>14</sup> His only doctoral student who actually completed a dissertation on the Scrolls was Otrilie Schwarz (1922-1986), the first woman with a Ph.D. in theology from a Dutch Catholic University. Her dissertation was published under the title *Der Erste Teil der Damaskusschrift und das Alte Testament* (Lichtland/Diest, 1965). Another of his students published a summary of his work (M.A. thesis) in the Festschrift for van der Ploeg. See Leo van den Boogaard, "Le Rouleau du Temple. Quelques remarques concernant les petits fragments," in Wilhelmus C. Delsman et al., eds., *Von Kanaan bis Kerala: Festschrift für J. P. M. van der Ploeg zur Vollendung des siebzigsten Lebensjahres am 4. Juli 1979* (Kevelaar: Butzon & Bercken, 1982), 285-94.

<sup>15</sup> Of the 36 contributions to his Festschrift, only four (by Leo van den Boogaard, William Brownlee, Bastiaan Jongeling and Adam van der Woude) are devoted to the Dead Sea Scrolls.

*Adam Simon van der Woude (1927-2000)*<sup>16</sup>

Adam van der Woude was born to a rural, orthodox Protestant family in Oosterlittens, in the northern province of Friesland. He attended the Gymnasium in Leeuwarden where he learnt Greek and Latin, as well as biblical Hebrew. In 1947 he started his studies at the University of Groningen, where he graduated in theology in 1953 and in Semitic languages in 1955. In 1957 he defended and published his doctoral dissertation *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân*. In 1960, after a short period as minister at the Dutch Reformed Church in Noorderlaren-Glimmen, he was appointed Professor of Old Testament and Intertestamental Literature at the Groningen Faculty of Theology, where he remained until his retirement in 1992. He worked on the Scrolls until the end of his life, producing a long series of publications on the Dead Sea Scrolls spanning the years 1953 to 2000.

In a self-portrait, written towards the end of his life at the request of the editors of *Kerk en Theologie*,<sup>17</sup> he describes his organizational and redactional activities as the strongest points of his academic career. His two most important initiatives were the foundation of the Qumran Institute in 1961, and the establishment of the *Journal for the Study of Judaism* in 1970, which is considered below. Note that much of his editorial work was in the field of Old Testament and biblical studies. From 1961 he was one of the main editors of the Dutch Protestant commentary series *De Prediking van het Oude Testament*; from 1972 to 1995 he was editor-in-chief of the series *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, of which he edited four volumes. He was also the general editor of the *Bijbels Handboek*,<sup>18</sup> and editor or co-editor of many

<sup>16</sup> See the bibliographies and appreciation of van der Woude, published by Florentino García Martínez: "Bibliografie van prof. dr. A. S. van der Woude," in Florentino García Martínez, Cornelis H. J. de Geus and Albertus F. J. Klijn, eds., *Profeten en profetische geschriften* (Kampen: Kok, 1985), 163-73; "A Bibliography of A. S. van der Woude," in Florentino García Martínez, Anthony Hilhorst, and Casper J. Labuschagne, eds., *The Scriptures and the Scrolls: Studies in Honour of A.S. van der Woude on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (VTSup 49; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 228-68; "Adam Simon van der Woude 1927-2000," *RevQ* 19 (2000): 501-5 (includes a bibliography 1992-2000); "Adam Simon van der Woude, 1927-2000," *JSJ* 32 (2001): 1-4. For van der Woude's life and career, see Albertus F. J. Klijn, "Wetenschappelijke biografie van Prof. Dr. A.S. van der Woude," in *Profeten en profetische geschriften*, 9-13; Florentino García Martínez and Ed Noort, "Bij het verschijnen van de tiende druk," in Theodoor C. Vriezen and Adam S. van der Woude, *Oudisraëlitische en vroegjoodse literatuur* (10th ed.; Kampen: Kok, 2000), 7-10; Ed Noort, "Herdenking Adam Simon van der Woude," *Levensberichten en herdenkingen 2002* (Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 2002), 133-8.

<sup>17</sup> "Een zelfportret," *Kerk en Theologie* 51 (2000): 64-67.

<sup>18</sup> *Bijbels Handboek* (vols. 1, 2a, 2b, 3; Kok: Kampen, 1981-1987). Volumes 1 and 2a were translated into English as *The World of the Bible* (Bible Handbook 1; Grand Rapids:

other books and series, for example, *Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology*.

Van der Woude's own research career may be divided into three periods. In the first, up to the early 1970s, he focused on the Scrolls. The two main projects were his dissertation and the publication of the cave 11 manuscripts assigned to him, including the joint publication of the *Targum of Job*.<sup>19</sup> He also published annotated Dutch translations of some scrolls, overviews for a general academic public, and the edition of the Five Syriac Psalms in the *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit (JSRZ)* series; he supervised a dissertation on the *Targum of Job* as well.<sup>20</sup> The second period, from the late 1960s to the mid-1980s, was oriented to work on the Minor Prophets. He published many articles on these books. His major effort was the publication of five volumes of commentaries to the prophets Micah to Malachi between 1976 and 1984, a project he had committed to in the early 1960s. Still, this period was not entirely without attention to the Scrolls. In 1976 he published the *Aramaic Texts from Qumran with Translations and Annotations*,<sup>21</sup> and in 1982 an article on the Wicked Priest.<sup>22</sup> His best-known article is the edition of the largest fragments of the *Melchizedek Peshar* (11Q17).<sup>23</sup> The third period, from the late 1980s until his death, focused on both the book of Daniel and the Scrolls. Sadly, van der Woude could not complete his commentary on Daniel. He did, however, publish widely on the Scrolls, including an extensive four-part survey

---

Eerdmans, 1986; repr. *The World of the Old Testament*, Bible Handbook 2; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989).

<sup>19</sup> Jan P. M. van der Ploeg and Adam S. van der Woude, with Bastiaan Jongeling, *Le Targum de Job de la grotte XI de Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 1971).

<sup>20</sup> Evert Willem Tuinstra, *Hermeneutische aspecten van de Targum van Job uit grot XI van Qumrân* (Groningen, 1970). In sum, van der Woude supervised eleven Ph.D. dissertations in Groningen, only two of which were directly related to the Scrolls, namely Tuinstra's (1970) and García Martínez's (1992), and one in part, namely Geert Lorein's (1997). The other eight dissertations are those of Jan Kees de Geus (1972), James Loader (1975), Hendrik Spykerboer (1976), Thomas Boogaart (1981), Roel Oost (1986), Eibert Tigchelaar (1994), Gerda Boiten (1996), and Jan Boersema (1997).

<sup>21</sup> Bastiaan Jongeling, Casper J. Labuschagne, and Adam S. van der Woude, *Aramaic Texts from Qumran with Translations and Annotations* (SSS, N.S. 4; Leiden: Brill, 1976).

<sup>22</sup> Adam S. van der Woude, "Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests: Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Commentary," *JJS* 33 (1982): 349-59. See also "Once Again: the Wicked Priest in the *Habakkuk Peshar* from Cave 1 of Qumran," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 375-84.

<sup>23</sup> "Melchizedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midrashim aus Qumran Höhle XI," *OTS* 14 (1965): 354-73. See also Marinus de Jonge and Adam S. van der Woude, "11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament," *NTS* 12 (1966): 301-26.

of Qumran research from 1974 to 1988 for the *Theologische Rundschau*,<sup>24</sup> and reflections on the Qumran biblical manuscripts and the evolution of the biblical text.<sup>25</sup> Together with García Martínez he published an article on the “Groningen Hypothesis”—on the origins and early history of the Qumran community<sup>26</sup>—and a two-volume Dutch translation with introductions to the non-biblical scrolls.<sup>27</sup> Finally, he was actively involved in the preparation of the DJD XXIII edition of manuscripts that he had first published. The volume includes the Qumran manuscript lot allotted to the Royal Netherlands Academy for publication.<sup>28</sup>

Many of these projects are discussed in detail below. Here we set out van der Woude’s general views on the field and his research in the Scrolls. He firmly believed that religious texts can be understood and studied only in their historical and literary context. He therefore sharply criticized any approach that did not fully take into account the historical dimensions of the Hebrew Bible text. This concern prompted him to establish the *Journal for the Study of Judaism (JSJ)* to create a forum for discussing the historical and literary aspects of the Qumran Scrolls’ context and background.

Most of his own work on the Hebrew Bible and the Scrolls was of philological and historical-critical character, accomplished through detailed exegesis of specific texts. He was not prone to larger theses or syntheses, and he generally avoided conceptual studies that would demand correlating the data of different texts and corpora. But in the field of the Scrolls, two of his most famous studies are exceptions to this general tendency. In his dissertation, van der Woude combined a thorough and detailed exegetical analysis with a more conceptual approach. However, in the joint article with García Martínez, “A ‘Groningen’ Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History,” the suppositions are more synthetic and daring than what is usually found in his articles. Perhaps it had to do with the combined authorship,

<sup>24</sup> Adam S. van der Woude, “Fünfzehn Jahre Qumran Forschung (1974-1988),” *TRu* 54 (1989): 221-61; 56 (1990): 245-307; 57 (1992): 1-57, 311-37.

<sup>25</sup> *Pluriformiteit en uniformiteit: overwegingen betreffende de tekstoverlevering van het Oude Testament* (Kok: Kampen, 1992); “Pluriformity and Uniformity: Reflections on the Transmission of the Text of the Old Testament,” in Jan N. Bremmer and Florentino García Martínez, eds., *Sacred History and Sacred Texts in Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of A. S. van der Woude* (Kampen: Kok, 1992), 151-69.

<sup>26</sup> Florentino García Martínez and Adam S. van der Woude, “A ‘Groningen’ Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History,” *RevQ* 14 (1990): 521-41.

<sup>27</sup> Florentino García Martínez and Adam S. van der Woude, *De Rollen van de Dode Zee: Ingeleid en in het Nederlands vertaald* (2 vols.; Kampen: Kok, 1994-1995).

<sup>28</sup> Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11.II: (11Q2-18, 11Q20-31)* (DJD XXIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998).



which introduced a broader element into his more philological and exegetical work.

His dissertation, the joint edition of the *Targum of Job*,<sup>29</sup> and his own editions of cave 11 manuscripts, as well as his commentaries on the Minor Prophets, earned van der Woude international recognition, offers from other universities (which he declined), membership of the Royal Netherlands Academy from 1974 (he was President of the Humanities and Social Sciences section from 1987 to 1990), as well as honorary doctorates from Munich (1972) and St. Andrews (1985). More importantly, van der Woude wove a fabric of international academic ties with scholars from the fields of the Hebrew Bible, Second Temple Judaism and Qumran studies. The first steps were taken when he wrote parts of his dissertation during sojourns in Heidelberg with Karl Georg Kuhn, in Basel with Walter Baumgartner, and in Paris with André Dupont-Sommer. Even before defending his dissertation he participated in the ninth Louvain Biblical Colloquium in 1957, being the most junior scholar there. The high regard for his scholarship was reflected by the advisory board he was able to assemble for the new *Journal for the Study of Judaism* that he established. It consisted mostly of internationally renowned scholars. Recognition of his academic standing was also expressed in 1987, when he became a member of the first advisory board of the *Revue de Qumran*, together with Jean Starcky, Józef Milik, Jerome Murphy O'Connor, and John Strugnell. Yet in his own projects he preferred to work with his close collaborators at the Groningen Qumran Institute (Bastiaan Jongeling, Florentino García Martínez), with colleagues at the Groningen faculty (Marinus de Jonge, Casper Labuschagne), and with other Dutch colleagues in his Hebrew Bible projects.

Van der Woude's contributions to Scrolls research are considerable. He founded both the Groningen Qumran Institute and the *Journal for the Study of Judaism*. He published at exemplary speed and quality the cave 11 materials assigned to him; some of his publications have become classics in the field, and are used and cited to this day.

### *The Qumran Institute in the 1960s and 1970s*

In 1961 the University of Groningen encouraged the creation of research institutes in specialized fields. Seizing the opportunity, van der Woude established the Qumran Institute. At first the institute received funding only for books and journals, but with the expansion of the Dutch universi-

---

<sup>29</sup> Van der Ploeg and van der Woude, *Le Targum de Job*.

ties in the late 1960s new resources became available. Bastiaan Jongeling (1913-1986) was appointed special research assistant at the Qumran Institute (1968 to 1978).

Jongeling<sup>30</sup> studied theology at the Free University in Amsterdam, and later Semitic languages in Groningen, where he wrote a dissertation on the *War Scroll* in 1962. After his retirement from ministry in 1966, he taught for one year at the Université Libre du Congo in Kisangani, before going to the Qumran Institute in 1968. There he was entrusted with compiling a bibliography of Scrolls research, resulting in the publication of the *Classified Bibliography 1958-1969*.<sup>31</sup> Jongeling also became involved in the editing of the *Targum of Job*, assisted van der Woude with editorial work on the *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, and was a member of its board from 1970 until his death. In addition to his own articles on the Scrolls, which were mainly philological and linguistic, he contributed to *Aramaic Texts from Qumran with Translations and Annotations* and published a monograph in Dutch on the *Targum of Job*.<sup>32</sup>

Jongeling's activities were typical of members of the Qumran Institute, which did not focus on specific research topics but sought to furnish a wide range of tools and materials for both scholars and a more general (Dutch) readership. From its beginning until 1996 the Qumran Institute was responsible for the Dead Sea Scrolls bibliography, and for many years most of the reviews of articles in *JSJ* were prepared by van der Woude and Jongeling, and later by the other Groningen contributors too. The tradition of publishing texts and translations of the Scrolls started in Groningen with van der Woude's first booklet in 1954 and went on until the revised 2007 Dutch translation of the non-biblical Scrolls.<sup>33</sup> Jongeling's monograph exemplifies the mission of the Qumran Institute to make the results of the study of the Scrolls known to a wider Dutch audience.

---

<sup>30</sup> Adam S. van der Woude, "In Erinnerung an Bastiaan Jongeling (1913-1986)," *JSJ* 17 (1986): 2; Jeannette C. Schaeffer, "Jongeling, Bastiaan," in *Biografisch Lexicon van het Nederlands Protestantisme. Deel 5* (Kampen: Kok, 2001), 294-5.

<sup>31</sup> Bastiaan Jongeling, *A Classified Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1958-1969* (STDJ 7; Leiden: Brill, 1971).

<sup>32</sup> Bastiaan Jongeling, *Een Aramees Boek Job uit de bibliotheek van Qumrân* (Exegetica, Nieuwe reeks 3; Amsterdam: Bolland, 1974).

<sup>33</sup> Florentino García Martínez and Adam S. van der Woude, in collaboration with Mladen Popović, *De Rollen van de Dode Zee* (Baarn: Ten Have, 2007).

*The Dutch lot of cave 11*

The first letter in the Royal Netherlands Academy archives referring to the Scrolls is a letter from de Vaux to van der Ploeg, dated June 7, 1959. He asks him to convey to the Royal Academy the offer by the Jordanian government concerning the acquisition of publication rights to manuscripts. It is not clear who started the correspondence since de Vaux's letter refers to a previous question by van der Ploeg. It is noteworthy that de Vaux also mentions "plusieurs manuscrits entre les mains des Bédouins." He relates that he made a similar offer to two American universities. De Vaux's letter was sent to the Royal Academy as an attachment to a memorandum written on July 10 by Willem van Unnik and Theodoor Vriezen, also on behalf of Jan van der Ploeg, to the Royal Netherlands Academy. It suggests that the Academy purchase the publication rights to manuscripts.

The Academy entered into negotiations with the Palestine Archeological Museum, but the initial conditions had to be changed slightly when on May 8, 1961 all the Qumran Scrolls were nationalized by the Jordanian government. In the first agreement between the Dutch Royal Academy and the Palestine Archaeological Museum, signed 23 December 1961, the Royal Academy agreed to donate to Jordan £10,000 for "the manuscript 'Aramaic Targum of Job' from cave 11," and to "acknowledge that after the donation is made the manuscript will become the property of the Jordan government." In return, "the Academy is granted the exclusive right to study the manuscript and to prepare its publication," and "the Academy will nominate, subject to the agreement of the Museum, the scholar or scholars who will...study the manuscript and prepare its publication." The agreement also covers the unrolling, photographing and deciphering of the manuscript, as well as the publication of the text. A part of the sum was funded by another Dutch academic organization, the Nederlandse Organisatie voor Zuiver-Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (ZWO), whose director, Jan Hendrik Bannier, had a special interest in the Scrolls.

Thereafter the Academy nominated Jan van der Ploeg and Adam Simon van der Woude to unroll, decipher, and study the scroll in Jerusalem. Both scholars started their work on March 15, 1962; van der Woude returned there on April 23, and van der Ploeg on May 6, and both reported on their work that year. On December 12, 1962 the Academy signed another agreement for the remaining cave 11 materials, specified as

- a. Unopened scroll and fragments containing an Aramaic text about the New Jerusalem;

- b. Unopened scroll and fragments containing a text provisionally denoted "Olat ha-Shabbat";
- c. Numerous fragments containing biblical texts in square Hebrew (Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Psalms) and non-biblical texts;
- d. Two unopened scrolls of unknown content;
- e. Some small scrolls and fragments also found in Cave 11.

At this time the Royal Netherlands Academy transferred £12,000 to Jordan. In spring 1963 van der Ploeg went to Jerusalem to sort out the fragments and to unroll the still unopened scrolls. Later, in October–November 1966, van der Ploeg and van der Woude studied the fragments together in Jerusalem.

As early as the beginning of the 1960s the Academy convened a Qumran Committee, consisting of Willem van Unnik (Utrecht), Theodoor Vriezen (Utrecht), Martin David (Leiden), Martinus Beek (Amsterdam), Reinier Schippers (Free University Amsterdam) and Willem Grossouw (Nijmegen); few records remain of its meetings. At its fourth meeting on June 8, 1962, members discussed the acquisition of the other cave 11 materials (Vriezen requested to be allowed to examine the fragments before acquisition), as well as how to proceed with the materials. They believed that before publication other scholars in the Netherlands should be granted the opportunity to study the fragments, and to complete dissertations on the cave 11 materials. It is not known how this was put into practice, but in November 1968 van der Ploeg sent a letter to the Academy, complaining that delay in the publication of the materials was due to the interference of the Academy's Qumran Committee.

The Dutch publication of the cave 11 materials began with two communications on the *Targum of Job* in 1962, and was followed in the 1960s and early 1970s by a series of preliminary publications of large fragments and manuscripts. Thus van der Ploeg published the version of Psalm 91 of 11Q11,<sup>34</sup> the large fragment containing the Plea for Deliverance of 11Q6,<sup>35</sup> 11Q2,<sup>36</sup> an overview of all the materials,<sup>37</sup> the remainder of 11Q11<sup>38</sup> and

<sup>34</sup> Jan van der Ploeg, "Le Psaume XCI dans une recension de Qumrân," *RB* 72 (1965): 210-17.

<sup>35</sup> Jan van der Ploeg, "Fragments d'un manuscrit de Psaumes de Qumran (11QPs<sup>b</sup>)," *RB* 74 (1967): 408-12.

<sup>36</sup> Jan van der Ploeg, "Lév. IX 23-X 2 dans un texte de Qumrân," in Siegfried Wagner, ed., *Bibel und Qumran: Beiträge zur Erforschung zwischen Bibel- und Qumranwissenschaft. Hans Bardtke zum 22.9.1966* (Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1968), 153-5.

<sup>37</sup> Jan van der Ploeg, "L'édition des manuscrits de la Grotte XI de Qumrân par l'Académie Royale des Sciences des Pays-Bas," in Pieter W. Pestman, *Acta Orientalia Neerlandica: Proceedings of the Congress of the Dutch Oriental Society Held in Leiden on the Occasion of Its 50th anniversary, 8th-9th May 1970* (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 43-45.

a fragment of 11Q7.<sup>39</sup> Van der Woude published 11Q13,<sup>40</sup> 11Q14<sup>41</sup> and 11Q12.<sup>42</sup> Jongeling published one fragment of 11Q18 in 1970.<sup>43</sup> Most substantial, however, was the joint publication of the *Targum of Job* in 1971.<sup>44</sup> This overview shows that many materials had already been published in 1968 when van der Ploeg voiced his complaint. The publication of other materials in the years after 1968 suggests that whatever the restrictions imposed by the Qumran Committee, they had apparently been lifted.

The process of publication slowed down after the early 1970s because of the fragmentary nature of the remaining manuscripts, and because the editors were aware that other cave 4 materials yet unpublished included copies of the same works.<sup>45</sup> Van der Ploeg presented some of the 11Q20 fragments in 1976 at the Louvain Biblical Colloquium,<sup>46</sup> but Yadin incorporated most of the 11Q20 fragments in his edition of the *Temple Scroll*.<sup>47</sup> Van der Ploeg's student Leo van der Boogaard commented on parts of the fragments which Yadin had included but had not transcribed (1982).<sup>48</sup> In 1985 van der Ploeg entrusted the then still unpublished materials to García Martínez, who in 1988 gave a general description of all the preserved frag-

<sup>38</sup> Jan van der Ploeg, "Un petit rouleau de psaumes apocryphes (11QPsa<sup>a</sup>)," in Gert Jeremias, Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, and Hartmut Stegmann, eds., *Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt. Festgabe für Karl Georg Kuhn zum 65. Geburtstag* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 128-39.

<sup>39</sup> Jan van der Ploeg, "Fragments d'un psautier de Qumrân," in Martinus A. Beek et al., eds., *Symbolae Biblicae et Mesopotamicae: Francisco Mario Theodora De Liagre-Böhl dedicatae* (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 308-9.

<sup>40</sup> Adam S. Van der Woude, "Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI," in *OtSt* 14 (Brill: Leiden, 1965): 354-73; and with Marinus de Jonge, "11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament," *NTS* 12 (1965-1966): 301-26.

<sup>41</sup> Adam S. Van der Woude, "Ein neuer Segensspruch aus Qumran (11QBer)," in Wagner, *Bibel und Qumran*, 253-8.

<sup>42</sup> Adam S. Van der Woude, "Fragmente des Buches Jubiläen aus Qumran Höhle XI (11QJub)," in Jeremias, Kuhn and Stegmann, *Tradition und Glaube*, 140-46.

<sup>43</sup> Bastiaan Jongeling, "Publication provisoire d'un fragment provenant de la grotte 11 de Qumrân (11QJérNouv AR)," *JSJ* 1 (1970): 58-64; "Note additionnelle," *JSJ* 1 (1970): 185-6.

<sup>44</sup> van der Ploeg, van der Woude, with Bastiaan Jongeling, *Le Targum de Job de la Grotte XI de Qumrân*.

<sup>45</sup> E.g., van der Ploeg, "L'édition des manuscrits de la Grotte XI de Qumrân," 45, mentions cave 4 fragments of the *Temple Scroll*, and van der Woude in his 11Q17 publication refers to the unpublished cave 4 and Masada manuscripts of the *Shirot Olai ha-Shabbat*.

<sup>46</sup> Van der Ploeg, "Une *halakha* inédite de Qumrân."

<sup>47</sup> Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll, vol. 3 Supplementary Plates* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977 [Hebrew] and 1983 [English]), pls. \*35-\*40.

<sup>48</sup> Van den Boogaard, "Le Rouleau du Temple. Quelques remarques concernant les 'petits fragments'."

ments<sup>49</sup> and in 1992 published more 11Q20 fragments.<sup>50</sup> Van der Woude published the largest 11Q17 fragments in 1982, in the Festschrift for van der Ploeg,<sup>51</sup> and Carol Newsom included in her monograph more 11Q17 fragments from a photograph (PAM 43.448) that was apparently unknown to van der Woude.<sup>52</sup> García Martínez published the 11Q18 fragments in two different articles (1992; 1997).<sup>53</sup> Van der Ploeg transcribed 11Q15 and 11Q16 in 1985,<sup>54</sup> and some of the 11Q6-11Q8 fragments in 1992.<sup>55</sup> A preliminary edition of all 11Q6-11Q8 fragments was published by Florentino García Martínez and Eibert Tigchelaar in 1996.<sup>56</sup>

In the final stage of publishing all the Dutch cave 11 materials, all the fragments were re-examined, the existing editions were revised, and many smaller and tiny fragments were edited for the first time. The product was published in DJD XXIII. The last stages of this editorial work were carried out at the Groningen Qumran Institute by Florentino García Martínez and Eibert Tigchelaar, with the active involvement of van der Woude in the texts he had initially published.

### *Other Dutch studies of the Scrolls*

Van der Woude's two most important teachers at the Faculty of Theology and the Faculty of Arts were Theodoor Vriezen (1899-1981),<sup>57</sup> who taught

<sup>49</sup> Florentino García Martínez, "Texts from Qumran Cave 11," in Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Forty Years of Research* (STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 18-26. The paper was presented in March 1988.

<sup>50</sup> Florentino García Martínez, "11QTemple<sup>b</sup>: A Preliminary Publication," in Trebolle Barrera and Vegas Montaner, *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 2:363-90.

<sup>51</sup> Van der Woude, "Fragmente einer Rolle der Lieder für das Sabbatopfer aus Höhle XI von Qumran (11QŠirŠabb)," in Delsman et al., *Von Kanaan bis Kerala*, 311-37.

<sup>52</sup> Carol Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSM 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 361-87.

<sup>53</sup> Florentino García Martínez, "The Last Surviving Columns of 11QNJ," in García Martínez, Hilhorst, and Labuschagne, eds., *The Scriptures and the Scrolls*, 178-92; "More Fragments of 11QNJ," in Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich, eds., *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 186-98.

<sup>54</sup> Van der Ploeg, "Les manuscrits de la Grotte XI de Qumrân."

<sup>55</sup> Van der Ploeg, "Fragments de Psaumes de Qumrân."

<sup>56</sup> Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, "Psalms Manuscripts From Qumran Cave 11: A Preliminary Edition," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 73-107.

<sup>57</sup> Adam S. van der Woude, "Vriezen, Theodorus Christiaan," in *Biografisch Lexicon van het Nederlands Protestantisme. Deel 5* (Kampen: Kok, 2001), 549-51. See also Meindert Dijkstra and Karel J. H. Vriezen, eds., *Th. C. Vriezen. Hervormd theoloog en oudtestamenticus* (Kampen: Kok, 1999).

Old Testament, and Johannes Hendrik Hospers (1921-1993),<sup>58</sup> a specialist of Semitic languages. Both were active in stimulating work on the Scrolls in the 1950s and early 1960s, and in some respects they may be regarded as the forefathers of Qumran research in the northern Netherlands. Three months after van der Woude went to Groningen as a student, Hospers, only six years older than he, was appointed professor of Semitic languages. Vriezen and Hospers soon published a booklet on Palestine inscriptions, and teamed up as editors of the series *Semietische Teksten met Vertaling* in which van der Woude's first small book with text and translation of the *Pesher of Habakkuk* appeared.<sup>59</sup> For the same publishing house, namely van Gorcum in Assen, Vriezen and Hospers, together with Martinus Beek, became the editors of the *Studia Semitica Neerlandica*, which published van der Woude's and Jongeling's dissertations related to the Qumran Scrolls.<sup>60</sup>

In 1956 Vriezen left Groningen for Utrecht, and Berend Gemser (1890-1962) was appointed to the Groningen chair of Old Testament (April 1957 - September 1960). When van der Woude defended his dissertation in October 1957 Hospers served as his promoter. Hospers also directed the second and third Dutch dissertations on the Scrolls, those of Bastiaan Jongeling (1962)<sup>61</sup> and Jan Buitkamp (1964).<sup>62</sup> In those years, until 1965, the Faculty of Theology with van der Woude as Professor of Old Testament, and the Semitists with Hospers, shared the same small university building. But later the two drifted apart.

Two years after Vriezen went to Utrecht as Professor of Old Testament, Hendrik Antonie Brongers (1904-1986) was appointed there Associate Professor of Old Testament. As students, Vriezen and Brongers had been members of the same theological debating society, and had become close friends. It was Vriezen who launched the idea of a new series of translations of the major Scrolls,<sup>63</sup> and between 1957 and 1960 four volumes appeared, two

<sup>58</sup> Jan Kees de Geus, "Hospers, Johannes Hendrik," in *Biografisch Lexicon van het Nederlands Protestantisme. Deel 5* (Kampen: Kok, 2001), 261-3.

<sup>59</sup> F. A. W. van 't Land and Adam S. van der Woude, *De Habakuk-rol van 'Ain Fašha: tekst en vertaling* (Assen: van Gorcum, 1954).

<sup>60</sup> Adam S. van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân* (SSN 3; Assen: van Gorcum, 1957); Bastiaan Jongeling, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre des manuscrits de Qumran. Commentaire et traduction* (SSN 4; Assen: van Gorcum, 1962). One of the later volumes in this series is David Shepherd, *Targum and Translation. A Reconsideration of the Qumran Aramaic Version of Job* (SSN 45; Assen: van Gorcum, 2004). In 2007 the series was acquired by Brill.

<sup>61</sup> Jongeling, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*.

<sup>62</sup> Jan Buitkamp, *Die Auferstehungsvorstellungen in den Qumran-texten und ihr alttestamentlicher, apokryphischer, pseudepigraphischer und rabbinischer Hintergrund* (Groningen: V.R.B. Kleine der A 3-4, 1964).

<sup>63</sup> *De handschriften van de Dode Zee in Nederlandse vertaling*.



by his former student van der Woude<sup>64</sup> and two by his friend and collaborator Brongers.<sup>65</sup> In Utrecht, Vriezen supervised the 1965 dissertation of Hendrik Goedhart (1919-1977) on the *Community Rule* (1QS).<sup>66</sup>

Other Dutch publications on the Scrolls in this first phase of research include a 1952 introduction to the Scrolls, with translations of major parts into Dutch, by Albertus Edelkoort (1890-1956),<sup>67</sup> Professor of Old Testament at Utrecht; a 1957 translation of the *Hodayot* into Dutch by Adrianus van Selms (1906-1984), Professor of Semitic languages at the University of Pretoria, South Africa;<sup>68</sup> the 1962 Utrecht dissertation of Andries Dreyer on Luke and the *Hodayot*;<sup>69</sup> and the 1965 Leiden dissertation of Jan de Waard (1931-) on the Old Testament text in the Scrolls and the New Testament.<sup>70</sup>

### *The Second Phase (1970-)*

The second phase of Scrolls research in the Netherlands consists of a transitional period in the 1970s, and a time of vigorous activity from the 1980s to the present. This section centers on the Groningen Qumran Institute when headed by Florentino García Martínez (1980-2007), but will refer to other aspects of Qumran research in the Netherlands as well.

#### *Florentino García Martínez (1942-)*

Born in Mochales in the province of Guadalajara, Spain, on November 27, 1942, García Martínez was educated in the seminary of Sigüenza and the

<sup>64</sup> Adam S. van der Woude, *De dankpsalmen* (Amsterdam: Proost en Brandt, 1957); *Bijbelcommentaren en Bijbelse verhalen* (Amsterdam: Proost en Brandt, 1958).

<sup>65</sup> Hendrik A. Brongers, *De Gedragsregels der Qoemraan-gemeente: het Damascusgeschrift, de Regel der Gemeenschap, het Twee Kolommen-document* (Amsterdam: Proost en Brandt, 1958); *De rol van de strijd* (Amsterdam: Proost en Brandt, 1960).

<sup>66</sup> Hendrik Goedhart, *De Slothymne van het Manual of Discipline* (Rotterdam, 1965). Note that in the spring of 1954, Vriezen had spent two months in Jerusalem, where he daily read, in the Palestine Archaeological Museum, the *Rule of the Community*, together with Frank Moore Cross, James Muilenburg, and Charles T. Fritsch.

<sup>67</sup> Albertus H. Edelkoort, *De handschriften van de Dode Zee* (Bibliotheek van Boeken bij de Bijbel; Baarn: Bosch & Keuning; 1952).

<sup>68</sup> Adrianus van Selms, *De rol der lofprijzingen: een der Dode Zee-rollen vertaald en toegelicht* (Bibliotheek van Boeken bij de Bijbel; Baarn: Bosch & Keuning, 1957).

<sup>69</sup> Andries Johannes Gerhardus Dreyer, *An Examination of the Possible Relation between Luke's Infancy Narratives and the Qumran Hodayot* (Amsterdam: A. A. A. Rotex, 1962).

<sup>70</sup> Jan de Waard, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament* (STDJ 4; Leiden: Brill, 1965).

University of Comillas (Santander), where he graduated *cum laude* in theology in 1967. Ordained as a priest, he taught history at a secondary school, and subsequently studied at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome, where again he graduated *cum laude* in 1973. After research residence at the New York Jewish Theological Seminary, the University of Bonn, and the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, he was a fellow of the Fundación Juan March at the École Biblique et Archéologique Française in Jerusalem from 1975 to 1979. In 1980 van der Woude invited him to take up a position at Groningen University. Soon after his arrival in Groningen, García Martínez became involved in two major journals, the *Journal for the Study of Judaism (JSJ)*, and the *Revue de Qumran*. Beginning in 1980, he wrote numerous reviews of articles and book reviews for the *JSJ*, and in 1990 became its secretary. In 1997 he became its editor-in-chief. From 1981 he was responsible for the Bibliography and Tables published in each issue of the *Revue de Qumran*. Following the death in 1986 of Jean Carmignac, Émile Puech and García Martínez assumed responsibility for the journal, the former as director, the latter as secretary (until 2010). Later in his career, after publishing numerous articles, García Martínez took his doctoral degree in Groningen (1992), once more *cum laude*, with van der Woude as promoter. In 1995 he was appointed Extraordinary Professor, and in 2000 Ordinary Professor, of Early Judaism and Dead Sea Scrolls at the Groningen University's Faculty of Theology. Also in 2000 he was invited to the position of Guest Professor by the Catholic University of Louvain, which appointed him Ordinary Professor in 2002. He then moved to Louvain but continued as a professor in Groningen and director of the Qumran Institute until his retirement from Groningen in 2007. In 2004 he was elected Foreign Member by the Humanities and Social Sciences Division of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences.

At the Groningen Qumran Institute García Martínez continued its traditional activities, including the Dead Sea Scrolls Bibliography, editing the *JSJ*, and publication of texts and translations. During this period he became a central figure in major publication enterprises for the Qumran Scrolls: executive editor of the *Revue de Qumran*, editor of the STDJ series, associate editor of the *JSJ Supplements*, and executive secretary of the International Organization for Qumran Studies. Besides these responsibilities, he produced an impressive array of articles on the Scrolls. His printed output is characterized by three features: (1) extensive and full bibliographical references; (2) a clear presentation of the research of a text or a concept, the

problems involved and their possible solutions; (3) fresh contribution to the topic.

Characteristic of the career of García Martínez is his view of scholarship not as a solitary activity but as a collective enterprise. He published the great majority of his books with co-authors or co-editors. In his work on the Scrolls his cooperative efforts within the Qumran Institute are noteworthy, yielding joint publications with Adam van der Woude, Eibert Tigchelaar, and Mladen Popović. But his bibliography also shows cooperation with Matthias Delcor, Julio Treballe Barrera, Corrado Martone, and Donald Parry.<sup>71</sup>

### *The Qumran Institute since 1980*

After Jongeling retired, the position at the Qumran Institute remained vacant for two years until the appointment of García Martínez in 1980. For the next twelve years, until van der Woude's retirement in 1992, and even after, the two scholars worked together, editing the *JSJ*, writing reviews, discussing and formulating the "Groningen hypothesis," organizing the 1989 Groningen conference, *The Texts of Qumran and the History of the Community*, and publishing the two-volume Dutch translation of the Scrolls with introductions to the separate documents (1994-1995).

García Martínez continued the bibliographical work of the Qumran Institute. The bibliography was published in part in the *Revue de Qumran*,<sup>72</sup> and in full, in cooperation with Donald Parry, between 1970 and 1995,<sup>73</sup> as a sequel to Jongeling's bibliography of 1958-1970. Subsequently, the Scrolls bibliography, for both the *Revue de Qumran* and the follow-up volumes in the STDJ series, was entrusted to the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

The Qumran Institute continued the Groningen tradition in regard to the publication of texts and translations as tools for specialists and sources of information for the general public. García Martínez presented translations of the Scrolls in Spanish, English, Portuguese and, with Corrado Mar-

<sup>71</sup> See "Bibliography of Florentino García Martínez," in Hilhorst, Puech and Tigchelaar, *Flores Florentino*, 803-16.

<sup>72</sup> *RevQ* 11 (1982-1983): 119-59, 295-320, 461-87; *RevQ* 12 (1984-1986): 129-60, 293-315, 455-80.

<sup>73</sup> Florentino García Martínez and Donald W. Parry, *A Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1970-95: Arranged by Author with Citation and Subject Indexes* (STDJ 19; Leiden: Brill, 1996).

tone, Italian.<sup>74</sup> Van der Woude and García Martínez together published the Dutch translation, which was expanded and revised by García Martínez and Popović in 2007. García Martínez and Tigchelaar presented the two-volume study edition of the non-biblical scrolls.<sup>75</sup> In the same period, García Martínez, Tigchelaar and van der Woude completed the publication of the Dutch cave 11 materials in DJD XXIII.

In 1989, to coincide with the celebration of the 375th anniversary of the founding of the University of Groningen, the Faculty of Theology and the Qumran Institute organized an international Qumran congress. At this congress the International Organization for Qumran Studies (IOQS) was founded, with García Martínez as its executive secretary. Since then the IOQS has met every three years. At the fifth congress (2004), held in Groningen, Eibert Tigchelaar became secretary of the organization; and in a public lecture, “The Study of the Texts from Qumran: A Groningen Perspective,”<sup>76</sup> García Martínez told of the philosophy behind the work of the Qumran Institute.

The last decade of the Qumran Institute has also been a period of expansion and change. Tigchelaar received two post-doctoral grants, enabling him to work at the Qumran Institute from 1997 to 2005. Between 2002 and 2007 four doctoral students completed dissertations on the Qumran Scrolls: Géza Xeravits (2002),<sup>77</sup> Albert Hogeterp (2004),<sup>78</sup> Mladen Popović (2006),<sup>79</sup> and Anke Dorman (2007).<sup>80</sup> Since the retirement of García Martínez in 2007, Popović has served as acting director of the institute. He initiated a new series of Qumran conferences in Groningen, the first of which

---

<sup>74</sup> Florentino García Martínez, *Textos de Qumrán* (Estructuras y Procesos / Serie Religión; Madrid: Editorial Trotta, 1992); *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English* (Leiden: Brill, 1994); *Textos de Qumran: Edição fiel e completa dos Documentos do Mar Morto* (Petrópolis: Vozes, 1995); *Testi di Qumran* (Bib 4; Edizione italiana a cura di C. Martone; Brescia: Paideia, 1996).

<sup>75</sup> Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997-1998; rev. ed. 2000).

<sup>76</sup> “A Study of the Texts from Qumran: A Groningen Perspective,” in Florentino García Martínez, *Qumranica Minora I. Qumran Origins and Perspectives* (ed. Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar; STDJ 63; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 297-310.

<sup>77</sup> Géza Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet. Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library* (STDJ 47; Leiden: Brill, 2002).

<sup>78</sup> Albert L. A. Hogeterp, *God and God's Temple. A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence* (Leuven: Peeters, 2006).

<sup>79</sup> Mladen Popović, *Reading the Human Body. Physiognomics and Astrology in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Hellenistic-Early Roman Period Judaism* (STDJ 67; Leiden: Brill, 2007). In 2008 this volume won the Keetje Hodshon Prize for best Dutch dissertation in the field of philosophy/theology, awarded once every four years.

<sup>80</sup> Anke Dorman, *The Blemished Body: Deformity and Disability in the Qumran Scrolls* (Groningen: s.n., 2007).

was held in April 2008<sup>81</sup> and the second, on Qumran, Josephus, and the Jewish Revolt, in 2010.

*The Journal for the Study of Judaism (JSJ)*

From its establishment in 1970, the *Journal for the Study of Judaism* was edited by members of the Qumran Institute. Van der Woude founded it to deal with the wider context of the Qumran Scrolls. Articles which concentrated specifically on the Scrolls he referred to the *Revue de Qumran*. For many years the editing of *JSJ* articles, as well as summaries of articles published in other journals, were largely the work at the Qumran Institute of Adam van der Woude, Bastiaan Jongeling, and Florentino García Martínez, and in more recent years of Ton Hilhorst, secretary of the journal from 1998 to 2004, of Eibert Tigchelaar (1959-), who became secretary in 2005, and of Jacques van Ruiten, its book-review editor since 2006. The *JSJ* has enjoyed continuous growth: from two 100-page issues per year in the first years, to three 120-page issues from 1995, to four issues from 1997, and to the present five yearly issues totaling 600 pages. Since 1995 the *JSJ* has become truly international, as reflected by its editorial board and its Supplements series, of the same scope as the journal proper.<sup>82</sup>

*The Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah Series (STDJ) and Brill*

In 1956 the publisher Brill in Leiden launched a new series, *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*, under the editorship of Jan van der Ploeg. The first book to appear in the series was Wernberg-Møller's *The Manual of Discipline*, in 1957. The series continued with the editor's *Le rouleau de la guerre* in 1959 and Menahem Mansoor's *The Thanksgiving Hymns* in 1963. In 1975 the eighth volume was published, and in 1979 a Supplement to Kutscher's *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll*. The series included important works on the Scrolls, but it slowly declined. But, at Brill's request, in 1990 van der Woude and García Martínez became involved in the series and breathed new life into it. Volume 9, García Martínez's *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, was still edited in cooperation with Jan van der Ploeg. But afterwards the editorship was transferred to Groningen,

<sup>81</sup> The proceedings are published in Mladen Popović, *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (JSJSup 141; Leiden: Brill, 2010).

<sup>82</sup> Editors-in-chief of the Supplements to the *Journal for the Study of Judaism* were John Collins until 2008 and Hindy Najman (2008-2010). In 2011, Benjamin Wright became the new editor-in-chief of the *JSJ* Supplements.

and van der Woude and García Martínez remained the sole editors of the series. In 2000 Peter Flint joined as associate editor, and Tigchelaar joined in 2004. Under the editorship of van der Woude and García Martínez, and as a result of the renewed interest in Qumran studies, the series gained momentum. From 1992 to 2010 eighty-five volumes were published, turning it into the best-known series in Qumran research.

Until the early 1990s, Brill had no special interest in the field of Dead Sea Scrolls studies. Things changed when one of the acquisitions editors, Hans van der Meij, became involved in Scrolls scholarship in the early 1990s. Initially Brill signed a contract to publish a facsimile edition of photographs of the Scrolls, which eventually would be published by the Biblical Archaeology Society. However, when in March 1991 van der Meij participated in the El Escorial Qumran congress, he realized the possible repercussions, and canceled the contract. Van der Meij's active connections with Qumran scholars, and the reluctance of some other major European publishers to become more involved in this field, put Brill in the leading position as publisher of Scrolls scholarship. Besides reviving the STDJ series, Brill also published García Martínez's English translation of the Scrolls, as well as the *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. More importantly, it invested in the official microfiche edition,<sup>83</sup> and initiated, together with Emanuel Tov and the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies (FARMS), a series of electronic and written tools, such as *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library*,<sup>84</sup> *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*,<sup>85</sup> and Abegg's *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*.<sup>86</sup> Brill also attempted to acquire the *Revue de Qumran* from Gabalda. When that project failed, Brill founded in 1994 a new journal, *Dead Sea Discoveries (DSD)*, and attracted major scholars in the field to form its editorial board. *DSD* is now well established as a major vehicle of research in the field.

---

<sup>83</sup> Emanuel Tov and Stephen J. Pfann, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche. A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 1993).

<sup>84</sup> Timothy H. Lim, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library Volume I* (in consultation with Philip S. Alexander; CD-ROM; Oxford: Oxford University Press / Leiden: Brill, 1997); Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, *Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library 2* (CD-ROM; Leiden: Brill, 1999); Emanuel Tov, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library* (CD-ROM; Leiden: Brill, 2006).

<sup>85</sup> Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader* (6 vols.; Brill: Leiden, 2004-2005).

<sup>86</sup> Martin G. Abegg et al., eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance* (3 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2003-2010).

*Other Scrolls scholarship in the Netherlands*

In 1978 at the University of Utrecht Arie van der Kooij defended his dissertation *De oudste tekstgetuigen van het boek Jesaja*, which deals with the Septuagint of Isaiah and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> in relation to the Masoretic text.<sup>87</sup> Van der Kooij, Professor of Old Testament in Leiden, never specialized in the Scrolls, preferring instead to cover all the fields pertinent to textual criticism, like the Septuagint, Qumran, targums and the Syriac Peshitta studies. A dissertation that he supervised concerns the textual history of the book of Joshua and extensively examines the Qumran Joshua materials (van der Meer, 2001<sup>88</sup>). In 2006 Jürgen Zangenberg, who had written extensively on the archaeology of Qumran, was appointed Professor of New Testament in Leiden.

Initiated by Takamitsu Muraoka and Elisha Qimron, four symposia were held on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira. The first two were in 1995 and 1997 in Leiden, the third in 1999 in Beer-Sheva, and the fourth in Strasbourg in 2006. Muraoka (1938-), who was Professor of Hebrew in Leiden from 1991 to 2003, had already contributed substantially to the understanding of Qumran Aramaic before going to Leiden; once there, he also concentrated on Qumran Hebrew. Two of Muraoka's students wrote their dissertations on this stage of Hebrew: Willem van Peursen (1999) on the verbal system in Ben Sira,<sup>89</sup> and Martin Baasten (2006) on the non-verbal clause in Qumran Hebrew.<sup>90</sup>

In the Faculty of Law at the University of Groningen, Jacobine Oudshoorn, who had graduated in Classics, Hebrew, and Law, defended in 2005 a dissertation on the relationship between Roman and local law in the Babatha and Salome Komaise archives.<sup>91</sup>

It is no surprise that other scholars of Bible, Judaism, or Hebrew and Aramaic in the Netherlands have treated the Scrolls and published their work on them. They include Pieter van der Horst, former Professor of New Testament at Utrecht, whose work evinces a keen interest in the Scrolls, and Johannes Tromp of the University of Leiden, who has published widely on

<sup>87</sup> Arie van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (OBO 35; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1981).

<sup>88</sup> Michael N. van der Meer, *Formation and Reformulation: The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses* (VTSup 102; Leiden: Brill, 2004).

<sup>89</sup> Willem Th. van Peursen, *The Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira* (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

<sup>90</sup> Martin F. J. Baasten, *The Non-Verbal Clause in Qumran Hebrew*.

<sup>91</sup> Jacobine G. Oudshoorn, *The Relationship between Roman and Local Law in the Babatha and Salome Komaise Archives. General Analysis and Three Case Studies on Law of Succession, Guardianship and Marriage* (STDJ 69; Leiden: Brill, 2007).



the Pseudepigrapha. More recently, Scrolls scholarship in the Netherlands has been strengthened by the appointment at the University of Leiden of Holger Gzella to the chair of Hebrew and Aramaic in 2005, and of Jürgen Zangenberg to the chair of New Testament in 2006.



## A HISTORY OF QUMRAN SCROLLS RESEARCH IN SPAIN

FLORENTINO GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ

AND

JULIO TREBOLLE BARRERA\*

### *Introduction*

Research on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Spain has been shaped by three key factors.<sup>1</sup> The first concerns a Spanish institution in Jerusalem, the *Casa de Santiago*, founded in 1955, and known as *Instituto Español Bíblico y Arqueológico* following its affiliation to the Pontifical University of Salamanca in 1975. Created as the Spanish counterpart to other international institutions based in Jerusalem, it allowed biblical scholars and archaeologists to conduct digs in Israel and Jordan, and to broaden their education at Jerusalem institutions such as the École Biblique, the Studium Franciscanum or the Hebrew University. The *Casa de Santiago* thereby provided Spanish scholars with a place to meet other colleagues with similar interests. Above all, Spanish scholars in Jerusalem were now able to establish direct contacts with the chief promoters of the Qumran Scrolls discoveries, and with members of the international team of editors, then based at the École Biblique. Thanks to these connections the general Spanish public could receive periodic information on archaeological digs and other news. Thus Vicente Vilar Hueso regularly published archaeological chronicles in the

---

\* We thank Andrés Piquer Otero (Universidad Complutense de Madrid) for the English translation of the Spanish original.

<sup>1</sup> The history of Qumran research in Spain is well documented. See particularly J. Vázquez Allegue, "Qumrán en España (1947-2002): 55 años de investigación," *MEAH* 50 (2001): 59-92, and in English: F. Sen Montero, "Qumran in the Spanish Research," in Zdzislaw J. Kapera, ed., *Mogilany 1989. Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Jean Carmignac* (Krakow: The Enigma Press, 1993), 159-74; "Addenda to the Spanish Bibliography on the Dead Sea Scrolls 1989-1997," in Zdzislaw J. Kapera, ed., *Mogilany 1995: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Alesky Klauwek* (Krakow: The Enigma Press, 1998), 223-8; "A Short History of Spanish Research on the Dead Sea Scrolls," *QC* 15 (2007): 47-54. The full bibliographical references to the articles published in periodicals, quoted here in a shortened form (periodical, year and pages), are readily found there.

journal *Estudios Bíblicos*, where he mentioned personal communications about the Scrolls that he received from Roland de Vaux or Józef Milik, for example.<sup>2</sup> The contents of the manuscripts as they were being deciphered were surveyed in the first original volume of synthesis published by Antonio González Lamadrid in 1956.<sup>3</sup> González Lamadrid had participated in the Qumran excavations and for many years his book,<sup>4</sup> especially in the much expanded version of 1973, together with the Spanish translations of volumes by Millar Burrows, John Allegro and Józef Milik, were the best source of information about the Scrolls for the Spanish public.

The benefit of the *Casa de Santiago* was felt even later, in the 1970s. Contacts established during their stay there in these years allowed two other scholars, Julio Trebolle Barrera and Florentino García Martínez, to establish ties with members of the aforementioned international team of editors.

The second important factor for the development of Qumran studies in Spain was the establishment of centers of interest at three universities: in the Department of Hebrew and Aramaic Studies at the Universidad Complutense of Madrid, set up by Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner; in the Department of Biblical Studies at the private Universidad de Navarra, initiated by José María Casciaro Ramírez and continued by Santiago Ausín Olmos; and in the Department of Biblical Studies at the Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, developed by Ramón Trevijano Etcheverría and later by Xaime Vázquez Allegue. This academic anchoring, at state and at private universities, facilitated the sustained growth of Qumran studies and the rise of new generations of Qumran scholars.

The third significant factor is the influence of two Spanish scholars who reside abroad but exercise a robust presence in Spanish research: José O'Callaghan, formerly a professor at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome and at the Instituto Papiroológico de San Cugat; and Florentino García Martínez, who resided in Groningen and later in Leuven, but who has been active in Spain in various ways. The work of both these scholars has been highly influential in Spain, and though they are established abroad their research can rightly be considered part and parcel of the history of Qumran research in Spain.

---

<sup>2</sup> All these studies have been collected in the *Festschrift* volume: V. Vilar Hueso, *En torno a la Biblia* (Series Valentina 29; Valencia: Facultad teológica San Vicente Ferrer, 1992).

<sup>3</sup> A. González Lamadrid, *Los descubrimientos de Qumrán* (Madrid: Instituto Español de Estudios Eclesiásticos, 1956).

<sup>4</sup> A. González Lamadrid, *Los descubrimientos del mar Muerto: Balance de 15 años de hallazgos y estudio* (BAC; Madrid, 1971).

Qumran research is customarily divided into two stages: before and after the declaration of free access to the Scrolls by the Israel Antiquities Authority on October 21, 1991. However, for reasons which will immediately become clear we find it more adequate to divide Qumran research in Spain into three periods: (1) 1947 to 1972; (2) 1972 to 1991; (3) 1991 to the present.

### 1947-1972

This period is marked by a persistent effort to keep Spanish-language readers informed and updated on the discovery of the Scrolls, on the texts, and on their contents and meaning. This was achieved by means of original contributions by Spanish authors or translation into Spanish of major publications by foreign scholars. This period opens with the first announcements of the discoveries and closes with the first Spanish contribution to Qumran research that made an international impact: O'Callaghan's presentation of his interpretation of cave 7 papyri in 1972.

The first notice of the discoveries appeared in Spain as a note by A. Toribios Ramos in the popular journal *Cultura Bíblica*.<sup>5</sup> This journal became a constant source of information about the Scrolls due to papers published by J. Cabet Iturbe almost until his death.<sup>6</sup> This scholar prepared a special issue on the Scrolls as early as 1958. He also published on the subject in other scholarly journals.<sup>7</sup> The labor of propagating information was energetically continued by Felipe Sen, who between 1966 and 1972 published a large number of short papers in the same *Cultura Bíblica*.<sup>8</sup>

Also Federico Pérez Castro announced the discovery of the Scrolls in an early note published in the journal *Sefarad*.<sup>9</sup> This was followed in 1949 by two articles published in that journal,<sup>10</sup> and by other studies of Pérez Castro in which he followed the progress of the work on the manuscripts.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>5</sup> A. Toribios Ramos, "Descubrimiento de manuscritos Hebreos," *Cultura Bíblica* 5 (1948): 301.

<sup>6</sup> J. Cabet Iturbe, *Cultura Bíblica* 10 (1953): 129-35, 187-94; 11 (1954): 176-80; 14 (1957): 365-70; 15 (1958): 193-320; 17 (1960): 145-55.

<sup>7</sup> J. Cabet Iturbe, *Sefarad* 14 (1954): 473-4, *Salmanticensis* 6 (1959): 131-42 or *Sacra Pagina* 2 (1959): 28-46.

<sup>8</sup> F. Sen, *Cultura Bíblica* 23 (1966): 366-7; 24 (1967): 14-16, 91-93, 163-4, 187-92; 25 (1968): 122-3, 173-4; 26 (1969): 96-105; 29 (1972): 48, 91-92, 93-107, 283-8, 289-91.

<sup>9</sup> F. Pérez Castro, *Sefarad* 8 (1948): 472-4.

<sup>10</sup> J. M. Baucher and Edmund F. Sutcliffe, *Sefarad* 9 (1949): 152-61 and 454-5.

<sup>11</sup> F. Pérez Castro, *Sefarad* 11 (1951): 115-53; 12 (1952): 167-97.

The same topic was also covered by Alejandro Díez Macho in a version addressed to a more general public.<sup>12</sup> Gradually, first attempts of Spanish scholars to interpret Qumranic texts began to appear in scholarly journals, such as *Estudios Bíblicos*, *Estudios Eclesiásticos*, *Salmanticensis*, *Estudios Teológicos* and *Revista Española de Teología*.<sup>13</sup> These focused mainly on the *Pesher* of *Habakkuk* (1QpHab) and the *Great Isaiah Scroll* (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>), and on the relation of the Qumran texts to the New Testament. The *Pesher of Habakkuk* is the subject of a monograph by Cantera Ortiz de Urbina, and of a paper by Díez Macho;<sup>14</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> is the subject of several articles by Sola Solé, Lange and González Núñez.<sup>15</sup> The importance of the manuscripts for clarifying specific issues relevant to the New Testament was also studied: among other questions tackled were the date of the Last Supper,<sup>16</sup> the relation of the scrolls to John the Baptist,<sup>17</sup> the concept of covenant in the scrolls,<sup>18</sup> and the community and its concepts.<sup>19</sup> The relationship of the Qumran finds to Christianity is also treated more generally in articles by García Cordero and Arnaldich,<sup>20</sup> and in López Melús's book.<sup>21</sup> Although

<sup>12</sup> A. Díez Macho, *Razón y Fe* 145 (1952): 148-65.

<sup>13</sup> These early publications are noted by different bibliographies, and are not detailed here.

<sup>14</sup> J. Cantera Ortiz de Urbina, *El comentario de Habacuc de Qumrán* (Textos y Estudios del Seminario Filológico Cardenal Cisneros; Madrid, 1960). A. Díez Macho, "El texto bíblico del Comentario de Habacuc de Qumrán," in Heinrich Gross and Franz Mussner, eds., *Lex tua veritas: Festschrift für Hubert Junker, zur Vollendung des siebzigsten Lebensjahres am 8. August 1961, dargeboten von Kollegen, Freunden und Schülern* (Trier: Paulinus Verlag, 1961), 59-64.

<sup>15</sup> J. M. Sola Solé, "Una tendencia lingüística en el manuscrito de Isaías (DSIa) de Khirbet-Qumrán," *Sefarad* 13 (1953): 61-71; F. Lange, "El texto del nuevo rollo de Isaías (1QIs<sup>a</sup>) comparado con el Texto Masorético," *Revista Teológica* 5 (1955): 19-25; 6 (1955): 21-26; 7 (1955): 29-33; A. González Núñez, "La lengua y la base lingüística del Rollo de Isaías (1QIs<sup>a</sup>)," *EstBib* 19 (1960): 237-44.

<sup>16</sup> J. Leal, "La nueva fecha de la Cena y el orden de los hechos de la Pasión de Nuestro Señor," *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 31 (1957): 173-88; J. Cortés Quirant, "La nueva fecha de la última cena," *EstBib* 17 (1958): 47-81; A. Ibáñez Arana, "La fecha de la última Cena y la tradición," *Lumen* 8 (1959): 97-124.

<sup>17</sup> J. Precedo Lafuente, "San Juan Bautista y los manuscritos del Mar Muerto," *Comp* 4 (1959): 5-38; J. M. Caballero Cuesta, "Fue el Bautista un esenio?" *Burguense Collectanea Scientifica* 3 (1962): 15-30.

<sup>18</sup> L. Arnaldich, "Los sectarios del Mar Muerto y su doctrina sobre la Alianza," *EstBib* 11 (1952): 359-98.

<sup>19</sup> J. M. Casciaro, "El vocabulario técnico de Qumrán en relación con el concepto de Comunidad," *ScrTh* 1 (1969): 7-56.

<sup>20</sup> M. García Cordero, "Los descubrimientos del desierto de Judá y los orígenes del Cristianismo," *Ciencia Tomista* 85 (1958): 59-137. L. Arnaldich, "Influencias de Qumrán en la primitiva comunidad judío-cristiana de Jerusalén," in *XIX Semana Bíblica Española (19-24 Sept 1958)* (CSIC, Madrid, 1962), 135-96.

<sup>21</sup> Francisco M. López Melús, *El cristianismo y los Esenios de Qumrán* (Madrid: Casa de la Biblia, 1965).

some of these contributions are clearly apologetic, the general thrust of the majority is to use the Scrolls as a background for understanding the origins of Christianity, or solving concrete exegetical problems.

The beginning and the end of this first period are marked by the publication of Lamadrid's two surveys, mentioned in notes 3 and 4. But at the time other books appeared, such as the aforementioned volume by López Melús in 1965 and a book by Millás Vallicrosas in 1958,<sup>22</sup> in addition to more general volumes by P. Herrero (1959) and Cachampdor (1962).<sup>23</sup>

The efforts of these early pioneers notwithstanding, advances in Qumran research were clearly made known to the Spanish public primarily through translations into Spanish of the books written by major Qumran scholars outside Spain. The list covers the entire period. Edmund Wilson's book appeared in 1956,<sup>24</sup> Vincent's book was translated in 1957,<sup>25</sup> concurrent with Allegro's;<sup>26</sup> Burrows's monograph came out in Spanish in 1958,<sup>27</sup> Yadin's book in 1959<sup>28</sup> and Del Medico's in 1960.<sup>29</sup> The following year witnessed the appearance of Milik's,<sup>30</sup> Schubert's<sup>31</sup> and Daniélou's surveys<sup>32</sup> and Laperrousaz's book was translated in 1964.<sup>33</sup>

Besides these translations, international Qumran research was felt in Spain through the invitation of eminent Qumran scholars from abroad to cooperate with Spanish scholars in various Spanish publications: the *Enciclopedia de la Biblia* (1963-1967, Garriga) and the *Diccionario de la Biblia* (1967, Herder). The authors of entries concerning Qumran include such

---

<sup>22</sup> J. M. Millás Vallicrosa, *Valor escriturario de los hallazgos en el mar Muerto* (Barcelona: Agustín Núñez, 1958).

<sup>23</sup> P. Herrero, *Los documentos del Mar Muerto* (Barcelona: Mateu, 1959); A. Cachampdor, *Las antiguas civilizaciones del Mar Muerto* (Barcelona: Aymá, 1962).

<sup>24</sup> Edmund Wilson, *Los rollos del mar Muerto* (México: Fondo de cultura Económica, 1956).

<sup>25</sup> Albert L. Vincent, *Los manuscritos del desierto de Judá* (Madrid: Escelicer, 1957).

<sup>26</sup> John M. Allegro, *Los manuscritos del Mar Muerto* (Madrid: Aguilar, 1957).

<sup>27</sup> Millar Burrows, *Los rollos del mar Muerto* (México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1958).

<sup>28</sup> Yigael Yadin, *Los rollos del mar Muerto* (Buenos Aires: Israel, 1959).

<sup>29</sup> Henri E. del Medico, *El Mito de los esenios desde los orígenes hasta el fin de la Edad Media* (Madrid: Taurus, 1960).

<sup>30</sup> Józef T. Milik, *Diez años de descubrimientos en el desierto de Judá* (Madrid: El Perpetuo Socorro, 1961).

<sup>31</sup> Kurt Schubert, *La Comunidad del Mar Muerto* (México: Uthea 1961).

<sup>32</sup> Jean Daniélou, *Los manuscritos del mar Muerto y los orígenes del cristianismo* (Madrid: Razón y Fe, 1961).

<sup>33</sup> Ernest-Marie Laperrousaz, *Los manuscritos del mar Muerto* (Buenos Aires: Universitaria de Buenos Aires, 1964).



well-known Qumranists as Edmund Sutcliffe,<sup>34</sup> Matthias Delcor,<sup>35</sup> Maurice Baillet,<sup>36</sup> Hans Bardtke,<sup>37</sup> and Jan van der Ploeg.<sup>38</sup> However, during this first period, Spanish Qumran scholars confined presentation of their research to Spain, not venturing beyond. The first issue of *Revue de Qumran* (1958) does contain a paper in Spanish,<sup>39</sup> but it is by an Argentinian author. Only one Spanish contribution to an international congress was published in those years: “El dualismo qumránico y San Pablo,” by J. Salguero.<sup>40</sup>

### 1972-1991

This situation started to change in 1972, when the well-known Spanish papyrologist José O’Callaghan, professor at the Instituto Biblico of Rome and at the Instituto de Papirología de San Cugat in Barcelona, introduced his particular interpretation of the fragments of Greek papyri from cave 7.<sup>41</sup> O’Callaghan thought that some of the remains of Greek papyri found in this cave contained copies of sections from writings of the New Testament. He wrote his articles in Spanish, and published them in Spanish<sup>42</sup> and international<sup>43</sup> journals. They sparked a polemic which lasted for several years. Reactions were immediate and abundant,<sup>44</sup> due to the prompt English translation and publication that year of his paper “Papiros neotes-

<sup>34</sup> Author of the article on the Essenes, in the *Enciclopedia de la Biblia*, 3:139-43.

<sup>35</sup> Author of the article on Murabá’at, the *Enciclopedia de la Biblia*, 5:354-6.

<sup>36</sup> Author of the articles on the *Damascus Document* in the *Enciclopedia de la Biblia* (2:470-80) and on the minor caves (6:71-74).

<sup>37</sup> Author of the article on the major caves, in *Enciclopedia de la Biblia* 6:52-71.

<sup>38</sup> Author of the article on the manuscripts from Qumran, in *Diccionario de la Biblia* (1624-40).

<sup>39</sup> J. Mejía “Posibles contactos entre los manuscritos de Qumrán y los libros de los Macabeos,” *RevQ* 1 (1958-1959): 51-72.

<sup>40</sup> J. Salguero, “El dualismo qumránico y San Pablo,” in *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus 1961* (AnBib 17-18; Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico 1966), 549-62.

<sup>41</sup> J. O’Callaghan, “¿Papiros neotestamentarios en la cueva 7 de Qumrán?” *Bib* 53 (1972): 91-100; “1 Tim 3,10; 4,1.3 en 7Q4?” *Bib* 53 (1972): 362-7; “Notas sobre 7Q tomadas en el ‘Rockefeller Museum’ de Jerusalén,” *Bib* 53 (1972): 517-33. A full list of O’Callaghan’s publications is given in Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “The New Testament in Qumran Cave 7?” *A Guide to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 265-8.

<sup>42</sup> Especially in *Studia Papyrologica* 11 (1972): 83-89; 12 (1973): 73-79, 91-100; 13 (1974): 21-29, 45-55, 61-63; 16 (1977): 41-47.

<sup>43</sup> Besides in *Biblica*, O’Callaghan published in *BL* 45 (1972): 121-2 and *NRT* 95 (1973): 188-95.

<sup>44</sup> They are listed by Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 169-72.

tamentarios en la cueva 7 de Qumrán?” as a supplement to the *Journal of Biblical Literature*,<sup>45</sup> and due to the immediate negative responses of the editors of the fragments, Pierre Benoit and Maurice Baillet.<sup>46</sup> O’Callaghan himself produced a large number of studies and two volumes of synthesis, published in 1974<sup>47</sup> and 1995.<sup>48</sup> Most scholars were not convinced by his arguments, but the polemic that O’Callaghan’s hypothesis ignited had significant impact on Spanish Qumran research. It encouraged Spanish scholars to present their views in the international arena. Interestingly, the first paper published by a Spanish scholar, Angel Urbán, in the *Revue de Qumran*, was a criticism of O’Callaghan’s identifications, together with an alternative proposal.<sup>49</sup> Another Spanish scholar, Victoria Spottorno, addressed the same issue in a Spanish article<sup>50</sup> and several years later in an English one.<sup>51</sup>

In the twenty years of this second period, Qumran research in Spain underwent a far-ranging transformation. The effort to keep the Spanish public informed through publications by Spanish scholars<sup>52</sup> and selective translations of high-standard works<sup>53</sup> was intensified; and Spanish scholars started to publish their own research abroad, so Spanish contributions to Qumran research began to make their mark worldwide.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>45</sup> L. Holladay, “New Testament Papyri in Qumran Cave 7?” Supplement to *JBL* 91 (1972): 1-14.

<sup>46</sup> Pierre Benoit, “Notes sur les fragments grecs de la Grotte 7 de Qumrán,” *RB* 79 (1972): 321-4; “Nouvelle note sur les fragments grecs de la Grotte 7 de Qumrán,” *RB* 80 (1973): 5-12; Maurice Baillet, “Les manuscrits de la Grotte 7 de Qumrán et le Nouveau Testament,” *Bib* 53 (1972): 508-16 ; *Bib* 54 (1973): 340-50.

<sup>47</sup> José O’Callaghan, *Los papiros griegos de la Cueva 7 de Qumrán* (BAC; Madrid: Editorial Católica, 1974).

<sup>48</sup> José O’Callaghan, *Los primeros testimonios del Nuevo Testamento: Papirología neotestamentaria* (Cordoba: El Almendro, 1995).

<sup>49</sup> A. C. Urbán, “Observación sobre ciertos papiros de la cueva 7 de Qumrán,” *RevQ* 8 (1973): 233-51; “La identificación de 7Q4 con Núm 14,23-24 y la restauración de textos antiguos,” *EstBib* 33 (1974): 219-44.

<sup>50</sup> V. Spottorno, “Una nueva posible identificación de 7Q5,” *Sefarad* 50 (1990): 541-53.

<sup>51</sup> V. Spottorno, “Can Methodological Limits be Set in the Debate on the Identification of 7Q5?” *DSD* 6 (1999): 66-77.

<sup>52</sup> As in the studies on the “mystery” of the Qumran texts by J. M. Casciaro Ramírez published in *ScrTh* 7 (1975): 481-97; 8 (1976): 9-56, 445-76.

<sup>53</sup> Such as Jean Pouilly, *Los manuscritos del Mar Muerto y la comunidad de Qumrán* (Estella: Verbo Divino, 1980), translated from the French original, or Geza Vermes, *Los Manuscritos del Mar Muerto* (Barcelona: Muchnik, 1980), translated from English and issued in several reprints.

<sup>54</sup> S. Sabugal published in *RevQ* 8 (1974): 417-23. L. Díez Merino published his studies on the crucifixion in *EstEcl* 51 (1976): 5-27 and in *SBFLA* 26 (1976): 31-120. Florentino García Martínez, who began to publish his work on the *Targum of Job* from cave 11 (11Q<sup>tg</sup>-Job) in *Sefarad* 36 (1976): 241-9 and continued with that on the *Temple Scroll* in *EstBib* 36

A Spanish translation of the main Scrolls by M. Jiménez F. Bonhomme was published,<sup>55</sup> as was an informative introduction to Qumran studies by Matthias Delcor and Florentino García Martínez.<sup>56</sup> Monographs on various aspects of Qumran research likewise appeared in this period: editions of texts (Vegas Montaner, 1980<sup>57</sup>), theological studies (Sabugal, 1976,<sup>58</sup> Casciaro Ramírez 1982,<sup>59</sup> Balbotin, 1989<sup>60</sup>) and philological investigations (Ausín Olmos, 1991<sup>61</sup>).

Spanish Qumran research began to gain attention outside Spain also. Florentino García Martínez's studies on Qumran publications, which appeared in *Estudios Bíblicos* between 1987 and 1989,<sup>62</sup> were surveyed in Adam van der Woude's overview of Qumran research published in *Theologische Rundschau* between 1989 and 1992.<sup>63</sup> García Martínez's "Lista de MSS procedentes de Qumrán" published in *Henoch*<sup>64</sup> likewise provided an important critical tool at that time. But his many other studies published in Spanish gained international attention only later, when they appeared in English versions. For this reason he started at that point to publish in other languages, mainly French.<sup>65</sup>

Another relevant feature of Spanish Qumran research in this second phase was the presentation of these studies in local initiatives: the sum-

---

(1977): 247-92 and on the *pesher* in *Salm* 26 (1979): 125-39, went on to publish in *RevQ* 9 (1978): 401-8.

<sup>55</sup> M. Jiménez F. Bonhomme, *Los documentos de Qumrán* (Libro de bolsillo Cristiandad 34; Madrid: Cristiandad, 1976).

<sup>56</sup> Matthias Delcor and Florentino García Martínez, *Introducción a la literatura esenia de Qumrán* (Academia Cristiana 20; Madrid: Cristiandad, 1982).

<sup>57</sup> L. Vegas Montaner, *Biblia del Mar Muerto: Profetas Menores* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1980).

<sup>58</sup> S. Sabugal, *La conversión de S. Pablo: Damasco: Ciudad de Siria o región de Qumrán?* (Barcelona: Herder, 1976).

<sup>59</sup> J. M. Casciaro Ramírez, *Qumrán y el Nuevo Testamento: Aspectos Eclesiásticos y Soteriológicos* (Pamplona: Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, 1982).

<sup>60</sup> J. A. Balbotin, *Jesús y los Rollos del Mar Muerto* (Madrid: Ediciones Iragra, 1989).

<sup>61</sup> S. Ausín Olmos, *Moral y conducta en Qumrán: Estudio lexicográfico y semántico de los verbos de movimiento en la literatura de Qumrán* (Pamplona: Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, 1991).

<sup>62</sup> *EstBib* 45 (1987): 125-206, 361-402; 46 (1988): 325-47, 527-48; 47 (1989): 93-118, 225-67.

<sup>63</sup> *TRu* 54 (1989): 221-61; 55 (1990): 245-307; 57 (1992): 1-57, 225-53.

<sup>64</sup> F. García Martínez, "Lista de MSS procedentes de Qumrán," *Hen* 11 (1989): 149-232.

<sup>65</sup> These publications are readily found in "Bibliography of Florentino García Martínez," in Hilhorst, Puech and Tigchelaar, *Flores Florentino*, 803-16, and in "Academic Bibliography Florentino García Martínez," in H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn, and M. Vervenne, eds., *Florilegium Lovaniense: Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (BETL 224; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 13-33.

mer courses of Universidad Complutense de Madrid and the triennial congresses of Asociación Bíblica Española. Spanish scholars similarly participated in international Qumran congresses. All this activity was to culminate with the Madrid Congress of 1991, held in El Escorial. This coincided with the controversy which shortly after would spur the Israel Antiquities Authority to make all the manuscripts available to the public; here too Spanish Qumran research began its full integration into the international scene.

An example of local initiatives is the Cursos de Cultura Hebrea organized by Jesús Peláez, with the support of the Regional Council and University of Córdoba. In the second of these courses Qumran stood out, together with communications on other aspects of Judaism in that period.<sup>66</sup>

The summer courses organized by Universidad Complutense de Madrid fostered meetings between Spanish and foreign scholars, and communicated research findings to a very wide audience. In the 1989 summer course, a panel consisting of Hartmut Stegemann, Edouard Cothenet and Florentino García Martínez discussed the "Meaning of the Qumran (Dead Sea) Manuscripts for the knowledge of Jesus Christ and Christianity."<sup>67</sup> In the 1990 course, entitled "The Origins of Christianity," Aharon Oppenheimer, Ya'akov Shavit and Florentino García Martínez presented the contributions of Qumran research to the topic.<sup>68</sup>

The triennial meetings of Asociación Bíblica Española furnished a proper context for Qumran studies within biblical scholarship in Spain. At the first conference, held in Salamanca in 1982,<sup>69</sup> Qumran studies appeared in the sections on the Hebrew text of the Bible,<sup>70</sup> the Greek text,<sup>71</sup> and intertesta-

<sup>66</sup> J. Mateos, "Grupos Judíos en la Palestina de principios de nuestra era"; J. Peláez del Rosal, "Los monjes de Qumrán, 'protestantes' del Judaísmo," and F. García Martínez, "La novedad de Qumrán," in J. Peláez del Rosal, ed., *De Abraham a Maimonides: Para entender a los Judíos II* (Estudios de Cultura Hebrea 2; Córdoba: El Almedro, 1984) 21-30, 31-44, 45-69.

<sup>67</sup> Hartmut Stegemann, "Las figuras de Jesucristo y del Maestro de Justicia"; F. García Martínez, "Los MSS de Qumrán y el cristianismo," and Edouard Cothenet, "La secta de Qumrán y la comunidad cristiana," in O. González de Cardedal, ed., *Jesucristo hoy* (Cursos de verano El Escorial, 1989; Madrid: Universidad Complutense, 1989), 225-37, 239-50, 251-61.

<sup>68</sup> Aharon Oppenheimer, "Sectas Judías en tiempos de Jesús: Fariseos, Saduceos, los 'amme ha-'aretz"; Ya'akov Shavit, "Ex Qumran Lux?" Notas históricas y literarias sobre los manuscritos del Mar Muerto y los orígenes del Cristianismo" and F. García Martínez, "La apocalítica judía como matriz de la teología cristiana?" in A. Piñero, ed., *Orígenes del Cristianismo: Antecedentes y primeros pasos* (Madrid-Córdoba: Universidad Complutense-El Almedro, 1991), 123-4, 135-74, 177-99.

<sup>69</sup> N. Fernández Marcos, J. Trebolle Barrera and J. Fernández Vallina, eds., *Simposio Bíblico Español* (Madrid: Universidad Complutense, 1984).

<sup>70</sup> L. Vegas Montaner, "Aportación al aparato de la *Biblia Hebraica*: relación completa de variantes de los manuscritos del Mar Muerto respecto a *textus receptus* de Profetas Menores,"

mental literature.<sup>72</sup> At the second symposium, held in Córdoba in 1985,<sup>73</sup> lectures on specific Qumran themes were included in the program.<sup>74</sup> Other communications took into account the data furnished by the Scrolls.<sup>75</sup> At the third conference (1988), in Lisbon,<sup>76</sup> Qumran biblical and non-biblical texts were presented.<sup>77</sup>

In these years the entry of Spanish scholars into the international scene was reflected in their participation in congresses in other countries. Florentino García Martínez was invited, together with Jacob Neusner and Johan Maier, to the fifth congress of the Associazione italiana per lo studio del Giudaismo in 1984,<sup>78</sup> to the 1987 congress of the Associazione biblica italiana<sup>79</sup> and to the First International Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls of

---

in Fernández Marcos, Trebolle Barrera and Fernández Vallina, eds., *Simposio Bíblico Español*, 149-81.

<sup>71</sup> N. Fernández Marcos, "La Septuaginta y los hallazgos del Desierto de Judá," in Fernández Marcos, Trebolle Barrera and Fernández Vallina, eds., *Simposio Bíblico Español*, 229-44.

<sup>72</sup> L. Díez Merino, "Los 'vigilantes' en la literatura intertestamentaria," in Fernández Marcos, Trebolle Barrera and Fernández Vallina, eds., *Simposio Bíblico Español*, 575-609, and F. García Martínez, "El Rollo del Templo y la halaká sectaria," in Fernández Marcos, Trebolle Barrera and Fernández Vallina, eds., *Simposio Bíblico Español*, 611-22.

<sup>73</sup> V. Collado Bertomeu and V. Vilar Hueso, eds., *II Simposio Bíblico Español* (Valencia-Córdoba: Fundación Bíblica Española, 1987).

<sup>74</sup> L. Vegas Montaner, "Edición de texto bíblicos hebreo del Mar Muerto en ordenador," in Collado Bertomeu and Vilar Hueso, eds., *II Simposio*, 159-69; F. García Martínez, "Orígenes del movimiento esenio y orígenes qumránicos: Pistas para una solución," in Collado Bertomeu and Vilar Hueso, eds., *II Simposio*, 527-56; "La Apocalíptica y Qumrán," in Collado Bertomeu and Vilar Hueso, eds., *II Simposio*, 603-13.

<sup>75</sup> E.g., J. Trebolle Barrera, "Historia y crítica del texto del Libro de los Reyes," in Collado Bertomeu and Vilar Hueso, eds., *II Simposio*, 143-58, and N. Fernández Marcos, "La Biblia de los autores del Nuevo Testamento," in Collado Bertomeu and Vilar Hueso, eds., *II Simposio*, 171-80.

<sup>76</sup> J. Carreira das Neves, V. Collado Bertomeu and V. Vilar Hueso, eds., *III Simposio Bíblico Español (I Luso-Espanhol)* (Valencia-Lisbon: Fundación Bíblica Española, 1991).

<sup>77</sup> L. Vegas Montaner, "Nuevos textos bíblicos procedentes de Qumrán: Implicaciones exegéticas," in Carreira das Neves, Collado Bertomeu and Vilar Hueso, eds., *III Simposio*, 151-60; F. García Martínez, "Algunas aportaciones al conocimiento del judaísmo del segundo templo de los textos no-bíblicos de Qumrán recientemente publicados," in Carreira das Neves, Collado Bertomeu and Vilar Hueso, eds., *III Simposio*, 161-8; F. García Martínez, "4QSecond Ezekiel y las tradiciones apocalípticas," in Carreira das Neves, Collado Bertomeu and Vilar Hueso, eds., *III Simposio*, 477-88.

<sup>78</sup> Where García Martínez presented a communication on "Essénisme Qumránien: Origines, caractéristiques, héritage," published in Bruno Chiesa, ed., *Correnti culturali e movimenti religiosi del Giudaismo* (Associazione italiana per lo studio del Giudaismo, Testi e Studi 5; Rome: Carucci, 1987), 37-57.

<sup>79</sup> With a paper on "Il problema della purità: la soluzione qumranica," published in G. L. Prato, *Israël alla ricerca di identità tra il III sec a.C. en il I sec. D. C.* (RSStB 1; Bologna: Dehoniane, 1989), 169-91.

Mogilany (1987).<sup>80</sup> The following year the “International Congress: Forty Years of Research on the Dead Sea Scrolls” took place in Haifa and Tel Aviv, and the Spanish representation was by Florentino García Martínez and Julio Treballe Barrera.<sup>81</sup> At the congress organized in 1989 by the Qumran Institute of Groningen on “The Texts of Qumran and the History of the Community,” three Spanish scholars were present: Julio Treballe Barrera, Luis Vegas Montaner and Florentino García Martínez, who edited the proceedings in the *Revue de Qumran*.<sup>82</sup>

This series of international congresses with Spanish participation culminated in the “Congreso Internacional Manuscritos del Mar Muerto,” held in El Escorial and Salamanca on March 18-21, 1991.<sup>83</sup> It was organized by Julio Treballe Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner, with the active collaboration of Florentino García Martínez. It brought together older and younger students of the Dead Sea Scrolls. *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, as it became known after its *Proceedings* were published,<sup>84</sup> was significant for the new texts presented, for the participation of many Spanish scholars<sup>85</sup> and invited experts, and for the new research directions it plotted.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> With the communication “Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis,” *FO* 25 (1988): 113-36.

<sup>81</sup> Who presented two communications, respectively “Texts from Cave 11” and “Light from 4QJudg<sup>a</sup> and 4QKgs on the Text of Judges and Kings,” in D. Dimant and U. Rappaport, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (STDJ 10; Leiden-Jerusalem: Brill-Magnes-Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992), 18-26, 315-24.

<sup>82</sup> J. Treballe Barrera, “Textual Variants in 4QJudg<sup>a</sup> and the Textual and Editorial History of the Book of Judges,” *RevQ* 14 (1989): 229-45; L. Vegas Montaner, “Computer-Assisted Study on the Relation between 1QpHab and the Ancient (mainly Greek) Biblical Versions,” *RevQ* 14 (1989): 307-23; F. García Martínez and Adam S. van der Woude, “A ‘Groningen’ Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History,” *RevQ* 14 (1990): 521-41.

<sup>83</sup> This congress was honored by the presence of Queen Sofía of Spain. Frank Cross and Józef Milik were awarded the Universidad Complutense Medal of Merit.

<sup>84</sup> Treballe Barrera and Vegas Montaner, *The Madrid Qumran Congress*.

<sup>85</sup> But only the three organizers published their contributions in the *Proceedings*: J. Treballe Barrera, “A Preliminary Edition of 4QKings (4Q554),” 229-46; L. Vegas Montaner, “Some Features of the Hebrew Verbal Syntax in the Qumran *Hodayot*,” 273-86, and F. García Martínez, “11QTemple<sup>1</sup>: A Preliminary Publication,” 363-91 and “The Temple Scroll: A Systematic Bibliography 1985-1991,” 393-403.

<sup>86</sup> See the evaluation on the congress by F. García Martínez: “Resultados y Tendencias: Congreso Internacional sobre los Manuscritos del Mar Muerto,” *Sefarad* 51 (1991): 417-35; and by J. Treballe Barrera, “Congreso Internacional sobre los manuscritos del Mar Muerto,” *EstBib* 49 (1991): 277-83.

*1991 to the Present*

The tendency in the first period, namely translations into Spanish of the most influential works of international research, is reversed in this third period. Books by Spanish scholars are translated into other languages, with international impact. This stage is marked by the numerous high-level monographs and collective works on Qumran research intended for Spanish readers, by an increase in publications on Qumran themes by Spanish authors in other languages, and by the rise of a new generation of young scholars. At this stage Spanish Qumran research has become fully integrated into research elsewhere, a circumstance reflected in the publication of the manuscripts entrusted to Florentino García Martínez and Julio Trebolle Barrera in the official series *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*.

Among the monographs and collective works geared to the Spanish audience we should start with the first complete translation of the Qumran texts by Florentino García Martínez published in 1992.<sup>87</sup> In 1993 Julio Trebolle Barrera published *La Biblia judía y la Biblia cristiana*,<sup>88</sup> in which Qumran evidence is fully taken into account. That year a more popular volume on Qumran, *Los hombres de Qumrán*, was published jointly by García Martínez and Trebolle Barrera.<sup>89</sup> Between 1993 and 1995 César Vidal Manzanares published a series of volumes addressed to the general public.<sup>90</sup> Other monographs published during this period are those by E. Gallego,<sup>91</sup> Felipe Sen Montero<sup>92</sup> and Adolfo Roitman.<sup>93</sup> Among collective works with the participation of Spanish specialists are the volume celebrating the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Qumran studies, edited by Antonio Piñero and Dimas Fernández Galiano, with the participation of Florentino García Martínez, Julio

<sup>87</sup> F. García Martínez, *Textos de Qumrán* (Madrid: Trotta, 1992, 2004<sup>6</sup>).

<sup>88</sup> J. Trebolle Barrera, *La Biblia Judía y la Biblia Cristiana* (Madrid: Trotta, 1993, 1998<sup>3</sup>).

<sup>89</sup> F. García Martínez and J. Trebolle Barrera, *Los hombres de Qumrán: Literatura, estructura social y concepciones religiosas* (Madrid: Trotta, 1993).

<sup>90</sup> C. Vidal Manzanares, *Los Esenios y los Rollos del Mar Muerto: El desenlace de un enigma apasionante* (Barcelona: Ediciones Martínez Roca, 1993); *Los Documentos del Mar Muerto* (Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1994); *Los manuscritos del Mar Muerto* (Alianza Cien; Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1995), and *Los esenios de Qumrán: La verdad sobre los manuscritos del Mar Muerto* (Girona: Tikal Ediciones, 1995).

<sup>91</sup> E. Gallego, *El enigma de Qumrán* (Nuevos Horizontes 43, Madrid: Biblia y Fe, 1995).

<sup>92</sup> F. Sen Montero, *Los manuscritos del Mar Muerto: La comunidad de Qumrán y sus escritos* (Madrid: Enigmas de la Historia, 1999).

<sup>93</sup> A. D. Roitman, *Sectarios de Qumrán: Vida cotidiana de los esenios* (Barcelona: Martínez Roca, 2000).



Trebolle Barrera and Natalio Fernández Marcos;<sup>94</sup> a volume of the journal *Reseña Bíblica* coordinated by Florentino García Martínez;<sup>95</sup> and the volume of synthesis edited by Jaime Vázquez Allegue, *Para comprender los Manuscritos del Mar Muerto*, with contributions by ten Spanish scholars together with Magen Broshi, Émile Puech and Adolfo Roitman.<sup>96</sup>

Two thorough, updated introductions to the Qumran scrolls were also published in these years. In 1995 Ramón Trevijano Etcheverría published a volume entitled *Orígenes del Cristianismo*, which contains a good introduction to the Qumran texts.<sup>97</sup> The following year Florentino García Martínez offered, in volume 9 of *Introducción al estudio de la Biblia*, an extensive and detailed introduction to each Qumran manuscript, arranged in the pattern devised in his translation.<sup>98</sup>

As noted, in a reversal of the tendency of the earlier period, new books on Qumran research meant for a Spanish audience are those that are translated into other languages, thereby influencing research abroad. An example is the translation of García Martínez's and Trebolle Barrera's books. In 1992 a collection of seven articles on the Aramaic texts from Qumran published in Spanish by Florentino García Martínez in the preceding decade appeared in English.<sup>99</sup> In 1994 García Martínez's edition of *Textos de Qumrán* was translated into English and Portuguese, and in 1996 into Italian and Dutch; the English, Italian and Portuguese translations of García Martínez and Trebolle Barrera's joint book *Los Hombres de Qumrán* appeared in 1995 and 1996. Trebolle Barrera's compilation was also translated into English,<sup>100</sup> as were books by Natalio Fernández Marcos, Angel Sáenz Badillos and Miguel Pérez Fernández,<sup>101</sup> each with important chap-

<sup>94</sup> A. Piñero and D. Fernández Galiano, eds., *Los Manuscritos del Mar Muerto: balance de hallazgos y de cuarenta años de estudio* (En torno al Nuevo Testamento 18; Córdoba: El Almendro, 1994).

<sup>95</sup> F. García Martínez, ed., *Los Manuscritos del Mar Muerto* (Reseña Bíblica 19; Estella: Verbo Divino, 1998).

<sup>96</sup> J. Vázquez Allegue, ed., *Para comprender los manuscritos del Mar Muerto* (Estella: Editorial Verbo Divino, 2004).

<sup>97</sup> R. Trevijano Etcheverría, *Orígenes del Cristianismo: El trasfondo judío del cristianismo primitivo* (Plenitudo Temporis 3; Salamanca: Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, 1995).

<sup>98</sup> G. Aranda Pérez, F. García Martínez, M. Pérez Fernández, *Literatura judía intertestamentaria* (Introducción al Estudio de la Biblia 9; Estella: Verbo Divino, 1996).

<sup>99</sup> F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic. Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992).

<sup>100</sup> J. Trebolle Barrera, *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible: An Introduction to the History of the Bible* (trans. from Spanish by W. G. E. Watson; Leiden-Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998, on the third Spanish edition).

<sup>101</sup> N. Fernández Marcos, *Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2001); A. Sáenz Badillos, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (trans. J. Elwolde; Cambridge:

ters on the Qumran texts from each author's perspective: the Septuagint, Hebrew language, and Mishnaic language respectively. The introduction to Qumran literature by García Martínez, published in *Introducción al estudio de la Biblia*, was soon translated into Italian and Portuguese. The two 2007 volumes in English of selected papers by Florentino García Martínez, edited by Eibert Tigchelaar, contain some written in English and several translated from the original Spanish and French.<sup>102</sup> Also, during this third period Spanish scholars tend increasingly to publish their research directly in other languages, to make their contributions more easily accessible.<sup>103</sup>

Among the younger scholars, Jaime Vázquez Allegue wrote a doctoral dissertation on the prologue of the *Community Rule* (1QS), published in 2000,<sup>104</sup> and Francisco Jiménez Bedman wrote a dissertation on the language of the *Copper Scroll*, published in 2002.<sup>105</sup> Both authors continue to write on Qumran topics. Jaime Vázquez Allegue, besides *Para comprender los manuscritos de Qumrán* already mentioned, has also published an edition of the *Community Rule*<sup>106</sup> and a series of papers on Qumran themes.<sup>107</sup> Francisco Jiménez Bedman has recently published a volume on Aramaic texts from Qumran.<sup>108</sup>

The last feature of Qumran research in Spain in this third period is its complete integration with international research. In 1997 the "Seminario

---

Cambridge University Press, 1993); Miguel Pérez Fernández, *An Introductory Grammar of Rabbinic Hebrew* (trans. J. Elwolde; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

<sup>102</sup> *Qumranica Minora I: Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism* and *Qumranica Minora II: Thematic Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls* by Florentino García Martínez, edited by Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar (STDJ 63-64; Leiden: Brill, 2007).

<sup>103</sup> Both Trebolle Barrera and García Martínez publish in French and English in *RevQ*: see J. Trebolle Barrera, *RevQ* 57-58 (1991): 79-100; 60 (1992): 523-9; 75 (2000): 383-99; and F. García Martínez, *RevQ* 61 (1993): 124-50; 62 (1993): 293-7; 65-68 (1996): 73-107; 83 (2004): 365-77; 86 (2005): 253-68. But other scholars too publish directly in English, for instance, M. Pérez Fernández, "4QMMT: Redactional Study," *RevQ* 18 (1997): 191-205. Of the seven titles by Trebolle Barrera in the latest Qumran bibliographical repertoire, four are in English: R. A. Clements and N. Sharon, *The Orion Center Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature (2000-2006)* (STDJ 71; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 266; of the 50 titles by García Martínez, 9 are in French and 25 in English (STDJ 71; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 101-5.

<sup>104</sup> J. Vázquez Allegue, *Los Hijos de la Luz y los Hijos de las Tinieblas: El Prólogo de la Regla de la Comunidad de Qumrán* (Biblioteca Midrásica 21; Estella: Verbo Divino, 2000).

<sup>105</sup> F. Jiménez Bedman, *El misterio del Rollo de Cobre de Qumrán. Análisis lingüístico* (Biblioteca Midrásica 25; Estella: Verbo Divino, 2002).

<sup>106</sup> J. Vázquez Allegue, *La "Regla de la Comunidad" de Qumrán* (Biblioteca de Estudios Bíblicos Menor 8; Salamanca: Sígueme, 2006).

<sup>107</sup> The recent bibliography catalogues seven of them: R. A. Clements and N. Sharon, *The Orion Center Bibliography*, 272-3.

<sup>108</sup> F. Jiménez Bedman, *Manuscritos arameos del Mar Muerto: Textos de Qumrán* (Estudios de Filología Semítica 4; Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona, 2005).

Internacional Complutense Manuscritos del Mar Muerto” and the summer course at Universidad Internacional Menéndez Pelayo in Santander both celebrated the 50th anniversary of the discovery of the manuscripts. The *Proceedings*, published by Julio Trebolla Barrera,<sup>109</sup> include, together with contributions by the Spanish participants,<sup>110</sup> papers by Emanuel Tov, Johann Maier, Adolfo Roitman, Eugene Ulrich and Émile Puech. In reference works for Qumran research, such as the *Encyclopaedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Trebolla Barrera and García Martínez collaborated with a wide array of foreign specialists; García Martínez was one of the “area editors” of the project. In the volumes celebrating the 50th anniversary (the Brill publications and those from the Jerusalem Congress), García Martínez represented Spanish research. In this period Julio Trebolla Barrera has published the biblical and parabiblical manuscripts assigned to him in DJD XIV,<sup>111</sup> XVI,<sup>112</sup> and XXII.<sup>113</sup> Florentino García Martínez published the Dutch share of cave 11 with Eibert Tigchelaar and Adam van der Woude in DJD XXIII,<sup>114</sup> and in DJD XXXVI edited with Eibert Tigchelaar the Aramaic text of *Astronomical Enoch*.<sup>115</sup> Spanish research thus participates in the collective effort of editing and interpreting the manuscripts.

The collective effort developed in this third period has brought Qumran research in Spain to the level of maturity already reached in that country in other branches of biblical research thanks to the pioneering efforts of other scholars. Targumic research, impelled by Alejandro Díez Macho, first in Barcelona and later in Madrid, was the first to achieve great international renown; likewise Ugaritic studies later on, under the auspices of Gregorio del Olmo Lete and Joaquín Sanmartín in Barcelona, and Jesús Luis Cunchillos in Madrid; or Septuagint studies, directed in Madrid by Natalio Fernández Marcos; or rabbinic studies, under the tutelage of Miguel Pérez

<sup>109</sup> J. Trebolla Barrera, ed., *Paganos, judíos y cristianos en los textos de Qumrán* (Biblioteca de ciencias bíblicas y orientales 5; Madrid: Trotta, 1999).

<sup>110</sup> F. García Martínez, L. Vegas Montaner, F. Jiménez Bedman, A. Piñero, N. Fernández Marcos and J. Trebolla Barrera.

<sup>111</sup> “4Q49 (4QJudg<sup>a</sup>),” “4Q50 (4QJudg<sup>b</sup>),” and “4Q54 (4QKgs),” in Eugene Ulrich et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (DJD XIV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).

<sup>112</sup> “4Q118 (4QChr),” in Eugene Ulrich et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles* (DJD XVI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000).

<sup>113</sup> “4Q481a (4QApocryphe d’Elisée),” in George Brooke et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 4. XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD XXII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

<sup>114</sup> Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar and Adam S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11.II (11Q2-18, 11Q20-31)* (DJD XXIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

<sup>115</sup> “4Q208 (4QAstronomical Enoch<sup>a</sup> ar) and 4Q209 (4QAstronomical Enoch<sup>b</sup> ar),” in Philip Alexander et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD XXXVI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000).

Fernández in Granada; and Spanish-Hebrew literature, with the important contributions of Ángel Sáenz Badillos and Ángeles Navarro Peiró in Madrid. As in all these areas, also Qumran research in Spain had to cover a long distance from its inception, and progressively break out of the isolation of the first years. But it has integrated into international research, becoming an influential part of it, and thereby contributing to the common cause.

\*\*\*

From the foregoing, the two figures that have most marked Qumran research in Spain are clearly Florentino García Martínez and Julio Trebolle Barrera. They studied together at the Universidad de Comillas in Santander and at the Pontificio Instituto Biblico in Rome. But it was their stay at the *Casa de Santiago* in Jerusalem that awakened their interest in Dead Sea Scrolls research, and furthered the integration of Qumran research in Spain into the main trend of international research in the field. They are the only Spanish members of the international team of editors of the texts. The two collaborate closely and have produced joint publications. They have remained faithful throughout their scholarly careers to their academic institutions. In 1979 Trebolle Barrera began working with Alejandro Díez Macho at Universidad Complutense, where he remains to this day. García Martínez began work at the Qumran Institute of Groningen in 1980 with Adam van der Woude. While accepting in 2002 a position as Research Professor at KU Leuven, Belgium, he continued to serve as director of the Groningen institute until his retirement in 2007. He was hosted by Trebolle Barrera at the Departamento de Estudios Hebreos y Arameos of Universidad Complutense for a sabbatical semester in 1997; in turn, Trebolle Barrera was his guest for a trimester in 2002 at the Bible Department of KU Leuven.

Trebolle Barrera, interested in the biblical text in all its manifestations, began to publish on the Septuagint<sup>116</sup> even before the defense of his first dissertation in philology<sup>117</sup> and of his second dissertation in theology.<sup>118</sup>

<sup>116</sup> *EstBib* 36 (1977): 91-94; *RB* 86 (1979): 524-43; *RB* 87 (1980): 87-103.

<sup>117</sup> Directed by A. Díez Macho and defended at Universidad Complutense de Madrid in 1980 with the title "Tipos textuales en el Libro de los Reyes," published under the title *Salomón y Jeroboán: Historia de la recensión y redacción de 1 Reyes 2-12; 14* (Institución San Jerónimo 10; Valencia: Institución San Jerónimo, 1980).

<sup>118</sup> Directed by M. García Cordero and defended at Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, published under the title *Jehú y Joás: Texto y composición literaria de 2 Reyes 9-11* (Institución San Jerónimo 17; Valencia: Institución San Jerónimo 1984).

His stay at *Casa de Santiago*, which he directed from 1978 to 1983, was a defining moment for shaping his interest in Qumran texts. It is telling that in the prologue to his first dissertation he thanks Frank Cross for his support, whereas on the second he thanks John Strugnell, two major figures in Qumran research. Given his specialization in the Septuagint, it is not surprising that his first Qumran paper is on the study of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, or that he has specialized in biblical texts from Qumran.<sup>119</sup> His research is not limited to Qumran but spans many fields, in which his publications are numerous: together with his Septuagint studies, he has worked on the Old Latin,<sup>120</sup> the Hebrew Old Testament,<sup>121</sup> hermeneutics,<sup>122</sup> Bible and literature,<sup>123</sup> and the history of religions, creating and directing for many years the Instituto de Ciencias de las Religiones at Universidad Complutense and the journal *Ilu. Revista de Ciencias de las Religiones*. At present he is preparing with Pablo Torijano Morales an edition of 3-4 Kings for the Göttingen Septuaginta Unternehmen.

Although Florentino García Martínez does not reside in Spain he is rightly considered a representative member of Spanish Qumran research. He continues to publish regularly in Spanish and collaborates with Spanish journals such as *Sefarad*, *Estudios Bíblicos*, *Filología Neotestamentaria*, *Communio*, *Aula Orientalis* and *Revista Catalana de Teología*; he is also an active member of the Asociación de Estudios Bíblicos and the Asociación Española de Estudios Hebreos y Judíos, and participates regularly in their activities and congresses. He has taught at Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, at Universidad Complutense de Madrid and at Universidad de Barcelona; he has lectured at many Spanish universities and worked for two sabbatical semesters at the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (1991) and at the Departamento de Estudios Hebreos y Arameos of Universidad Complutense de Madrid (1997), actively contributing to the

<sup>119</sup> J. Trebolle Barrera, "El estudio de 4QSam<sup>a</sup>: implicaciones exegéticas e históricas," *EstBib* 39 (1981): 5-18.

<sup>120</sup> J. Trebolle Barrera, *Centena in libros Samuelis et Regum: Variantes textuales y composición literaria en los libros de Samuel y Reyes* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto de Filología, 1989).

<sup>121</sup> Trebolle Barrera's translation and commentary on the book of Psalms: *Libro de los Salmos: Himnos y Lamentaciones*, with S. Pottecher (Madrid: Trotta, 2001) and *Libro de los Salmos: Religión, poder y saber* (Madrid: Trotta, 2001) have been translated into Italian: *Il libro dei salmi: Religione, potere e sapere: Introduzione di Gianfranco Ravasi* (Assisi: Cittadella Editrice, 2003).

<sup>122</sup> M. Maceiras Fafián and J. C. Trebolle Barrera, *La hermenéutica contemporánea* (Serie Historia de la Filosofía 51; Madrid: Editorial Doncel, 1990, 2nd ed. 1993).

<sup>123</sup> J. Trebolle Barrera, *Imagen y palabra de un silencio: La Biblia en su mundo* (Madrid: Trotta, 2008).

organization of the two Madrid Qumran congresses. In his case too, the stay at *Casa de Santiago* was decisive for his decision to devote himself to Qumran studies, and it is significant that his first paper in an international journal was written in collaboration with Émile Puech, a well-known Qumran scholar.<sup>124</sup> Originally coming from targumic and rabbinic studies, García Martínez focused on Qumran studies after his first year in Jerusalem.<sup>125</sup> Considering these interests, his first works focused on the *Targum of Job* and on legal texts, such as the *Temple Scroll*, whose complete translation he published in 1977, the same year that Yadin's edition appeared. Leaving aside some publications on targumic and apocryphal literature, the bulk of García Martínez's scholarly output has concentrated on the study of Qumran texts, particularly non-biblical ones.

Florentino García Martínez holds a key position in international Qumran research thanks to his work as director of the Groningen Qumran Institute, as founder, executive secretary and editor or co-editor of the triennial congresses of the International Organization for Qumran Studies from 1989 to 2004, as secretary of the *Revue de Qumran* (Gabalda, Paris) from 1986 to 2010, and especially, as editor since 1990, of the series *Studies on the Text of the Desert of Judah* (Brill, Leiden) and co-editor of *Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature* (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids), since 2001.

Julio Trebolle Barrera and Florentino García Martínez developed a passion for Qumran research during their years in Jerusalem. And together they have managed to transmit this interest to many other Spanish scholars by assiduously working on the development of Dead Sea Scrolls research. Qumran research in Spain is above all a collective effort. Thanks to this collective effort, Spanish research in this field has managed to integrate itself successfully into the international arena.

---

<sup>124</sup> É. Puech and F. García Martínez, "Remarques sur la Colonne XXXVIII de 11Qtg-Job," *RevQ* 35 (1978): 401-7.

<sup>125</sup> He himself has told the story in "Fifty Years of Research on the Dead Sea Scrolls and Its Impact on Jewish Studies," in J. Targarona Borrás and Á. Sáenz-Badillos, eds., *Biblical, Rabbinical, and Medieval Studies. Proceedings of the 6th EAJIS Congress, Toledo, July 1998*; Vol. 1 of *Jewish Studies at the Turn of the 20th Century* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 243.

## QUMRAN RESEARCH AND BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP IN GERMANY\*

JÖRG FREY

A comprehensive history of Qumran research is a complex matter, and the present article can only develop selected aspects from a German viewpoint.<sup>1</sup> It focuses on the issue of Qumran and the Bible, with special consideration of the Qumran contribution to the interpretation of the New Testament and Early Christianity.

### *The context of Qumran scholarship in the period after the Second World War*

The beginnings and early history of German Qumran scholarship can be adequately considered only in light of the state of biblical scholarship at faculties of theology – mostly Protestant – in the years after the Second World War, and of the tradition of German exegetical (primarily New Testament) scholarship. Some aspects are significant.

In the German academic system, biblical studies are taught in theology faculties, where there is a clear distinction between chairs in Old and New Testament. Apart from this, there were some positions for Semitic or Oriental studies at philosophical faculties, whereas most of the chairs in Jewish studies were installed only later.<sup>2</sup> This may explain why in Germany Qum-

---

\* The article was written during my research leave at the Alfried-Krupp-Wissenschaftskolleg in Greifswald in the 2008-2009 academic year. Sincere thanks are due to the Krupp Foundation for granting this prestigious scholarship; and to Devorah Dimant for all her patience and friendly support, including the correction of my non-native English.

<sup>1</sup> “German” is used here in the sense of German-speaking scholarship, including that of Austrian and Swiss scholars.

<sup>2</sup> Of course, there had been a long-standing tradition of Jewish scholarship in Germany, the *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, including scholars such as Leopold Zunz, Heinrich Graetz, Abraham Geiger, and more recently Leo Baeck. But those scholars did not teach at universities, and the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* came to an end with the emigration of most Jewish scholars from Germany in the 1920s and 1930s, and finally with the annihilation of most of European Jewry in the years of persecution and the Shoah. There was also an earlier tradition of Christian theological institutions exploring Judaism, the *Instituta Judaica* in Leipzig (Franz Delitzsch) and Berlin (Hermann L. Strack), but some scholars of



ran scholarship was primarily guided by a “Christian” perspective on the relevance of the Scrolls for Early Christianity and by the “Christian” quest for the relevance of the new discoveries for understanding Early Christianity.<sup>3</sup>

Furthermore, in the early post-war period Protestant theology,<sup>4</sup> as well as New Testament scholarship, underwent total restructuring. Several leading scholars in the field had died during the war or immediately after,<sup>5</sup> and others were at least temporarily excluded from university service due to their activities during the Nazi period.<sup>6</sup> So with few competitors,<sup>7</sup> the famous

---

that tradition held a rather negative view of post-biblical Judaism as the dark background of Christianity; others from those institutions became involved in the ideological *Forschungen zur Judenfrage* during the Nazi period. Whereas the Delitzsch-Institute was reopened in 1948 by Karl H. Rengstorff in Münster, to prepare a new Jewish-Christian encounter and another *Institutum Judaicum* was then founded in Tübingen by Otto Michel, specialist institutions for Judaic studies at German-language universities were only founded from 1966 (see Günther Stemberger, “Judaistik,” *TRE* 17 (1988): 290-304 [294-5]). Only a few Jewish scholars continued to publish in German after their emigration (such as Joseph Klausner, or later David Flusser), but their contributions belong to the context of scholarship in Israel and are not included here.

<sup>3</sup> In the first two decades this was the most prominent question in the Qumran debate in Germany but also in France (André Dupont-Sommer) and in the English-speaking context. Note the title of the first Leuven conference devoted to Qumran in 1957: Jan van der Ploeg, ed., *La secte de Qumrân et les origines du Christianisme* (RechBib 4; Paris: Desclée et Brouwer, 1959).

<sup>4</sup> Roman Catholic exegesis was not wholly free to engage in critical Biblical scholarship before the Second Vatican Council, but afterwards it entered promptly into the exegetical debate having speedily adopted most of the methods and results of earlier Protestant scholarship. In the Qumran field, however, some of the first scholars, above all from the French *École Biblique et Archéologique* in Jerusalem, were Roman Catholics. Later, some rather popular suspicions were nourished that Qumran scholars might hide some texts that could endanger the truth of Christianity, but they were totally unjustified.

<sup>5</sup> Hans Lietzmann had died in 1942, Hans von Soden in 1945, and Martin Dibelius in 1947; Ernst Lohmeyer was murdered by Russian occupation troops in 1946, and in 1948 Julius Schniewind died, who had given the most profound response to Rudolf Bultmann’s famous lecture on demythologizing the New Testament (Julius Schniewind, “Antwort an Rudolf Bultmann: Thesen zum Problem der Entmythologisierung,” in Hans W. Bartsch, ed., *Kerygma und Mythos* [2 vols.; Hamburg-Volksdorf: Reich, 1948], 1:77-121).

<sup>6</sup> E.g., Gerhard Kittel from Tübingen (1888-1948), who had inaugurated the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, and his student Walter Grundmann, who had become Professor of New Testament in Jena (1906-1976). Both had been intensely involved in anti-Jewish writing, and Grundmann especially speculated that Jesus was of a non-Jewish (i.e., “Arian”) descent (see Walter Grundmann, *Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum* [Leipzig: Wigand, 1940]; on Grundmann see Roland Deines, ed., *Walter Grundmann – ein Neutestamentler im Dritten Reich* [Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2007]). Kittel died in 1948. Grundmann, however, became active again in East Germany and wrote influential commentaries on the Synoptics. Together with Johannes Leipoldt he wrote a popular classroom book on the *Umwelt* of the New Testament during the 1950s and 1960s. On Karl Georg Kuhn, a former student of Kittel, see below.

<sup>7</sup> The most prominent opponents of Bultmann’s approach were Joachim Jeremias in

Marburg scholar Rudolf Bultmann and some of his students<sup>8</sup> achieved the predominant position in New Testament studies, which they held at least until the 1970s. They generally advocated a “modern” interpretation of the New Testament with the focus mainly on a Hellenistic or Gnostic background to Early Christianity, but showed little interest in (or knowledge of) Jewish sources. Accordingly, Bultmann himself and most of his former students (with the exception of Herbert Braun) paid little attention to the Qumran discoveries. The more conservative wing of scholarship, still unsatisfied with the Bultmannian interpretation, turned to consider these new sources.

In the early years following the discovery of the Scrolls mainly Hebraists and Old Testament scholars noted and commented on the new textual discoveries.<sup>9</sup> In the 1950s and 1960s debates on the Scrolls chiefly engaged New Testament scholars, such as Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, the only German member of the initial Scrolls’ editorial team,<sup>10</sup> and Karl Georg Kuhn, who became the most respected German Qumran specialist and director of

---

Göttingen and Oscar Cullmann in Basel. Other non-Bultmannian New Testament scholars with a certain influence were Otto Michel in Tübingen, Karl-Heinrich Rengstorf in Münster, Ethelbert Stauffer in Erlangen, and – in East Germany – Gerhard Dellinger in Halle.

<sup>8</sup> Important among them as New Testament scholars were Ernst Käsemann (Göttingen and Tübingen), Günther Bornkamm (Heidelberg), Herbert Braun (Mainz), Hans Conzelmann (Göttingen) and Philipp Vielhauer (Bonn); later Erich Gräßer (Bonn), Günter Klein (Münster), Willi Marxsen (Münster) and Otto Merk (Erlangen); in the North American context Helmut Koester (Harvard), and indirectly Hans Dieter Betz (Chicago). In the post-war context, the Bultmann school appeared trustworthy, since Bultmann himself could not be accused of any anti-Semitic attitudes, and some of his students had been imprisoned (Käsemann) or were at least members of the oppositional ‘Bekennende Kirche’ (Bornkamm, Braun); others were younger and graduated only in the early 1950s.

<sup>9</sup> The first reports on the Scrolls in German were: Peter Thomsen, “Handschriftenfund in Palästina,” *TLZ* 73 (1948): 690; Walter Baumgartner, “Der palästinische Handschriftenfund,” *ThR* 17 (1948-1949): 329-46; 19 (1951): 97-154; Otto Eißfeldt and Paul Kahle, “Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften,” *TLZ* 74 (1949): 91-98, 221-8, 595-600 (continued by several authors in the following volumes of *TLZ*); Johannes Hempel, “Vorläufige Mitteilungen über die am Nordwestrande des Toten Meeres gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften,” in *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl.* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949), 411-38; Otto Eißfeldt, “Die Bedeutung der 1947 in Palästina aufgefundenen alten hebräischen und aramäischen Handschriften,” *FF* 25 (1949): 196-200, 302; Kurt Schubert, “Ein Höhlenfund bei Jericho,” *Wort und Wahrheit* 4 (1949): 636-40; “Die Texte aus der Sektiererhöhle bei Jericho,” in Hubert Junker and Johannes Botterweck, eds., *Alttestamentliche Studien: Friedrich Nötscher zum sechzigsten Geburtstag, 19 Juli 1950, gewidmet von Kollegen, Freunden und Schülern* (BBB 1; Bonn: Hanstein, 1950), 224-45.

<sup>10</sup> Claus-Hunno Hunzinger (1929-) became Professor of New Testament and Late Ancient History of Religions at the Protestant Theological Faculty of the University of Hamburg in 1962. Having provisionally edited a few materials, he left the team quite early, and the French scholar Maurice Baillet took his place.

the Qumranforschungsstelle in Heidelberg, where he trained and inspired numerous students.<sup>11</sup> But other scholars also contributed to the field, such as Otto Betz in Tübingen, Oscar Cullmann in Basel, and Herbert Braun in Mainz.<sup>12</sup> With a few exceptions,<sup>13</sup> German scholars of the Hebrew Bible (or the Old Testament) were less involved in early Qumran early debates and entered the field relatively late.<sup>14</sup>

The reason for this is evident in the nature of the earliest discoveries and in the predominantly Christian agenda of research. Of course, specialists of the Hebrew Bible quickly noted the relevance of the *Great Isaiah Scroll* and some other manuscripts to the biblical text,<sup>15</sup> and Hebraists had also

---

<sup>11</sup> Karl Georg Kuhn (1906-1976), later director of the Qumranforschungsstelle in Heidelberg (see below), became an Extraordinary Professor of New Testament in Göttingen in 1949 and moved to Heidelberg in 1954 where he occupied a second chair for New Testament at the Theological Faculty which he held until his retirement. Kuhn trained a large number of students in Qumran research who later became professors of New Testament at different German universities (Jürgen Becker in Kiel, Christoph Burchard in Heidelberg, Gert Jeremias in Marburg and Tübingen, Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn in Munich, Hermann Lichtenberger in Münster and Tübingen, and Hartmut Stegemann in Marburg and Göttingen). Stegemann was given responsibility for the famous Qumranforschungsstelle, and he transferred it first to Marburg and then to Göttingen. On the biography and research of Karl Georg Kuhn see Gerhard Lindemann, "Theological Research about Judaism in Different Political Contexts: The Example of Karl Georg Kuhn," *Kirchliche Zeitgeschichte* 17 (2004): 339-51, and most recently Gert Jeremias, "Karl Georg Kuhn (1906-1976)," in Cilliers Breytenbach and Rudolf Hoppe, eds., *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft nach 1945: Hauptvertreter der deutschsprachigen Exegese in der Darstellung ihrer Schüler* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2008), 297-312, and Gerd Theissen, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor und nach 1945: Karl Georg Kuhn und Günther Bornkamm* (Schriften der Philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften 47; Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2009), 15-149.

<sup>12</sup> Herbert Braun was the only member of the Bultmann school who published extensively on Qumran. His work on Jesus and Qumran (Herbert Braun, *Spätjüdisch-häretischer und frühchristlicher Radikalismus: Jesus von Nazareth und die essenische Qumransekte* [2 vols.; BHTh 24; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1957]) is guided by the basic hermeneutical issues of the Bultmann school. His extensive report on the first ten years of research on Qumran and the New Testament (*Qumran und das Neue Testament* [2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1966]) became a standard work but is also strongly influenced by the Bultmannian views on history-of-religion issues.

<sup>13</sup> Notably Kurt Schubert (Vienna) and Johann Maier (Cologne), both of whom had started as Roman Catholic theologians but became professors of Jewish studies; the Old Testament scholars Hans Bardtke in Leipzig and Rudolf Meyer in Jena, and Georg Molin, who taught Semitic languages in Graz in Austria.

<sup>14</sup> E.g., Odil Hannes Steck, who held the chair in Old Testament in Zurich, his former student Reinhard Gregor Kratz, who is now director of the Qumranforschungsstelle in Göttingen, Heinz-Josef Fabry, who holds the chair in Old Testament exegesis at the Catholic Theological Faculty in Bonn, and Armin Lange who wrote a Habilitation thesis in Old Testament in Tübingen and is now Professor of Second Temple Studies at the University of Vienna. On these scholars see below.

<sup>15</sup> E.g., Otto Eißfeldt, "Varianten der Jesajarolle," *TLZ* 74 (1949): 221-6; *Variae lectiones rotulorum manusccriptorum anno 1947 prope Mare Mortuum repertorum ad Jes 1-*

noticed the importance of the new discoveries for linguistic matters.<sup>16</sup> But since most of the biblical manuscripts, and also the parabiblical texts, were published only in the 1990s a more complete appreciation of the textual and related issues could not have arisen earlier. Instead, the agenda was set by the quest for the origins of Christianity and by issues raised from the contents of the *Community Rule*, the *War Scroll* and the other non-biblical texts from cave 1.<sup>17</sup> Thus, scholars started to explore and discuss the dualism found in some of the Scrolls<sup>18</sup> and the linguistic and history-of-religions background of some New Testament texts, especially the Gospel of John.<sup>19</sup>

---

66 et Hab 1-2 pertinentes (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1951); Paul Kahle, "Die Auffindung der Rollen und ihr Ankauf: Die textkritische Bedeutung der Jesaja-Rolle (1QIs<sup>a</sup>): Der Anlaß für das Verbergen der Rollen," *TLZ* 74 (1949): 91-94; *Die hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1951); "Die im August 1952 entdeckte Lederrolle mit dem griechischen Text der kleinen Propheten und das Problem der Septuaginta," *TLZ* 79 (1954): 81-94.

<sup>16</sup> See Rudolf Meyer, "Zur Sprache von 'Ain Feschcha," *TLZ* 75 (1950): 721-6; "Das Problem der Dialektmischung in den hebräischen Texten von Qumran," *VT* 7 (1957): 139-48; "Bemerkungen zu den hebräischen Aussprachetraditionen von Chirbet Qumran," *ZAW* 70 (1958): 39-48; "Spuren eines westsemitischen Präsens-Futur in den Texten von Chirbet Qumran," in Johannes Hempel and Leonhard Rost with William F. Albright, eds., *Von Ugarit nach Qumran: Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen und altorientalischen Forschung: Otto Eissfeld zum 1. September 1957 dargebracht von Freunden und Schülern* (BZAW 77; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1958), 118-28.

<sup>17</sup> In German research, this was stated first by Karl G. Kuhn, "Die Bedeutung der neuen palästinischen Handschriften für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft," *TLZ* 75 (1950): 81-86, who stressed the relevance of a "late Jewish sect" in temporal and spatial proximity to Jesus and the Primitive Community. In this early note Kuhn points out the analogy of sharing property; in subsequent articles he extensively discussed the issue of dualism and its historical explanation (see next footnote).

<sup>18</sup> Karl G. Kuhn, "Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament," *ZTK* 47 (1950): 192-211; "Πειρασμός - ἀμαρτία - σάρξ im Neuen Testament und die damit zusammenhängenden Vorstellungen," *ZTK* 49 (1952): 200-222; "Die Sektenschrift (1QS) und die iranische Religion," *ZTK* 49 (1952): 296-316.

<sup>19</sup> E.g., Kuhn, "Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte," 209-10, and later "Johannes-Evangelium und Qumrantexte," in Willem C. van Unnik, ed., *Neotestamentica et Patristica: Eine Freundesgabe Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag überreicht* (NovTSup 6; Leiden: Brill, 1962), 111-22; cf. also Oscar Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of the New Testament," in Krister Stendahl, ed., *The Scrolls and The New Testament* (New York: Harper, 1957), 18-32; "L'opposition contre le temple de Jérusalem, motif commun de la théologie johannique et du monde ambiant," *NTS* 5 (1959): 157-73; Günther Baumbach, *Qumran und das Johannes-Evangelium: Eine vergleichende Untersuchung der dualistischen Aussagen der Ordensregel von Qumran und des Johannes-Evangeliums mit Berücksichtigung der spätjüdischen Apokalypsen* (AVTRW 6; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1958); and Otto Böcher, *Der johanneische Dualismus im Zusammenhang des nachbiblischen Judentums* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1965). A little later the aspect of predestination was thoroughly analyzed and compared with the Johannine view by Roland Bergmeier, *Glaube als Gabe nach Johannes* (BWANT 112; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1980).

They analyzed Scriptural interpretation<sup>20</sup> and eschatology<sup>21</sup> at Qumran, the figure of the Teacher of Righteousness in comparison with Jesus,<sup>22</sup> and the character of the community as against the primitive community.<sup>23</sup> The nature of the community meals was compared with the Eucharist,<sup>24</sup> and the immersions with John the Baptist's purification rite and with early Christian baptism.<sup>25</sup> The calendrical differences provoked attempts to solve the problems of the chronology of the account of Jesus' passion by references to the Qumran calendar.<sup>26</sup> Moreover, scholars found numerous helpful parallels to various New Testament themes and texts. The early debate is summarized in a *catena* on the New Testament and thematic essays by Herbert Braun.<sup>27</sup>

The parallels between the Qumran "sect" and Early Christianity are also treated extensively in the comprehensive introductions to the new discoveries by the Austrian Semitist Georg Molin,<sup>28</sup> the Vienna professor of Jewish studies Kurt Schubert<sup>29</sup> and the East German Old Testament scholar Hans Bardtke.<sup>30</sup> But such parallels were not uncommon in the early discussion of the Qumran findings. Extensive comparisons of the Scrolls with the New

<sup>20</sup> Otto Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (WUNT 6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1960). On the radicalization of the Torah see also Braun, *Spätjüdisch-häretischer und frühchristlicher Radikalismus*.

<sup>21</sup> Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran mit einem Anhang über Eschatologie und Gegenwart in der Verkündigung Jesu* (SUNT 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966).

<sup>22</sup> Gert Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963).

<sup>23</sup> Otto Betz, "Die Geburt der Gemeinde durch den Lehrer," *NTS* (1957): 314-26; "Das Volk seiner Kraft," *NTS* 4 (1958): 67-75; "Felsenmann und Felsengemeinde: Eine Parallele zu Mt 16,17-19 in den Qumranpsalmen," *ZNW* 48 (1957): 49-77.

<sup>24</sup> Karl G. Kuhn, "Über den ursprünglichen Sinn des Abendmahls und sein Verhältnis zu den Gemeinschaftsmahlen der Sektenschrift (1QS)," *EvT* 10 (1950-1951): 508-27.

<sup>25</sup> Otto Betz, "Die Proselytentaufe der Qumransekte und die Taufe im Neuen Testament," *RevQ* 1 (1958): 213-34.

<sup>26</sup> E.g., originally Annie Jaubert, "La Date de la dernière Cène," *RHR* 146 (1954): 104-73; *La Date de la Cène* (Paris: Gabalda, 1957); "Jésus et le calendrier de Qumrân," *NTS* 7 (1960-1961): 1-30; in German research see the conservative Roman Catholic scholars Josef Blinzler, "Qumran-Kalender und Passionschronologie," *ZNW* 39 (1958): 223-51, and later Eugen Ruckstuhl, "Zur Chronologie der Leidensgeschichte Jesu: I. Teil," *SNTU* 10 (1985): 27-61, "Zur Chronologie der Leidensgeschichte Jesu: II. Teil," *SNTU* 11 (1986): 97-129.

<sup>27</sup> Braun, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*.

<sup>28</sup> Georg Molin, *Die Söhne des Lichtes: Zeit und Stellung der Handschriften vom Toten Meer* (Vienna and Munich: Herold, 1954).

<sup>29</sup> Kurt Schubert, *Die Gemeinde vom Toten Meer: Ihre Entstehung und ihre Lehren* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1958); later reprinted in several editions in: Johann Maier and Kurt Schubert, *Die Qumran-Essener: der Schriftrollen und Lebensbild der Gemeinde* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1973).

<sup>30</sup> Hans Bardtke, *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer: Die Sekte von Qumran* (Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1958).

Testament entailing far-reaching conclusions were already made in 1950 by the French scholar André Dupont-Sommer, and later, in a more balanced manner, by Millar Burrows and Frank Moore Cross.<sup>31</sup> The focus on the comparison between Qumran and Early Christianity was not solely a particular German phenomenon but a common trait of the early phase of Qumran research.

The impact of the Qumran discoveries on New Testament scholarship in Germany must be viewed in the context of the dominating exegetical school of Rudolf Bultmann. His views, like those of most of his students', were shaped overall by the history-of-religions school with a strong focus on the Hellenistic-oriental and allegedly gnostic background of the New Testament, together with a lack of interest in contemporary or rabbinic Judaism. Unlike some of his students, Bultmann refused to look for the historical Jesus and focused his work largely on Paul and John. He interpreted the two from the perspective of an alleged pre-Christian gnostic world view and by the use of existentialist hermeneutics inspired by the philosophy of the early Martin Heidegger. Bultmann's approach of "demythologizing" the New Testament, first presented in a famous lecture in 1941 but published only in 1948,<sup>32</sup> became very influential in German Protestantism after the Second World War. In the 1950s and 1960s it sparked sharp controversy among academic theologians and between theologians and those in conservative Church circles.

Against the totality of Bultmann's theology and hermeneutics, with its lack of interest in the Jewish background of Early Christianity, the discovery of hitherto unknown Jewish documents in the Judean Desert could enhance scholarly interest in contemporary Judaism. For conservative scholars, the new texts also provided a better framework for an alternative interpretation, especially regarding the history of the religious background of the New Testament. The parallels between the texts from cave 1 and the fourth Gospel especially could also serve to advocate more "conservative" views of the transmission and historical reliability of the Jesus tradition<sup>33</sup> and a

---

<sup>31</sup> Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*; Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1957); *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1958); Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. But see the early article (autumn 1948) by Millar Burrows, "The Contents and Significance of the Manuscripts," *BA* 11 (1948): 58-61 (59): "The fact that the manuscripts were found not far from the Dead Sea suggests at once that this group may have been the sect of the Essenes..."

<sup>32</sup> Rudolf Bultmann, "Neues Testament und Mythologie," in Bartsch, *Kerygma und Mythos*, 1:15-48.

<sup>33</sup> This is especially true for some American scholars, e.g. William F. Albright, "Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of St. John," in William D. Davies and David



stronger Palestinian Jewish influence on Paul.<sup>34</sup> As a result of the criticism of Bultmann's school, German scholars were more cautious than others. In general the Scrolls helped to draw German New Testament scholarship away from Gnosticism and to re-orient it to a more robust consideration of Jewish and especially Palestinian Jewish contexts.

Most significant is the shift in the study of the Gospel of John, in relation to which Bultmann had established his views in numerous articles and in his magisterial commentary.<sup>35</sup> From the very beginning, the type of dualism found at Qumran (primarily in 1QS III, 14-IV, 26) seemed to provide a closer parallel to the type of dualism in the Johannine writings than the Gnostic parallels adduced by Bultmann from the later movements of Mandaeism and Manichaeism. Quite significantly, the type of Judaism found in the Dead Sea Scrolls also differed from the types known from apocalyptic sources, and even more from later rabbinic thought. Karl Georg Kuhn claimed quite early that the non-orthodox type of Judaism found at Qumran was the "mother soil" of Johannine language and thought.<sup>36</sup> He even concluded that Qumran dualism, or "more widely" the Essene sect, was the door through which Zoroastrian ideas were transmitted into the world of Early Christianity. Therefore, the "Qumran paradigm" was thought to replace the leading Gnostic paradigm.<sup>37</sup> Consequently, the focus of scholarship did not shift from Gnosticism to a common or even "normative" type of Judaism but to a type that was different from Pharisaic or rabbinic thought, a "sectarian" or "heterodox" type of Judaism.

---

Daube, eds., *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology: In Honour of Charles Harold Dodd* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), 153-71, who viewed the Scrolls as a confirmation that the fourth Gospel contained no less than "the memories of the Apostle John" himself (170-71), and Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 161-2: "John preserves authentic historical material which first took form in an Aramaic or Hebrew milieu where Essene currents still ran strong."

<sup>34</sup> Cf. William D. Davies, "Additional notes," in *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (2d ed.; London: SPCK, 1955), 352-3; "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit," in Stendahl, *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, 157-82, 276-82.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Rudolf Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (KEK 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 1948.

<sup>36</sup> E.g., Karl G. Kuhn, "Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte," 210: "Wir bekommen in diesen neuen Texten den Mutterboden des Johannesevangeliums zu fassen, und dieser Mutterboden ist palästinisch-jüdisch, ist aber nicht das pharisäisch-rabbinische Judentum, sondern ist eine palästinisch-jüdische Sektenfrömmigkeit gnostischer Struktur."

<sup>37</sup> See Jörg Frey, "Auf der Suche nach dem Kontext des Johannesevangeliums," in Jörg Frey and Udo Schnelle, with Juliane Schlegel, eds., *Kontexte des Johannesevangeliums: Das vierte Evangelium in religions- und traditionsgeschichtlicher Perspektive* (WUNT 175; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 3-43 (26-28).



This was not a mere coincidence but was linked to the hermeneutical pattern adopted when the Qumran texts had been attributed to the Essenes. The attribution, originally suggested by Eliezer Lipa Sukenik<sup>38</sup> simply because Pliny had localized the Essenes near the Dead Sea, opened up a hermeneutical paradigm with a long prehistory, some implications of which should not go unnoticed.<sup>39</sup>

As is well known, most of the Church fathers, beginning with Eusebius,<sup>40</sup> considered Philo's *therapeutae* to be Christian ascetics, hence the Essenes and Therapeutae were viewed as Christians through the Middle Ages and later, the notable exception to this view being held by some Reformation theologians.<sup>41</sup> Some authors, especially from the Carmelite order, even claimed that John the Baptist, Jesus, his mother, and the Apostles were Essenes (and Carmelites).<sup>42</sup> With the enlightenment era the paradigm was modified and, chiefly within the Freemasonry movement, the Essenes were then considered an ideal enlightened association, open to Egyptian wisdom, Greek mysteries and Pythagorean teaching, or even the ideal, enlightened type of non-dogmatic and universalist Christianity. Some authors even thought that Jesus himself had been taught "therapeutical" wisdom by the Essenes<sup>43</sup> and some Rationalists aspired to explain his miracles or even his "resurrection" (or survival of apparent death) by such knowledge or by the assistance of the Essenes.<sup>44</sup> Long before the Qumran discoveries, the Essenes were viewed as a precursor group of Christianity; later the French historian Ernest Renan expressed this idea in viewing Christianity

<sup>38</sup> Eliezer L. Sukenik, *Megillot Genuzot: Scrolls that Were Stored Away from an Ancient Gemah Found in the Judean Desert, First Survey* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1948), 1:16-17 (Hebrew). Cf. also Burrows, "The Contents and Significance of the Manuscripts," 59.

<sup>39</sup> For the following passage, cf. the extensive survey by Siegfried Wagner, *Die Essener in der wissenschaftlichen Diskussion: Vom Ausgang des 18. bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts* (BZAW 79; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1960).

<sup>40</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* II 16-17. Cf. also Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 11 where even Philo is considered a Christian.

<sup>41</sup> See Wagner, *Die Essener*, 3-4.

<sup>42</sup> Wagner, *Die Essener*, 5.

<sup>43</sup> The first author to suggest this was Johann Georg Wachter in *De primordiis Christianae religionis libri duo, quorum prior agit de Essaeis Christianorum inchoatoribus, alter de Christianis, Essaeorum posteris* (1713); see Wagner, *Die Essener*, 2. The work is now reprinted in: Johann G. Wachter, *De primordiis Christianae religionis: Elucidarius cabalisticus* (Winfried Schröder, ed.; vol. 1,2 of *Freidenker der europäischen Aufklärung*; Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Fromman-Holzboog, 1995).

<sup>44</sup> Modern novelists, such as Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh, or Dan Brown, draw on material borrowed from those early Enlightenment authors. Cf. Carl Friedrich Bahrdt, *Ausführung des Planes und Zweckes Jesu* (12 vols.; Berlin: Mylius, 1784-1793), and Karl Heinrich Venturini, *Natürliche Geschichte des großen Propheten von Nazareth* (4 vols.; Bethlehem [Copenhagen]: Schuboth, 1800-1802).

as an Essenism that had succeeded.<sup>45</sup> The broad range of scholarly views on the Essenes notwithstanding, they were often considered—based on the ancient descriptions from Philo and Josephus—a relatively open-minded group within Judaism, strongly influenced by non-Jewish (Persian, Egyptian, Greek or even Buddhist) ideas, rendering it possible for non-Jewish elements to be transmitted to Early Christianity by the Essenes.<sup>46</sup> Even the Jewish scholar Joseph Klausner sought to explain all non-Pharisaic elements in Early Christianity by means of the Essenes.<sup>47</sup>

This paradigm was effective once the Qumran texts had been ascribed to the Essenes. Although the character of that group could now be determined from very different sources, the idea of the Essenes as precursors of the Primitive Community,<sup>48</sup> as a quasi-“monastic” group,<sup>49</sup> or as the doorway for non-Jewish religious influences on Early Christianity could be adopted for the interpretation of the new texts, suggesting a direct line between Qumran and Early Christianity. This is just a variation of those earlier views, when Karl Georg Kuhn expressed the idea that the influence of Zoroastrianism on Early Christianity was mediated by the Essenes “heterodox” type of Judaism (or alternatively the dualism from Qumran). The Essenes were now the source of the “liberal” and universalistic tendencies in Early Christianity, which were notably different from the “normal,” Pharisaic, or rabbinic type of Judaism.

<sup>45</sup> “Le christianisme est un essénisme qui a largement réussi.” See Ernest Renan, *Ceuvres Complètes: Édition définitive* (vol. 6; Henriette Psicharied, ed.; Paris: Calman-Levy, 1953), 1301. Cf. also Ernest Renan, *Vie de Jésus* (Paris: Levy, 1863), 73-74, where the author is more circumspect but notes numerous similarities between Essenism and Jesus, who are considered the enlightened people of that time. Cf. Wagner, *Die Essener*, 178.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Wilhelm Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (2d ed.; Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1906), 535-7: “Diese Sekte scheint der Kanal gewesen zu sein, durch welchen dem jungen Christentum in seiner ersten Entwicklung manche fremdartigen Elemente (Sakramentswesen, Verwerfung des Kultus?) zugeströmt sind. Der Zusammenhang zwischen ihnen und auch den für die Religionsgeschichte der folgenden Jahrhunderte ... nicht belanglosen judenchristlichen Sekten des Ostjordanlandes ist offenkundig.”

<sup>47</sup> Joseph Klausner, *Jesus von Nazareth* (Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag, 1930), 284: “Jakobus, Jesu leiblicher Bruder, lebte ganz wie ein Essäer: als Asket und Einsiedler. Das Christentum hat also in der Zeit kurz vor und gleich nach Jesus dem Essäismus vieles entnommen. Auch Jesus selbst steht den Essäern in manchem Sinne nahe. ... So können wir fast mit Sicherheit sagen, daß alles Nicht-Pharisäische im Urchristentum von den Essenern stammt.”

<sup>48</sup> E.g., Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, 121, where he quotes the saying by Renan.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. already Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums* (2d ed.), 524: “die erste Erscheinung einer organisierten Mönchsgemeinde.” So this paradigm was adopted when Qumran was taken to be an Essene monastery.

*Scholars, Insights and Projects*

The second part of this article highlights the works of the most important German-speaking scholars active in Qumran research and some methodological developments and insights achieved in the first 40 years of discussion and after the full release of the Qumran fragments in 1991. A sketch of the most important projects developed in the last two decades and of those in progress concludes the article.

*Editorial Work*<sup>50</sup>

The eight scholars first entrusted with the publication of the fragments kept in the Palestine Archaeological Museum (later Rockefeller Museum) included one German, the young Protestant New Testament Claus-Hunno Hunzinger. He was to edit the fragments of the *War Scroll* from cave 4 and some liturgical text fragments. But Hunzinger (later replaced by Maurice Baillet<sup>51</sup>) left the team quite quickly, having published only a few articles. One of them deserves mention because of the pioneering methodology used to discover different redactional layers in the *War Scroll*, evinced by a careful comparison of a cave 1 scroll (1QM) with cave 4 texts (4QM).<sup>52</sup> The 1955 article shows how early scholars concluded that different manuscripts of allegedly the same work could provide different stages of development or even different recensions.<sup>53</sup> Hunzinger's observations were an important

<sup>50</sup> On this aspect see also the article by Annette Steudel in this volume.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. the introduction by Maurice Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4.III* (DJD VII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), xi-xiv.

<sup>52</sup> Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, "Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milhamā aus Höhle 4 von Qumran," *ZAW* 69 (1957): 131-51. Hunzinger concluded that 4QM<sup>a</sup> is a copy of the old non-Qumranic text of the book *Milhamah*, whereas 1QM is a "Qumranized" version (150). His general conclusions were adopted in research only much later, when scholars generally recognized the diversity among the different texts from Qumran and the need to distinguish the different works, or even different redactional layers within a single work. Cf. also his article "Beobachtungen zur Entwicklung der Disziplinarordnung der Gemeinde von Qumran," in Hans Bardtke, ed., *Qumran-Probleme: Vorträge des Leipziger Symposions über Qumran-Probleme vom 9. bis 14. Oktober 1961* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963), 231-47.

<sup>53</sup> Decades later, similar observations were made regarding other texts, e.g., the *Community Rule*. Cf. the analysis by Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997); "The Textual Traditions of the Qumran Community Rule," in Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen, eds., *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995: Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten* (STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 141-8.

step that furthered the realization of the internal variety within the library and the later distinction between “pre-sectarian” and “sectarian” texts.

The German contribution to the editing of the Qumran fragments was generally rather limited. After Hunzinger’s departure the international team had no German member, and only after its expansion under the direction of Emanuel Tov in the 1990s were other German scholars involved with preparing the official editions of the texts in the DJD series. Before that, only four phylacteries, acquired by Karl Georg Kuhn for the Heidelberg University Library, were edited elsewhere.<sup>54</sup> Later Hartmut Stegemann was invited to join the editorial team. He re-edited some fragments from the cave 4 copies of the *Damascus Document*<sup>55</sup> and his edition of the *Hodayot* was issued posthumously by Eileen Schuller.<sup>56</sup> Annette Steudel<sup>57</sup> and Armin Lange<sup>58</sup> were also charged with editorial tasks in this context. Noteworthy are Steudel’s thorough re-edition of manuscripts 4Q174 and 4Q177 in her doctoral dissertation<sup>59</sup> and especially Klaus Beyer’s preliminary edition of numerous Aramaic texts in the supplement to his magisterial linguistic work where he provides access to numerous Aramaic fragments still unedited at that time.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>54</sup> Karl Georg Kuhn, *Phylakterien aus Höhle 4 von Qumran* (AHAW, Philologisch-historische Klasse 1/1957; Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1957). They were re-edited in DJD VI by Józef T. Milik.

<sup>55</sup> Hartmut Stegemann, “4QDamascus Document<sup>d</sup> frgs. 10, 11 (Re-edition), 15, 16,” in Stephen Pfann et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 4:XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD XXXVI; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 201-15.

<sup>56</sup> Hartmut Stegemann, Eileen Schuller and Carol Newsom, *1QHodayot<sup>d</sup> with Incorporation of 1QHodayot<sup>b</sup> and 4QHodayot<sup>e-f</sup>* (DJD XL; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2008).

<sup>57</sup> Annette Steudel edited some sapiential texts (4Q411, 412, 425 and 426) in DJD XX (159-68, 203-24) and further miscellanea in DJD XXXVI.

<sup>58</sup> Armin Lange edited some miscellanea in DJD XXXVI (one of them in collaboration with Dorothee Ernst), and prepared the “Annotated List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert Classified by Content and Genre” in DJD XXXIX, 115-64, together with Ulrike Mittmann-Richert.

<sup>59</sup> Annette Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidr-Eschat<sup>a,b</sup>): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 (“Florilegium”) und 4Q177 (“Catena A”) repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994).

<sup>60</sup> Klaus Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: Samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten; aramäistische Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Deutung, Grammatik/Wörterbuch, deutsch-aramäische Wortliste, Register* (Ergänzungsband; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994); enl. edition under the same title was published as vol. 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).

*Karl Georg Kuhn and the tradition of the Qumranforschungsstelle*

But long before the first editorial team was established another German scholar had entered the debate and established himself as the leading expert of the new discoveries. This was Karl Georg Kuhn, later to become director of the Qumranforschungsstelle in Heidelberg. He was the first German to point out the relevance of the new textual discoveries for understanding Early Christianity, and he soon developed a comprehensive “history-of-religions” interpretation of the Scrolls in a series of articles between 1950 and 1952.<sup>61</sup> Trained in Oriental and Semitic languages (including Persian) as well as in the New Testament, he was well qualified to commence work on the newly discovered texts and to interpret them in a broader context.

However, we are unable to omit a brief note on Kuhn’s “pre-Qumran” scholarly phase.<sup>62</sup> Anyone who admires Kuhn’s work as a Qumran scholar might be shocked to learn of his earlier works on the *Judenfrage* in the Nazi period. It is still hard to understand how such a learned scholar could be ensnared by the ideology of that time, and yet how quickly he was rehabilitated and built up a new scholarly reputation in an entirely fresh field of research.

<sup>61</sup> See the titles mentioned above: Kuhn, “Die Bedeutung der neuen palästinischen Handschriften;” “Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte;” “Die Sektenschrift und die iranische Religion;” “Πειρασμός - ἁμαρτία - σάρξ;” “Über den ursprünglichen Sinn des Abendmahls;” “Jesus in Gethsemane;” *EvTh* 12 (1952-1953): 260-85.

<sup>62</sup> The most thorough and balanced survey of the career of Karl Georg Kuhn is by Gerd Theissen, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor und nach 1945: Karl Georg Kuhn und Günther Bornkamm* (Schriften der Philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften 47; Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2009), where Kuhn’s career is compared with that of his Heidelberg colleague Günther Bornkamm. Cf. also the article by Kuhn’s former student Jeremias, “Karl Georg Kuhn (1906-1976),” in Breytenbach and Hoppe, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft nach 1945*, 297-312, who gives important information but is determined to give an apologetic interpretation. The brief article by Heinz Wolfgang Kuhn, “Kuhn, Karl Georg,” in John H. Hayes, ed., *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1999), 2:39-40, passes in complete silence over the activities of Kuhn during the Nazi period. But see Lindemann, “Theological Research about Judaism,” 331-8, where significant quotations from Kuhn’s anti-Semitic speeches and publications between 1933 and 1945 are given. Cf. also the book by Wolfgang Fenske, *Wie Jesus zum ‘Arier’ wurde: Auswirkungen der Entjudaisierung Christi im 19. und zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005), 221-4, although the analysis suffers from problems concerning its historiographical method; Alan E. Steinweis, *Studying the Jew: Scholarly Antisemitism in Nazi Germany* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), 76-91, and Horst Junginger, “Judenforschung’ in Tübingen: Von der jüdischen zur antijüdischen Religionswissenschaft,” *Jahrbuch des Simon-Dubnow-Instituts* 5 (2006): 375-98; “Das Bild des Juden in der nationalsozialistischen Judenforschung,” in Andrea Hoffmann et al., eds., *Die kulturelle Seite des Antisemitismus zwischen Aufklärung und Shoah* (Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde e. V., 2006), 171-220.

As a student of Gerhard Kittel and Enno Littmann, Kuhn earned his doctorate in 1931 in Tübingen with a pioneering and highly respected translation and commentary of the rabbinic Midrash *Sifre Numeri*. His Habilitation thesis (accepted in 1934) was about the textual tradition of the Psalms of Solomon.<sup>63</sup> As a student of Kittel, he was also asked to write several articles in volumes 1-4 of the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*<sup>64</sup> and to review and update the sections about Jewish sources in other articles. Remarkably, there is no open anti-Semitism in those articles,<sup>65</sup> although at least some of them were written at the time when Kuhn was deeply involved in a line of research that ultimately served to legitimize the anti-Jewish actions of the Nazi regime. Having joined the NSDAP (Nazi party) for whatever reasons<sup>66</sup> in 1932, Kuhn was the only public speaker at an evening event in Tübingen on April 1, 1933 to advocate the boycott of Jewish shops.<sup>67</sup> On becoming a *Dozent* in Tübingen he delivered his lectures dressed in SA uniform. In his inaugural lecture on the internal conditions of Jewish proliferation,<sup>68</sup> he interpreted it as “the alleged unchangeable character of the ‘Jewish people’,”<sup>69</sup> with extensive reference to

<sup>63</sup> Publication of the dissertation was only in 1959. See Karl G. Kuhn, *Der tannaitische Midrasch Sifre zu Numeri ... bearbeitet und erklärt* (Rabbinische Texte 2.3; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933-1959). The Habilitation thesis was published under the title *Die älteste Textgestalt der Psalmen Salomos auf Grund der syrischen Übersetzung neu untersucht mit einer Bearbeitung und Übersetzung der Psalmen Salomos 13-17* (BWANT 73; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1937).

<sup>64</sup> Karl G. Kuhn, “Αβηλ - Κάιν,” *TWNT* (1932), 1:6-7; “Der Heiligkeitsbegriff im rabbinischen Judentum,” *TWNT* (1932), 1:97-101; “Βαβυλών,” *TWNT* (1932), 1:512-4; “Βολαίμ,” *TWNT* (1932), 1:521-3; “שׁוּשַׁן תְּרַשׁוּ in der rabbinischen Literatur,” *TWNT* (1932), 1:570-73; “Γὼγ καὶ Μαγῶγ,” *TWNT* (1932), 1:790-792; “Die rabbinischen Gottesbezeichnungen,” *TWNT* (1938), 3:93-95; Ἰσραήλ, Ἰουδαῖος, Ἐβραῖος in der nachalttestamentlichen jüdischen Literatur,” *TWNT* (1938), 3:360-370; “μαρναναθά,” *TWNT* (1942), 4:470-75; “προσήλυτος,” *TWNT* (1959), 6:727-43.

<sup>65</sup> This has been shown by Johan S. Vos, “Antijudaismus/Antisemitismus im Theologischen Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament,” *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 38 (1984): 89-110. As was customary at that time, Kuhn uses the term “Spätjudentum” (*TWNT* 1:6, 522), and some of the categories used appear too schematic and simplistic from today’s perspective. Although the language in some articles (e.g. in *TWNT* 3:360 on Ἰσραήλ and Ἰουδαῖος) is similar to that of contemporary anti-Semitic writings, there is only a very subtle devaluation of Judaism, in marked contrast with Kuhn’s writings in the context of his research on the “Jewish question” and also with articles of some other authors in the *TWNT* (see Theissen, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor und nach 1945*, 15 n. 2).

<sup>66</sup> Jeremias, “Karl Georg Kuhn,” 301 explains this as a mere reaction to the fact that his former fiancée joined the Communist party; cf. the more extensive discussion in Theissen, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor und nach 1945*, 18-19.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Lindemann, “Theological Research about Judaism,” 339-40; Theissen, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor und nach 1945*, 19-21.

<sup>68</sup> Karl G. Kuhn, “Die inneren Voraussetzungen der jüdischen Ausbreitung,” *Deutsche Theologie* 2 (1935): 9-17.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Lindemann, “Theological Research about Judaism,” 334.



racial patterns.<sup>70</sup> Thereafter he devoted himself increasingly to work on the *Judenfrage*. As an orientalist and Protestant theologian he served (together with Kittel) as an expert of the Forschungsabteilung *Judenfrage* within the Reichsinstitut für Geschichte des neuen Deutschland, and contributed a number of articles to the “scientific” work of this institute in the service of Nazi ideology.<sup>71</sup> In an address at the fourth annual conference of that institute from November 30 to December 3, 1938,<sup>72</sup> published quickly as a separate booklet, he concluded that Jewry was now reaping what it had sown. His text closes with praise of the Führer for creating for the first time the conditions that allow for a true solution to the “Jewish question.”<sup>73</sup>

After 1945, Kuhn distanced himself from this publication (only). He did so in a personal footnote to an article he was allowed to publish in the journal *Evangelische Theologie*, which was closely linked to theological circles belonging to the German resistance in the Protestant Church (“Bekennende Kirche”) and to the theological school of Karl Barth.<sup>74</sup> But the *retractatio* could appear somewhat ambiguous and half-hearted, given that Kuhn had published more anti-Jewish articles than the single pamphlet he mentions there. In a letter written in the late 1960s he explicitly refused to retract his other articles written in the context of the Reichsinsti-

---

<sup>70</sup> E.g., in Karl G. Kuhn, *Die Judenfrage als weltgeschichtliches Problem* (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1939), 29: “So bleibt als einzige Erklärung dieses jüdischen Wesensgefüges... die Erklärung aus den rassischen Eigenschaften des jüdischen Volkes, aus seiner biologischen Erbanlage.”

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Karl G. Kuhn, “Die Entstehung des talmudischen Denkens,” *Forschungen zur Judenfrage* 1 (1937): 63-80; “Das Weltjudentum in der Antike,” *Forschungen zur Judenfrage* 2 (1937): 9-29, 64-80; “Ursprung und Wesen der talmudischen Einstellung zum Nichtjuden,” *Forschungen zur Judenfrage* 3 (1938): 199-34; and—most comprehensively—*Die Judenfrage*. Cf. also his article “Der Talmud, das Gesetzbuch der Juden,” in *Zur Geschichte und rechtlichen Stellung der Juden in Stadt und Universität Tübingen: Aus den Jahressbänden der wissenschaftlichen Akademie des NSD-Dozentenbundes / Wissenschaftliche Akademie Tübingen des NSD-Dozentenbundes 1 (1937-1939)* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1941), 226-33. On this article see Lindemann, “Theological Research about Judaism,” 335.

<sup>72</sup> This was only a few weeks after synagogues were burnt all over Germany in the so-called *Reichskristallnacht* on November 9, 1938.

<sup>73</sup> Kuhn, *Die Judenfrage*, 46-47. For more quotations from this pamphlet in English translation see Lindemann, “Theological Research about Judaism,” 335-7.

<sup>74</sup> The note is worth quoting: “Ich für meine Person sage in diesem Zusammenhang, daß ich es bedaure, die Schrift: *Die Judenfrage als weltgeschichtliches Problem*, Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt Hamburg 1939, 51 Seiten, geschrieben zu haben und daß ich sie in aller Form widerrufe. Ich bedaure, daß ich damals so blind war, nicht zu sehen, daß der Weg der Hitlerschen Judenpolitik in den Abgrund des Grauens ging und daß er unaufhaltsam war. Nur solche Blindheit machte es möglich, daß ich die Schrift damals schrieb” (Karl G. Kuhn, “Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer: Zum heutigen Stand ihrer Veröffentlichung,” *EvT* 11 [1951-1952]: 72-75 [73 note 4]).



tut.<sup>75</sup> “From today’s perspective it appears strange that in June 1940 Kuhn entered the occupied Warsaw Ghetto, accompanied by an SS officer, to confiscate Jewish manuscripts and other items for research in the institutes for the *Judenfrage*.”<sup>76</sup>

Soon after his dismissal from his teaching position at Tübingen University by the French military administration in 1946, Kuhn was invited to the Theological Faculty at the University of Göttingen as an expert in rabbinic Judaism. Having started teaching in May 1949, he presented a small monograph on the Jewish *Shmone Esre* prayer and the Lord’s Prayer.<sup>77</sup> He also published extensively on the newly discovered Qumran texts. For him, this fascinating new field of research provided the opportunity to build up a new scholarly existence in an area where he was not obliged to refer to his earlier publications. Kuhn’s (relatively few) later publications show no traces of overt anti-Semitism. But the enigma of his scholarly biography still awaits further explication.

In Göttingen, Kuhn initiated the study of the new Qumran texts with a group of students and colleagues. This “workshop” became a fascinating experience especially for students, who thereby enjoyed an opportunity to participate in current research. This type of work continued when Kuhn was called to a chair at the University of Heidelberg in 1954, and it became the nucleus of the well-known Qumranforschungsstelle (nicknamed the ‘Qumran Höhle’), founded in 1957. In this context, the Scrolls were studied with extremely accurate and advanced philological and historical-critical methods free from theological constraints, and thus attracted numerous guest scholars from abroad.<sup>78</sup>

In Heidelberg the “workshop” team developed tools for further research, such as a “reversed” Hebrew dictionary which could help to fill the lacu-

<sup>75</sup> The letter is quoted and cautiously considered in Theissen, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor und nach 1945*, 138-43.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Hans-Joachim Barkenings, “Spuren im Warschauer Ghetto,” in Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz, ed., *Christlicher Antijudaismus und Antisemitismus: Theologische und kirchliche Programme Deutscher Christen* (Arnoldshainer Texte 85; Frankfurt a. M.: Haag & Herchen, 1994), 111-24 (115-17), and Theissen, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor und nach 1945*, 41-42.

<sup>77</sup> Karl G. Kuhn, *Achtzehngebet und Vaterunser und der Reim* (WUNT 1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1950). The brief but philologically accurate study was the first volume of a new monograph series, founded by Joachim Jeremias and Otto Michel. In addition to the articles on the new textual discoveries, it helped to establish Kuhn’s reputation as the philologically most able expert on the Judaism of the New Testament period.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. the impressions noted by Mathias Delcor, “Où en sont les études Qumrâniennes?,” in Delcor, *Qumrân, sa piété*, 11-46 (17-21). See also the impressive account in Jeremias, “Karl Georg Kuhn.”

nae in corrupted texts,<sup>79</sup> the first printed concordance of the non-biblical texts,<sup>80</sup> and a two-volume bibliography on the Scrolls.<sup>81</sup> Kuhn and his team also conceptualized a linguistic dictionary of the non-biblical texts from Qumran that would set out the Qumran terms distinct from biblical parlance, and thus supplement the existing Hebrew and Aramaic dictionaries. The slow publication process of the cave 4 texts during the 1970s and 1980s prevented the completion of this dictionary. This remained the case even after the Qumranforschungsstelle came under the direction of Hartmut Stegemann, and was moved to Marburg in 1973 and to Göttingen in 1980. The project was interrupted in 1988.<sup>82</sup> It resumed in Göttingen in 2002 under the direction of Reinhard Kratz and Annette Steudel.

Probably the most fruitful results of the Heidelberg institute were the works of the large number of doctoral students. Almost all the German Qumran scholars of the second generation were trained by Kuhn, and most of their works touched on important aspects of the early Qumran discussions and debates, which were also relevant for comparison with New Testament texts and early Christian phenomena. Gert Jeremias provided a comprehensive analysis of Qumran passages relevant to the “Teacher of Righteousness” together with a sober comparison of them with the historical Jesus.<sup>83</sup> Jürgen Becker analyzed the terms related to “salvation” at Qumran and compared them with soteriological concepts in the preaching of Jesus, in Johannine dualism and in the theology of Paul and the Fourth Gospel.<sup>84</sup> He concluded that the author of the Fourth Gospel used and reshaped a Qumranic type of dualism rather than a Gnostic one,<sup>85</sup> but also that Paul’s ideas about sin were influenced by the Essenes.<sup>86</sup> Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn (not related to his teacher) examined the notion of the eschaton present

<sup>79</sup> Karl G. Kuhn (with Hartmut Stegemann and Georg Klinzing), *Rückläufiges hebräisches Wörterbuch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958).

<sup>80</sup> Karl G. Kuhn (with Albert M. Denis, Reinhard Deichgräber, Werner Eiss, Gert Jeremias and Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn), *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960); “Nachträge zur Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten,” *RevQ* 4 (1963): 163-234.

<sup>81</sup> Christoph Burchard, *Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer* (BZNW 76; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1957); *Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer* (vol. 2; BZNW 89; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1965).

<sup>82</sup> Cf. the account of Hartmut Stegemann, “Die Qumranforschungsstelle Marburg und ihre Aufgabenstellung: Ein Bericht,” in Delcor, ed., *Qumrân, sa piété*, 47-54.

<sup>83</sup> Gert Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963).

<sup>84</sup> Jürgen Becker, *Das Heil Gottes: Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament* (SUNT 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964).

<sup>85</sup> Becker, *Das Heil Gottes*, 236.

<sup>86</sup> Becker, *Das Heil Gottes*, 243, cf. 276.

within the community of Qumran texts, especially in *Hodayot*.<sup>87</sup> He was able to establish the distinction between the hymns of the Teacher and of the community more accurately than others.<sup>88</sup> Kuhn's thesis also provided an important parallel for understanding the particular eschatology of the historical Jesus. Georg Klinzing investigated the transformation of cultic terms in Qumran texts and in the New Testament.<sup>89</sup> Hermann Lichtenberger (who had studied with Kuhn, but completed his dissertation later with Stegemann) made a comprehensive study of the anthropology of the Qumran community, including aspects of creation, predestination, dualism, and resurrection.<sup>90</sup> Roland Bergmeier (who completed his dissertation with Hartwig Thyen) established the view that the Qumran ideas on predestination are the closest parallel and possible background to the respective views in the Johannine writings. Although Bergmeier could not continue a university career, he still published extensively on themes related to Qumran and the New Testament.<sup>91</sup>

*Hartmut Stegemann and the "material reconstruction of fragmentary Scrolls"*

The works by Hartmut Stegemann were the most important. Although they remained unpublished until his untimely death in 2005, they were widely circulated in photocopies from which they were quoted. These works established Stegemann's international reputation as the leading German Qumran scholar of the second generation, who continued the Qumranforschungsstelle, which he took first to Marburg and then to Göttingen. In his philological dissertation<sup>92</sup> Stegemann developed his method of the material reconstruction of scrolls from scattered fragments,<sup>93</sup> which became an

<sup>87</sup> Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran mit einem Anhang über Eschatologie und Gegenwart in der Verkündigung Jesu* (SUNT 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966).

<sup>88</sup> E.g. Günter Morawe, *Aufbau und Abgrenzung der Loblieder von Qumran* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961).

<sup>89</sup> Georg Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im NT* (SUNT 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971).

<sup>90</sup> Hermann Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde* (SUNT 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980).

<sup>91</sup> Roland Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte des Flavius Josephus; Quellenstudien zu den Esserertexten im Werk des jüdischen Historiographen* (Kampen: Kok, 1993); "Beobachtungen zu 4Q521 f. 2 II, 1-13," *ZDMG* 145 (1995): 38-48.

<sup>92</sup> Hartmut Stegemann, *Rekonstruktion der Hodayot: Ursprüngliche Gestalt und kritisch bearbeiteter Text der Hymnenrolle aus Höhle 1 von Qumran* (typescript; Heidelberg, 1963).

<sup>93</sup> On this method see Hartmut Stegemann, "Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments," in Lawrence H. Schiffman, ed., *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (JSPSup 8;

indispensable tool for the publication of numerous texts, especially those from caves 4 and 11. In his work on the *Hodayot* scroll from cave 1 (1QH<sup>a</sup>), edited early on by Eliezer Lipa Sukenik, Stegemann discovered that the *editio princeps* had arranged the columns and the line numbering incorrectly. Using the shape of the fragments and their margins, together with traces of physical decay caused by humidity, he was able to rearrange the columns and insert numerous additional fragments in their correct positions. His results were later independently confirmed by Émile Puech.<sup>94</sup> They have been incorporated in most of the subsequent editions and translations, marking Stegemann's new arrangement and numbering beside Sukenik's original numbering.<sup>95</sup> Throughout his career, Stegemann continued to work on improving his edition, introducing new readings and inserting more fragments. He finally collaborated with the editor of the cave 4 *Hodayot* fragments, Eileen Schuller. His work is now published posthumously together with the cave 4 fragments, edited by Schuller in DJD XL.<sup>96</sup>

Beyond the *Hodayot*, Stegemann's method has become accepted as a fundamental tool for the study of other fragmentary manuscripts. Stegemann helped numerous other scholars worldwide with their reconstructions. Mention should be made particularly of the work of his doctoral student Annette Steudel who suggested that manuscripts 4Q174 (the so-called Florilegium) and 4Q177 (the so-called Catena A) are actually two manuscripts representing different parts of the same work, which she called "Midrash on Eschatology."<sup>97</sup> Another achievement accomplished using his method is Sarianna Metso's thorough analysis of the cave 4 *Community Rule* copies. She established that the manuscripts differ greatly in length and content, and concluded that there was never a "definitive" or "valid" form of the *Rule* material at Qumran.<sup>98</sup>

---

Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 189-220; "The Material Reconstruction of the *Hodayot*," in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years, 272-84*. See also Annette Steudel, "Assembling and Reconstructing Manuscripts," in Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1:516-34.

<sup>94</sup> Émile Puech, "Quelques aspects de la restauration du Rouleau des Hymnes (1QH)," *JJS* 39 (1988): 38-55; cf. Eileen Schuller, "Introduction and History of the Edition" in *1QHodayot<sup>a</sup>* (DJD XL), 1-11 (4-5).

<sup>95</sup> E.g. Florentino García Martínez and Eibert Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997-1998); Michael O. Wise, Martin Abegg, and Edward Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1996), and also the German translation by Johann Maier, see Johann Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer* (2 vols.; Munich: Reinhardt, 1995).

<sup>96</sup> Stegemann, Schuller and Newsom, *1QHodayot<sup>a</sup>*.

<sup>97</sup> Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde*.

<sup>98</sup> Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*.

Stegemann's second major work, which also remained unpublished but was circulated in private copies, was his second (theological) dissertation on the emergence of the Qumran community.<sup>99</sup> Taking as his point of departure the work on the Teacher of Righteousness by Gert Jeremias, Stegemann utilized the data of a new text, the pesher of Psalm 37 (4Q171 = 4QpPs<sup>a</sup>), and analyzed the polemics embedded in it and its terminology describing the community's opponents. He thereby reconstructed the developments that led to the creation of the Qumran community of the Teacher, the *Yahad*. In this context he developed his views that the Teacher of Righteousness was a priestly figure, more precisely<sup>100</sup> a high priest, probably the one who followed on after the death of Jakim-Alkimos until Hasmonean Jonathan removed him from office and assumed the position himself. True, Josephus and his sources do not mention a high priest in Jerusalem for the years 159-152 BCE, but in Stegemann's opinion Temple service could not possibly function without a high priest in office. In his reconstruction, the deposed high priest, with his claim to represent the spiritual authority and tradition of Israel as a whole, escaped and found refuge in conservative groups who opposed the Hasmonean rule. He was accepted there as the legitimate leader and teacher, as opposed to the illegitimate one in Jerusalem, and thus influenced and shaped the *Yahad* as an association of opposing groups. This association was—according to Stegemann's own arguments—not a “sect” but the legitimate and main “community” of Israel, where, according to its interpretation, the law was interpreted in the correct and faithful manner under the guidance of the divine inspiration accorded to the Teacher. Stegemann's unpublished work is still one of the most important and comprehensive contributions to the early history of the community. It remains indispensable for research in this field. A condensed summary of Stegemann's views was later published in the Madrid congress volume.<sup>101</sup>

The only book Stegemann published by himself is his popular textbook with the somewhat misleading title *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer*

<sup>99</sup> Hartmut Stegemann, *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde* (Th.D., Bonn, 1965; privately published, repr. 1971). His Habilitation thesis on the usage of the Divine name and its development in Early Judaism and in the New Testament also remained unpublished: *Kyrios o Theos und Kyrios Jesus: Aufkommen und Ausbreitung des religiösen Gebrauchs von Kyrios und seine Verwendung im NT* (Habilitationsschrift, Bonn 1969).

<sup>100</sup> Cf. especially the historical synthesis, 198-246 and the summary, 247-52.

<sup>101</sup> Hartmut Stegemann, “The Qumran Essenes: Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times,” in Treballe Barrera and Vegas Montaner, *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 1:83-166.

und Jesus, in English more accurately titled *The Library of Qumran*.<sup>102</sup> Here Stegemann presents a wealth of observations about the caves and the character of the most important manuscripts and works. He also includes a summary of his views on the Essene movement and of the site of Qumran as a “publishing house” of the Essenes. He provides important insights on the similarities and differences between John the Baptist and the Qumran community, and of the relationship between the teaching of the historical Jesus and the Essenes.

*Other miscellaneous scholars and works*

Without striving for comprehensiveness, a number of other scholars who were not connected with the Qumranforschungsstelle in Heidelberg should be mentioned.

The theological faculties in East Germany functioned under much more difficult circumstances than those in the West. Nevertheless, Hans Bardtke of the University of Leipzig, a scholar who had remained in church service during the war, was one of the very first European scholars to work on the Qumran texts. As early as 1952 he published a complete German translation and interpretation of the first texts. In 1958 he issued a second volume with additions, namely the ancient texts on the Essenes and a more comprehensive commentary.<sup>103</sup> Bardtke’s work was the first monograph on the new discoveries to be published in German. Until his death in 1975 he also provided translations of Qumran texts and accounts of relevant scholarly publications in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* and in the *Theologische Rundschau*.<sup>104</sup> An often neglected but quite important contribution to the

<sup>102</sup> Hartmut Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus* (Freiburg: Herder, 1993); English trans.: *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

<sup>103</sup> Hans Bardtke, *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer* (Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1952; 3d ed. 1961); *Die Sekte von Qumrān* (vol. 2 of *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer*; 2d ed.; Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1961).

<sup>104</sup> Hans Bardtke, “Qumran und seine Funde,” *TRu* 29 (1963): 261-92; 30 (1964): 281-315; “Qumran und seine Probleme,” *TRu* 33 (1968): 97-119, 185-236; “Literaturbericht über Qumran V. Teil,” *TRu* 35 (1970): 196-230; “Literaturbericht über Qumran VI. Teil: 1. Die Kriegsrolle 1 QM,” *TRu* 37 (1972): 97-120; “Literaturbericht über Qumran VI. Teil: II Das Genesis-Apocryphon 1 QGenAp; III. Das Hiobtargum aus Höhle XI von Qumran (11 QtgJob),” *TRu* 37 (1972): 193-204, 205-19; “Literaturbericht über Qumran VII. Teil: Die Sektenrolle 1 QS,” *TRu* 39 (1974): 257-91; “Literaturbericht über Qumran VIII Teil: Die Damaskusschrift CD,” *TRu* 39 (1974): 189-221; “Literaturbericht über Qumran IX. Teil: Die Loblieder (Hodajoth) von Qumran,” *TRu* 40 (1975): 210-26; “Literaturbericht über Qumran X. Teil: Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit und die Geschichte der Qumrangemeinde,” *TRu* 41 (1976): 97-140.

history of research was the dissertation of his student Siegfried Wagner on the Essenes in the scholarly debate before the Qumran discoveries.<sup>105</sup>

Another East German scholar who worked extensively on Qumran texts was the Hebraist and Old Testament scholar at Jena, Rudolf Meyer (1909-1991). He wrote numerous articles and reviews, especially on the language of the Qumran texts,<sup>106</sup> but also an important monograph on the *Prayer of Nabonidus*.<sup>107</sup> Due to the efforts and the reviewing activity of scholars such as Bardtke and Meyer especially, Qumran scholarship was noted and accessible in the academic context of East Germany, behind the Iron Curtain. Two other doctoral dissertations are also noteworthy: the unpublished dissertation by Meyer's student Waltraut Bernhard, the first thorough analysis of the *New Jerusalem* fragments from cave 1;<sup>108</sup> and the work by the New Testament scholar Günther Baumbach on Johannine dualism in comparison with the Qumran texts.<sup>109</sup>

Another scholar who worked on the Scrolls independently of Kuhn's and Stegemann's Qumranforschungsstelle was Otto Betz in Tübingen. Drawing on his broad knowledge of Josephus and rabbinic traditions, he published numerous articles with interesting exegetical ideas, mainly focused on the relevance of Qumran texts for understanding Jesus and the New Testament.<sup>110</sup> Note too the late Hans Burgmann, who also published ex-

<sup>105</sup> Wagner, *Die Essener*.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. his reviews: Rudolf Meyer, "Die Fragmente der Höhle I," *TLZ* 82 (1957): 21-26; "Die vier Höhlen von Murabba'at," *TLZ* 88 (1963): 19-28; "Die sogenannten 'Kleinen Höhlen' von Qumran," *TLZ* 90 (1965): 331-42; also his articles "Zur Sprache von 'Ain Feshcha;" "Das Problem der Dialektmischung;" "Bemerkungen zu den hebräischen Aussprachetraditionen;" "Spuren eines westsemitischen Präsens-Futur," in Hempel and Rost with Albright, eds., *Von Ugarit nach Qumran*. See his collected articles in Waltraut Bernhardt, ed., *Zur Geschichte und Theologie des Judentums in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit: Ausgewählte Abhandlungen* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1989); Waltraut Bernhardt, ed., *Beiträge zur Geschichte von Text und Sprache des Alten Testaments: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (BZAW 209; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993).

<sup>107</sup> Rudolf Meyer, *Das Gebet des Nabonid: Eine in den Qumran-Handschriften wiederentdeckte Weisheits Erzählung* (Sitzungsberichte der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse 3/107; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962).

<sup>108</sup> Waltraut Bernhardt, *Die kultur- und religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung des Qumranfragmentes 5Q15* (Th.Diss., Jena, 1970).

<sup>109</sup> Günther Baumbach, *Qumran und das Johannes-Evangelium: eine vergleichende Untersuchung der dualistischen Aussagen der Ordensregel von Qumran und des Johannes-Evangelium mit Berücksichtigung der spätjüdischen Apokalypsen* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1958).

<sup>110</sup> See Otto Betz, *Der Paraklet: Fürsprecher im häretischen Spätjudentum, im Johannes-Evangelium und in neu gefundenen gnostischen Schriften* (AGSÜ 2; Leiden: Brill, 1963); "Rechtfertigung in Qumran," in Johannes Friedrich, Wolfgang Pohlmann and Peter Stuhlmacher, eds., *Rechtfertigung: Festschrift für Ernst Käsemann zum 70. Geburtstag* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1976), 17-36; "Probleme des Prozesses Jesu," in *ANRW* 2.25.1 (Berlin: de



tensively on the history of the Qumran community until his death in 1992 but received little academic attention in Germany.<sup>111</sup>

Apart from Bardtke's translations, two other translated editions were quite influential in Germany. The first is the early bilingual textbook by the New Testament scholar and then Lutheran bishop Eduard Lohse. His edition offered the Hebrew text of the most important Scrolls with a Masoretic vocalization to make it accessible to non-specialists and regular theology students with knowledge of Biblical Hebrew alone.<sup>112</sup> Another important early work was the German translation of the texts by one of the pioneers of Jewish studies in Germany, Johann Maier of the University of Cologne, with a separate volume of annotations.<sup>113</sup> Maier's translation was later republished (without the notes) together with the popular introduction by Kurt Schubert in a students' edition, which was long the most accessible German introduction to Qumran for non-specialists.<sup>114</sup> Soon after the release of the unpublished material in 1991, Maier provided a comprehensive two-volume edition of almost all the texts, cautiously translating the fragments without trying to combine them into a "composite text."<sup>115</sup> This translation is still the most reliable and comprehensive edition of the Qumran material in German. A third volume provided much historical in-

---

Gruyter, 1982), 566-647; "Early Christian Cult in the Light of Qumran," *Religious Studies Bulletin* 2/2 (1982): 73-85; "Die Bedeutung der Qumranschriften für die Evangelien des Neuen Testaments," *BK* 40 (1985): 54-64; "Der Tod des Choni-Onias im Licht der Tempelrolle von Qumran," in *Jesus der Messias Israels* (WUNT 42; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 59-74; "Jesus and the Temple Scroll," in James H. Charlesworth, ed., *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 75-103; "The Qumran Halakhah in Miqṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah (4QMMT) and Sadducean, Essene and Early Pharisaic Tradition," in Derek R. G. Beattie and Martin J. McNamara, eds., *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context* (JSOTSup 166; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 176-202.

<sup>111</sup> Hans Burgmann, *Vorgeschichte und Frühgeschichte der Gemeinden von Qumrân und Damaskus* (ANTJ 7; Frankfurt a. M.: Lang, 1987); *Zwei lösbar Qumranprobleme: Die Person des Lügenmannes; Die Interkalation im Kalender* (Frankfurt a. M.: Lang, 1986); *Die essenischen Gemeinden von Qumran und Damaskus in der Zeit der Hasmonäer und Herodier* (Frankfurt a. M.: Lang, 1988); *Der 'Sitz im Leben' in den Josuaflucht-Texten in 4Q379 22 II und 4QTestimonia* (Qumranica Mogilensia 1; Krakow: Enigma, 1990); *Weitere lösbar Qumranprobleme* (ed. Zdzislaw Kaperka; Krakow: Enigma, 1992).

<sup>112</sup> Edouard Lohse, ed., *Die Texte aus Qumran: Hebräisch und Deutsch; Mit masoretischer Punctuation Übersetzung, Einführung und Anmerkungen* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971). A second volume appeared thirty years later, after the release of the new texts in the 1990s: Annette Steudel, ed., *Die Texte aus Qumran II* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001).

<sup>113</sup> Johann Maier, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer* (2 vols.; Munich: Reinhardt, 1960).

<sup>114</sup> Johann Maier and Kurt Schubert, *Die Qumran-EssenerSchriftrollen und Lebensbild der Gemeinde* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1973; paperback edition, Uni-Taschenbücher 224; Munich: Reinhardt, 1982).

<sup>115</sup> Johann Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener. Die Texte vom Toten Meer* (2 vols.; Munich: Reinhardt, 1995).

formation but also a comprehensive index of terms to the texts.<sup>116</sup> Although Maier was much more than a Qumran specialist and published in the whole area of Jewish history, and therefore did not contribute a “school” of his own in Qumran research, he was especially interested in cultic and calendrical aspects and provided the first German analysis of the *Temple Scroll*.<sup>117</sup> With his broader background, Maier was one of the first German-speaking scholars to leave the original focus on the relevance of the Scrolls for biblical scholarship, or even for the origins of Early Christianity, in order to focus on other issues that seemed important in Jewish tradition and thought.<sup>118</sup>

The delay in the publication of new texts and the decline of the “Qumran fever” that had raged in the first two decades lessened public interest in the Qumran texts in Germany, especially from the late 1960s to the early 1990s. It was sparked again around 1991, when a mass of new texts became accessible. Another factor was the suspicion cast on the Scrolls by Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh’s best-seller, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception*. In their novelistic manner the two authors claimed to unveil the true nature of the Scrolls and Christianity, as suggested by the title of the German translation.<sup>119</sup> Playing on the suspicions regarding the Vatican<sup>120</sup> that were widespread at the time in Germany, the book circulated widely in several

<sup>116</sup> Johann Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener. Vol. 3: Einführung, Zeitrechnung, Register und Bibliographie* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1996).

<sup>117</sup> Johann Maier, *Die Tempelrolle vom Toten Meer* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1978); English trans.: *The Temple Scroll* (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1982); enlarged ed.: *Die Tempelrolle vom Toten Meer und das ‘Neue Jerusalem’: 11Q19 und 11Q20; 1Q32, 2Q24, 4Q554-555, 5Q15 und 11Q18; Übersetzung und Erläuterung mit Grundrissen der Tempelhofanlage und Skizzen zur Stadtplanung* (3d enl. ed.; completely renewed and extended; Munich: Reinhardt, 1997).

<sup>118</sup> Cf., e.g., Johann Maier, “Zu Kult und Liturgie der Qumrangemeinde,” *RevQ* 14 (1990): 543-86; “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für das Verständnis des Judentums,” *BK* 48 (1993): 2-9; “Purity at Qumran: Cultic and Domestic,” in Alan J. Avery-Peck, Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton, eds., *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part 5: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2 vols.; Handbook of Oriental Studies 1.56; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 1:91-124; “Liturgische Funktionen der Gebete in den Qumrantexten,” in Albert Gerhards, Andrea Doeker and Peter Ebenbauer, eds., *Identität durch Gebet: Zur gemeinschaftsbildenden Funktion institutionalisierten Betens in Judentum und Christentum* (Studien zu Judentum und Christentum; Paderborn: Schöningh, 2003), 59-112.

<sup>119</sup> Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception* (New York: Summit Books, 1991); German trans.: *Verschlußsache Jesus: Die Qumranrollen und die Wahrheit über das frühe Christentum* (Munich: Droemer Knauer, 1991).

<sup>120</sup> The suspicion was reinforced after the Vatican Institution for Faith and Doctrine (then directed by the German Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, now Pope Benedict XVI) withdrew teaching permission from well-known German Roman Catholic theologians, first the Tübingen ecumenicist Hans Küng, and then, in 1991, the psychologist, preacher and Bible interpreter Eugen Drewermann.

editions. It propagated Robert Eisenman's theory<sup>121</sup> that the Scrolls were, in fact, about Jesus, James and Paul, but also that the insights gained from the Scrolls could endanger Christian teaching and that this might be the true reason for the delay in the publication. The book elicited powerful negative scholarly reactions,<sup>122</sup> but it brought Qumran back to the center of public debate. The release of the microfiches of the hitherto unpublished Scrolls, and the Eisenman-Wise pirated edition of new texts,<sup>123</sup> ushered in a new phase of the debate about the Scrolls. However, at that time only a few German biblical scholars were trained to work with the Qumran texts and take part in the discussion regarding the newly released texts.

Apart from the new fields of study suggested by the recently published texts, other lines of research continue the focus on the relationship of Qumran and Early Christianity, but rather in the margins of Qumran studies. Mention should be made of the assumption of an Essene quarter in Jerusalem, supposedly located on the southwestern hill of the city, near the Dormition Abbey, where later tradition locates the Last Supper and Pentecost. The idea was developed by the Tyrolean Benedictine archaeologist Bargil Pixner, who had also excavated the Essene Gate in that area, partly with the German New Testament scholar Rainer Riesner.<sup>124</sup> If this view had proved correct, it would have opened up the possibility of major Essene influences on the Primitive Community and on Christianity in general. Yet despite some support by other scholars not only in Germany, the hypothesis could not stand up under critical scrutiny. The continued search for

<sup>121</sup> Robert Eisenman, *Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran: A New Hypothesis of Qumran Origins* (StPB 34; Leiden: Brill, 1983); *James the Just in the Habakkuk Peshet* (Leiden: Brill, 1986).

<sup>122</sup> Cf. Martin Hengel, "Die Qumranrollen und der Umgang mit der Wahrheit," *TBei* 23 (1992): 233-7; Klaus Berger, *Qumran und Jesus: Wahrheit unter Verschluss* (Stuttgart: Quell, 1993); Otto Betz and Rainer Riesner, *Jesus, Qumran und der Vatikan* (Gießen: Brunnen, 1993).

<sup>123</sup> Robert Eisenman and Michael O. Wise, *Jesus und die Urchristen: Die Qumran-Rollen entschlüsselt* (Munich: Bertelsmann, 1993). In contrast to the English title, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, the German title referred directly to the New Testament and incorrectly suggested a direct connection between it and the texts reproduced in the edition.

<sup>124</sup> Bargil Pixner, "An Essene Quarter on Mount Zion?," in *Studia Hierosolymitana on onore di P. Bellarmino Bagatti* (2 vols; Jerusalem: Franciscan Print Press, 1976), 1:245-85; Rainer Riesner, "Essener und Urkirche in Jerusalem," *BK* 40 (1985): 64-76; Bargil Pixner, *Wege des Messias und Stätten der Urkirche: Jesus und das Judenchristentum im Licht neuer archäologischer Erkenntnisse* (ed. Rainer Riesner; Biblische Archäologie und Zeitgeschichte 2; Giessen: Brunnen, 1991); "Jerusalem's Essene Gateway: Where the Community Lived in Jesus' Time," *BAR* 23 (1997): 22-31, 64-66; Rainer Riesner, "Jesus, the Primitive Community, and the Essene Quarter of Jerusalem," in Charlesworth, *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 198-234; *Essener und Urgemeinde in Jerusalem* (Biblische Archäologie und Zeitgeschichte 6; Gießen: Brunnen, 1998).

Christians and Christian traces in Qumran texts<sup>125</sup> was also apparent in the persistence of an earlier suggestion that some of the Greek texts from cave 7 could represent New Testament texts. This suggestion, originally proposed by the Spanish papyrologist José O'Callaghan in 1972,<sup>126</sup> but immediately rejected by some leading specialists in Qumran studies as well as in papyrology and textual criticism, was taken up in 1984 by the German Carsten Peter Thiede, a specialist in English literature but also an autodidact in papyrological studies. His defense of the identification of 7Q5 with Mark 6:52-53 by the utilization of new technological tools for improving the legibility of the fragment was especially popularized in Evangelical and Fundamentalist circles,<sup>127</sup> but the better photographs confirmed experts' rejection of the proposed identification.<sup>128</sup> The hypothesis became popular in those circles because Thiede's identification, if proven, would have meant an earlier date for the Gospel of Mark than about 70 CE, as usually suggested by historical-critical scholarship. The case amply demonstrates how Qumran is always in danger of being utilized for ideological purposes. It shows how the general public is unable to understand the complexity and the tentative character of historical arguments and therefore tends to accept simple identifications.

Only rather late did a (limited) number of German Old Testament scholars engage in Qumran research. This was due to the growing realization of the relevance of the Qumran discoveries for the reconstruction of the biblical text and the redaction and assembly of the canonical Hebrew Bible. At the same time there was a shift in German Old Testament scholarship, which was traditionally interested in the most "genuine" strata of the biblical books, their secondary parts being deemed less important. In particular the Zurich scholar Odil Hannes Steck stimulated greater attention to the late redactional strata of the books of the prophets (especially Isaiah and the Minor Prophets), taking into consideration the data culled from the

<sup>125</sup> Cf. Bernhard Mayer, ed., *Christen und Christliches in Qumran?* (Eichstätter Studien, Neue Folge 32; Regensburg: Pustet, 1992).

<sup>126</sup> José O'Callaghan, "¿Papiros neotestamentarios en la cueva 7 de Qumrán?," *Bib* 53 (1972): 91-100.

<sup>127</sup> Carsten P. Thiede, "7Q: Eine Rückkehr zu den neutestamentlichen Papyrusfragmenten in der siebten Höhle von Qumran," *Bib* 65 (1984): 538-59; cf. Thiede, *Die älteste Evangelien-Handschrift? Das Markusfragment von Qumran und die Anfänge der schriftlichen Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments* (Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 1986); Carsten P. Thiede and Matthew D'Ancona, *Der Jesus-Papyrus: Die Entdeckung einer Evangelien-Handschrift aus der Zeit der Augenzeugen* (Munich: Luchterhand, 1997).

<sup>128</sup> Summarized in German by Stefan Enste, *Kein Markustext in Qumran: Eine Untersuchung der These: Qumran-Fragment 7Q5 = Mk 6,52-53* (NTOA 45; Freiburg-Göttingen: Academic Press-Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000).

Qumran texts. Steck's efforts resulted in a thorough interpretation of the exegesis of the Qumran *pesharim*, but also in a remarkable monograph on the Qumran version of the book of Isaiah according to the *Great Isaiah Scroll* from cave 1.<sup>129</sup> His former student Reinhard Kratz then worked on the book of Daniel and other late traditions of the Hebrew Bible, and later became the director of the Qumranforschungsstelle in Göttingen after the retirement of Hartmut Stegemann. Together with Stegemann's student Annette Steudel, he trained young scholars such as Roman Vielhauer and Peter Porzig in work on the Scrolls,<sup>130</sup> and launched a new joint project on the interpretation of the book of Genesis in the Scrolls, together with Devorah Dimant of the University of Haifa.

Another Hebrew Bible scholar who engaged in Qumran research before the release of texts in the 1990s is the Roman Catholic scholar Heinz-Josef Fabry in Bonn. As early as his doctoral dissertation, submitted to the University of Bonn in 1975, he provided a thorough examination of the root שׁוּב in the Qumran texts.<sup>131</sup> In his Habilitation thesis he analyzed community terminology in the Scrolls. This work was published almost entirely in articles of the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament*, edited by his teacher Johannes Botterweck, and since 1981 with Fabry as a co-editor. As the leading Roman Catholic Qumran specialist in Germany, Fabry has worked continually to impart Qumran insights to other German-speaking biblical scholars, and to utilize the Scrolls to improve the semantics of biblical terms and to understand better the textual history and canonization of the Hebrew Bible.<sup>132</sup> He has also linked Qumran research with the study

<sup>129</sup> Odil H. Steck, *Die erste Jesajarolle von Qumran (1QIs<sup>a</sup>)* (2 vols.; SBS 173; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1998); "Bemerkungen zur Abschnittsgliederung in den Jesaja-Handschriften aus der Wüste Juda: Ein Vergleich auf der Grundlage von 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>," in Ulrich Dahmen, Armin Lange and Hermann Lichtenberger, eds., *Die Textfunde vom Toten Meer und der Text der Hebräischen Bibel* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2000), 53-90.

<sup>130</sup> Roman Vielhauer, *Das Werden des Buches Hosea: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (BZAW 349; Berlin-New York: de Gruyter, 2007); see also "Materielle Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der beiden Pescharim zum Hoseabuch (4QpHos[a] und 4QpHos[b])," *RevQ* 20 (2001): 39-91; Peter Porzig, *Die Lade Jahwes im Alten Testament und in den Texten vom Toten Meer* (BZAW 397; Berlin-New York: de Gruyter, 2009).

<sup>131</sup> Heinz-J. Fabry, *Die Wurzel Šûb in der Qumran-Literatur: Zur Semantik eines Grundbegriffes* (BBB 53; Cologne: Hanstein, 1975).

<sup>132</sup> Heinz-J. Fabry, "11QP<sup>s</sup> und die Kanonizität des Psalters," in Frank-L. Hossfeld and Ernst Haag, eds., *Freude an der Weisung des Herrn: Beiträge zur Theologie der Psalmen; Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag von Heinrich Gross* (2d ed.; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1987), 45-67; "Der Makarismus – mehr als nur eine weisheitliche Lehrform: Gedanken zu dem neu-edierten Text 4Q525," in Jutta Hausmann and Hans-J. Zobel, eds., *Alttestamentlicher Glaube und Biblische Theologie: Festschrift für Horst Dietrich Preuß zum 65. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1992), 362-71; "Der Umgang mit der kanonisierten Tora in Qumran," in Erich Zenger, ed., *Die Tora als Kanon für Juden und Christen* (HBS

of the Septuagint;<sup>133</sup> he likewise takes into account archaeological studies and the relation between textual and material remains of the past.<sup>134</sup> His student Ulrich Dahmen wrote his Habilitation thesis on the relevance of the *Psalms Scroll* from cave 11 (11QPs<sup>a</sup>) for the canonical history of the Psalter.<sup>135</sup>

Of note too is the Hebrew Bible scholar Klaus Koch from Hamburg, whose works on apocalypticism and especially on the book of Daniel integrate insights obtained from the Qumran texts.<sup>136</sup> His student Uwe Gleßmer contributed to Qumran research by analyzing the calendar, in particular its use by the *mishmarot* texts.<sup>137</sup> Together with Matthias Albani, another younger Hebrew Bible scholar and one of the leading experts in astronomical and calendrical issues,<sup>138</sup> he discovered in the storerooms of

---

10; Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 1996), 293-327; "Der Psalter in Qumran," in Erich Zenger, ed., *Der Psalter in Judentum und Christentum* (HBS 18; Freiburg i.B.: Herder, 1998), 137-63; "Die Schriftfunde aus Qumran und ihre Bedeutung für den hebräischen Bibeltext," in Michael Fieger, Konrad Schmid and Peter Schwagmeier, eds., *Qumran - Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer: Vorträge des St. Galler Qumran-Symposiums vom 2./3. Juli 1999* (NTOA 47; Freiburg-Göttingen: Academic Press-Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 111-28; "Die Messiaserwartung in den Handschriften von Qumran," in Florentino García Martínez, ed., *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (BETL 168; Leuven: University Press, 2003), 357-84; "Zadokiden und Aaroniden in Qumran," in Frank-L. Hossfeld, ed., *Das Manna fällt auch heute noch: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theologie des Alten, Ersten Testaments* (HBS 44; Freiburg i.B.: Herder, 2004), 201-17.

<sup>133</sup> Heinz-J. Fabry, "The reception of Nahum and Habakkuk in the Septuagint and Qumran," in Paul et al., *Emanuel*, 241-56.

<sup>134</sup> See, e.g., Heinz-J. Fabry, "Die Friedhöfe von Chirbet Qumran," in Jörg Frey and Hartmut Stegemann, eds., *Qumran kontrovers* (Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 173-91; "Archäologie und Text: Versuch einer Verhältnisbestimmung am Beispiel von Chirbet Qumran," in Max Küchler and Karl M. Schmidt, eds., *Texte, Fakten, Artefakte: Beiträge zur Bedeutung der Archäologie für die neutestamentliche Forschung* (NTOA 59; Fribourg-Göttingen: Academic Press-Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 69-101.

<sup>135</sup> Ulrich Dahmen, *Psalmen und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QPs<sup>a</sup> aus Qumran* (STDJ 49; Leiden: Brill, 2003); "Psalmentext und Psalmensammlung: Eine Auseinandersetzung mit P. W. Flint," in Dahmen, Lange, and Lichtenberger, *Die Textfunde vom Toten Meer*, 109-26.

<sup>136</sup> Cf. the collections: Klaus Koch, *Die Reiche der Welt und der kommende Menschensohn: Studien zum Danielbuch* (vol. 2 of *Gesammelte Aufsätze*; ed. M. Rösler; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1995); *Vor der Wende der Zeiten: Beiträge zur apokalyptischen Literatur* (vol. 3 of *Gesammelte Aufsätze*; ed. Uwe Gleßmer and Martin Krause; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1996); *Daniel: Dan 1-4* (BK 22/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2005).

<sup>137</sup> Cf. his published Habilitation thesis: Uwe Gleßmer, *Die ideale Kultordnung: 24 Priesterordnungen in den Chronikbüchern, kalendarischen Qumrantexten und in synagogalen Inschriften* (STDJ 24; Leiden: Brill, 1998).

<sup>138</sup> Cf. his published doctoral dissertation: Matthias Albani, *Astronomie und Schöpfungsglaube: Untersuchungen zum astronomischen Henochbuch* (WMANT 68; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1994). See "Zur Rekonstruktion eines verdrängten Konzepts: Der 364-Tage Kalender in der gegenwärtigen Forschung," in Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey and Armin Lange,



the Rockefeller Museum an object identified as a sundial from the Qumran site.<sup>139</sup>

One last Hebrew Bible scholar who has specialized almost exclusively on Qumran is Armin Lange. Trained by Hans-Peter Müller, Hermann Lichtenberger and Bernd Janowski, he started to work on the new Qumran Wisdom texts in the early 1990s in Münster and Tübingen<sup>140</sup> and is now director of the Institute of Judaic Studies at the University of Vienna. Among numerous other projects he published a comprehensive categorization of the non-biblical Qumran texts according to literary genres,<sup>141</sup> and an extensive introduction to the biblical manuscripts along with the long-term project of a synoptic presentation in the *Biblia Qumranica*.<sup>142</sup>

During the 1990s German Qumran research was located at only a few centers, mainly Göttingen (with Hartmut Stegemann), Tübingen (with Hermann Lichtenberger), Munich (with Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn) and Bonn (with Heinz-Josef Fabry). The release of the hitherto unpublished texts from 1991 rekindled interest in Qumran among biblical scholars, including a larger number of Hebrew Bible scholars. It is noteworthy that the leading scholars of that period were still those who had been trained in the Qumranforschungsstelle in Heidelberg. In Tübingen, where Martin Hengel had always included Qumran in his overall reconstruction of the his-

---

eds., *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1997), 79-125. See also his published Habilitation thesis *Der eine Gott und die himmlischen Heerscharen: Zur Begründung des Monotheismus bei Deuteronesaja im Horizont der Astralisierung des Gottesverständnisses im Alten Orient* (Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte 1; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2000).

<sup>139</sup> Matthias Albani and Uwe Gleßner, "Un instrument de mesures astronomiques à Qumrân," *RB* 104 (1997): 88-115; "An Astronomical Measuring Instrument from Qumran," in Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich, eds., *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 407-42.

<sup>140</sup> Armin Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995). Among his numerous articles see especially "Die Weisheitstexte aus Qumran: Eine Einleitung," in Carlotte Hempel, Armin Lange, and Hermann Lichtenberger, eds., *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (BETL 159; Leuven: University Press, 2002), 3-30.

<sup>141</sup> Armin Lange and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, "Annotated List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert Classified by Content and Genre," in Emanuel Tov, ed., *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (DJD XXXIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 115-64.

<sup>142</sup> Armin Lange, *Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten* (vol. 1 of *Handbuch der Textfunde zum Toten Meer*; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009). On the *Biblia Qumranica* see below.



tory of Judaism in the Hellenistic period,<sup>143</sup> the focus was strongly on New Testament connections and the relevance of Qumran for New Testament scholarship. In Hengel's famous research seminar, the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* were read and analyzed with regard to the notion of the kingdom of God and the New Testament writings.<sup>144</sup> At the initiative and under the guidance of Hermann Lichtenberger, who himself published numerous articles on Qumran and New Testament parallels,<sup>145</sup> the themes of wisdom, dualism and messianism were investigated afresh on the basis of the newly released texts. Here Armin Lange developed his views on wisdom and determinism,<sup>146</sup> and Johannes Zimmermann wrote a comprehensive monograph on the messianic texts from Qumran.<sup>147</sup> Jörg Frey investigated the development of dualism in connection with the dualistic terminology in

<sup>143</sup> Already in his well-known work, Martin Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus* (WUNT 10; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1973). See further Hengel, "Qumran und der Hellenismus," in *Judaica et Hellenistica* (WUNT 90; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 258-94, and lately "Qumran und das frühe Christentum," in Claus-J. Thornton, ed., *Studien zum Urchristentum* (WUNT 234; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 488-96.

<sup>144</sup> Cf. Martin Hengel and Anna M. Schwemer, eds., *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult im Judentum, Urchristentum und in der hellenistischen Welt* (WUNT 55; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991); see especially Anna M. Schwemer, "Gott als König und seine Königsherrschaft in den Sabbatliedern aus Qumran," in Hengel and Schwemer, *Königsherrschaft Gottes*, 48-118; Hermut Löhr, "Thronversammlung und preisender Tempel: Beobachtungen am himmlischen Heiligtum im Hebräerbrief und in den Sabbatopferliedern aus Qumran," in Hengel and Schwemer, *Königsherrschaft Gottes*, 185-205.

<sup>145</sup> Cf. e.g., Hermann Lichtenberger, "Johannes der Täufer und die Texte von Qumran," in Zdzislaw J. Kapera, ed., *Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Jean Carmignac Part I: General Research on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Qumran and the New Testament, the Present State of Qumranology* (Qumranica Mogilanensia 2; Krakow: Enigma Press, 1993), 139-52; "Die Texte von Qumran und das Urchristentum," *Judaica* 50 (1994): 68-82; "Messianische Erwartungen und Messianische Gestalten in der Zeit des Zweiten Tempels," in Ekkehard Stegemann, ed., *Messias-Vorstellungen bei Juden und Christen* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1993), 9-20; "Auferstehung in den Qumranfunden," in Friedrich Avemarie and Hermann Lichtenberger, eds., *Auferstehung – Resurrection* (WUNT 135; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 79-91; "Messiasvorstellungen in Qumran und die neutestamentliche Christologie," *CV* 44 (2002): 139-60; "Makarismen in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament," in García Martínez, ed., *Wisdom and Apocalypticism*, 395-411; "Qumran and the New Testament," in Ian H. Henderson and Gerbern S. Oegema, eds., *The Changing Face of Judaism, Christianity and Other Greco-Roman Religions in Antiquity* (Studien zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit 2; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2006), 103-29.

<sup>146</sup> Cf. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*; cf. also the papers of a Tübingen conference: "The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought," in Hempel, Lange, and Lichtenberger, *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran*.

<sup>147</sup> Johannes Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran* (WUNT 2/104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).

the Gospel of John and in Pauline anthropology,<sup>148</sup> and developed general perspectives on the relation of the Qumran texts to New Testament themes.<sup>149</sup> In Munich, Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn established a project for the detailed examination of all Qumran parallels to the genuine Pauline epistles, accompanied by numerous articles.<sup>150</sup> Michael Becker analyzed parallels between Qumran, apocalypticism and the Jesus tradition.<sup>151</sup> In Göttingen, the work of Hartmut Stegemann and his team in the Forschungsstelle was less focused on the “Christian” topics and more on the reconstruction of manuscripts, and on texts, genres, and historical reconstruction. The influence of this center radiates out to many other scholars who are working on the Qumran texts.

<sup>148</sup> Jörg Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library: Reflections on Their Background and History,” in Bernstein, García Martínez and Kampen, *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*, 275-335; “Licht aus den Höhlen? Der ‘johanneische Dualismus’ und die Texte von Qumran,” in Frey and Schnelle, with Schlegel, *Kontexte des Johannesevangeliums*, 117-203; “Die paulinische Antithese von ‘Fleisch’ und ‘Geist’ und die palästinisch-jüdische Weisheitstradition,” *ZNW* 90 (1999): 45-77; “Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage,” in Hempel, Lange, and Lichtenberger, *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, 367-404.

<sup>149</sup> Jörg Frey, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments,” in Fieger, Schmid and Schwagmeier, *Qumran - Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer*, 129-208; “The Character and Background of Matt 5:25-26: On the Value of Qumran Literature in New Testament Interpretation,” in Hans-J. Becker and Serge Ruzer, eds., *The Sermon on the Mount and Its Jewish Setting* (CahRB 60; Paris: Gabalda, 2005), 3-39; “Die Bedeutung der Qumran-Funde für das Verständnis der Apokalypik im Frühjudentum und im Urchristentum,” in Jörg Frey and Michael Becker, eds., *Apokalypik und Qumran* (Einblicke 10; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2007), 11-62.

<sup>150</sup> Cf., e.g., Heinz-W. Kuhn, “Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Ersten Thessalonicherbriefes: Vorstellung des Münchener Projekts: Qumran und das Neue Testament - The Impact of the Qumran Scrolls on the Understanding of Paul’s First Letter to the Thessalonians; Presentation of the Munich Project on Qumran and the New Testament,” in Treballe Barrera and Vegas Montaner, *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 1:340-53; “The Impact of the Qumran Scrolls on the Understanding of Paul,” in Devorah Dimant and Uri Rappaport, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (STDJ 10; Leiden-Jerusalem: Brill-Magnes, 1992), 327-39; “Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Galaterbriefes aus dem Münchener Projekt: Qumran und das Neue Testament,” in George J. Brooke and Florentino García Martínez, eds., *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 169-221; “Qumran und Paulus: Unter traditionsgeschichtlichem Aspekt ausgewählte Parallelen,” in Ulrich Mell and Ulrich B. Müller, eds., *Das Urchristentum in seiner literarischen Geschichte: Festschrift für Jürgen Becker zum 65. Geburtstag* (BZNW 100; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 227-46; “Qumran Texts and the Historical Jesus: Parallels in Contrast,” in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years*, 573-80.

<sup>151</sup> Michael Becker, “4Q521 und die Gesalbten,” *RevQ* 18 (1997): 73-96; “Die ‘messianische Apokalypse’ 4Q521 und der Interpretationsrahmen der Taten Jesu,” in Frey and Becker, *Apokalypik und Qumran*, 237-303.

### *Current projects*

Although few German-speaking scholars concentrate on Qumran research, some promising projects organized and directed by German scholars or in German-speaking academic contexts are currently underway. The first is centered at the Qumranforschungsstelle in Göttingen, with the renewed lexical project of the *Qumran Wörterbuch*. Now funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) and the Göttingen Academy of Sciences, the completion of this long-term project, headed by Reinhard Kratz and Annette Steudel, may be expected in due course.<sup>152</sup> Another project, on interpretation and subject matter, is the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten* (*ThWQ*), based in Bonn. It was launched by Heinz-Josef Fabry of the University of Bonn as a supplement to the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* (*ThWAT*). Notably, both these dictionary projects are run by Hebrew Bible scholars. Another significant project plans to produce a synoptic edition of the Qumran biblical manuscripts, together with the Masoretic text and the Septuagint, under the title *Biblia Qumranica*. It was originally conceptualized in the 1990s by Hermann Lichtenberger and Armin Lange in Tübingen and is now edited jointly by Beate Ego, Kristin de Troyer, Armin Lange and Hermann Lichtenberger.<sup>153</sup> A further promising project is an introduction to all Qumran manuscripts and works by Armin Lange in Vienna, of which the volume on the biblical manuscripts was published in 2009.<sup>154</sup> The Munich Qumran-Projekt of Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn is devoted to the Qumran parallels to the New Testament, currently Paul's letters. Of note finally is the series of bi-annual Qumran conferences at the Schwerte Catholic Academy (near Dortmund), originally launched by the late Hartmut Stegemann as a forum of exchange for German-speaking Qumran scholars. It is now run by Jörg Frey with a wider range of contributors from the European context.<sup>155</sup>

<sup>152</sup> The aims are stated on the website (<http://www.qwb.adw-goettingen.gwdg.de/> [cited 27 February 2011]): "Erarbeitung eines philologischen Wörterbuchs, das den gesamten Wortschatz der nichtbiblischen Texte vom Toten Meer erfasst und das Material etymologisch, morphologisch sowie semantisch aufbereitet."

<sup>153</sup> See the first volume, Beate Ego et al., eds., *Minor Prophets* (Biblia Qumranica 3b; Leiden: Brill, 2005).

<sup>154</sup> Armin Lange, *Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran*.

<sup>155</sup> Cf. the conference volumes: Frey and Stegemann, *Qumran Kontroversen*; Ulrich Dahmen, Hartmut H. Stegemann, and Günter Stemberger, eds., *Qumran - Bibelwissenschaften - Antike Judaistik* (Einblicke 9; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2006); Frey and Becker, *Apokalyptik und Qumran*; Michael Becker and Jörg Frey, eds., *Qumran und der biblische Kanon* (BTS 92; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2009); Jörg Frey, Carsten Claußen and Nadine Kessler, eds., *Qumran und Archäologie* (WUNT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).

*Future perspectives*

German Qumran scholarship shares in the general shift in Qumran studies away from issues of Early Christianity to other topics, mostly those specific to the Qumran context. The two dictionary projects as well as the *Biblia Qumranica* are directed by scholars of the Hebrew Bible or of Second Temple Judaism. Qumran texts are increasingly used to clarify aspects of the redaction and textual history of Hebrew Bible books, Scriptural interpretation and canonization, the characterization of apocalypticism, Palestinian wisdom traditions, and other contemporary Jewish groups.

Some of these aspects are still important for interpreting early Christian traditions. But in contrast to the early period of Qumran research, nowadays the large number of non-sectarian texts—parabiblical, sapiential, liturgical and the like—provide the most important and intriguing parallels for the New Testament. Accordingly, the scholarly focus has also moved from the Essene group or the “Qumran community,” with its particular piety and theology, toward the numerous non-sectarian traditions and texts, or to the diversity of Second Temple Judaism as revealed through the Qumran library.

Most of the early assumptions of close links between the Qumran community or the Essenes and Early Christianity have been abandoned. German research is generally in agreement that no Christian texts exist among the Qumran texts, and that the Qumran group or the Essenes are not mentioned in the New Testament. Neither John the Baptist, Jesus, Paul, the author of the Fourth Gospel, nor any other New Testament author can be associated convincingly with the “sectarian” texts or even be considered influenced by the Qumran community. Therefore the issues to be discussed now are no longer the possible relation between the Qumran community and Early Christianity but rather the links between terms, themes and genres in early Christian texts and contemporary Judaism as a whole, in its variegated and diverse traditions and groups, at present better recognized through the texts from the Qumran library. The main value of the Scrolls is found in the wide selection of literary products belonging to Second Temple Judaism in the centuries before the turn of the era, and not in their representation of the library of a particular Jewish group. Without the information gleaned from the Scrolls, an adequate view of the literature and thought of Palestinian Judaism at that time would not be possible. The most important contribution of the Scrolls to an understanding of the New Testament is the information they contain on a whole range of issues developed in Second Temple Judaism: the process of Scriptural canonization,

techniques and forms of Bible interpretation, literary forms and genres, apocalyptic and wisdom thought, the variety of eschatological or messianic figures and agents, the last judgment, life after death, angels and demons, halakhah and purity, calendar and festivals.

One of the results of the Qumran debate is that New Testament scholarship—not only in Germany—has come to recognize the fundamental Jewishness of early Christian texts, even if there is a critical debate with and distancing from other Jewish groups. This is a major achievement, especially in view of the persistent theological traditions that view “the law,” and with it also Judaism as a whole, in a somewhat negative light. Based on the insights gained from the Qumran library, New Testament texts can now be read as part of the Jewish literature of the late Second Temple period (and later). However, in contrast to an earlier type of “pan-Qumranism,” consideration of the contemporary Jewish context calls for a broader perspective encompassing not only the Scrolls but also the Septuagint, the entirety of “intertestamental” literature, evidence from the Jewish Diaspora and also the early rabbinic texts; a much deeper analysis than simply collecting parallels is needed. Instead, every parallel adduced from Qumran or elsewhere deserves cautious interpretation, taking into account its own original context, the possible methods of transmission, the number of analogies and differences, the possible reasons for them and also alternative explanations.

The abating of the “Qumran fever” of the early decades also reduced the interest among many German New Testament scholars, and many of them do not realize the real challenges of Qumran research. Only a few of them are still engaged in Scrolls research. By contrast, Old Testament scholars in Germany are engaging more and more in the Qumran discussion. Yet even they do not take full note of the data and challenges of the Qumran texts.

Of course, the Scrolls have transformed scholarship on Jesus, John, and even Paul, and have served to modify New Testament scholars’ views of contemporary Judaism. We can measure the tremendous change by comparing the present views on the Jewish context of the early Christian authors with those expressed early in the twentieth century by the history-of-religions school, before the Qumran discoveries. See, for instance, the views of that time regarding “normative Judaism,” or the non-Jewish background of the most important Christological terms and titles, or of the Hellenistic-Oriental, or even Gnostic, background of the religious language of the Fourth Gospel. These views have changed considerably. The fresh textual data today allow for much more diversity in Second Temple Judaism, even within the context of Palestine. This enables scholars to fit

Jesus and the early Christians into it, rather than to look for non-Jewish elements in their position and preaching. Qumran has opened up new perspectives allowing for novel explanations, particularly in respect of dualistic language. Dualistic elements in Paul or John are no longer seen as being Hellenistic or Gnostic and non-Jewish, but can be explained as having developed from the Palestinian Jewish background and language, although the direct influence of the sectarian texts is quite improbable.<sup>156</sup>

Moreover, the Qumran discoveries have considerably changed our views on apocalypticism, the Palestinian Jewish wisdom traditions, and on the relationship between them. This is especially relevant to the views on the earliest Jesus tradition. For the scholarly polarity between the description of Jesus' teaching as being apocalyptic or purely "sapiential", i.e. non-apocalyptic, appears increasingly inadequate. There has also been a considerable change regarding Christology. Most views of Christ in the New Testament can now be identified with the various Jewish messianic ideas registered in the Scrolls. Explaining them as originating in pagan Hellenism seems unwarranted for most of the Christological "titles," as it is for the development towards a decidedly "high" Christology.

The Palestinian Jewish elements of Paul's language and argument are now noticed, and have led to a correction of the one-sided Hellenistic image that previously dominated Pauline research. The Fourth Gospel especially now seems much more Jewish than before the Qumran discoveries, although there is no reason to locate its particular background in the Qumran corpus. In contrast to the pan-Qumranism that was prevalent in the first decades of the Qumran debate, scholars are now aware that in history-of-religion matters any monolithic explanation is too simplistic. Methodologically then, it is important also to keep in mind Greco-Roman parallels and—especially—the Jewish diaspora background that contributed considerably to the language and views of New Testament authors. It is neither the "Essene" paradigm nor the specific sectarian texts but rather the variety of non-sectarian parabiblical, exegetical, sapiential, and liturgical texts that help us to determine more precisely the history-of-religions perspective of early Christian texts.

---

<sup>156</sup> See the articles by Jörg Frey, "Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library;" "Licht aus den Höhlen?;" "Die paulinische Antithese von 'Fleisch' und 'Geist';" "Flesh and Spirit;" "Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für das Verständnis des Neuen Testaments;" "The Character and Background of Matt 5:25-26;" "Die Bedeutung der Qumran-Funde für das Verständnis der Apokalypitk im Frühjudentum und im Urchristentum."

German scholarship has contributed much to these insights. Yet at present it is far more involved in the international and interreligious discussion on Second Temple Judaism, especially related to Qumran and its relevance to this period.



# BASIC RESEARCH, METHODS AND APPROACHES TO THE QUMRAN SCROLLS IN GERMAN-SPEAKING COUNTRIES

ANNETTE STEUDEL

Scholarship in German-speaking countries has contributed greatly to basic research on the Dead Sea Scrolls from the start. It is characterized by adherence to the older scholarly traditions of compiling dictionaries, concordances, and other tools for critical investigation. The history of these scientific enterprises, and of the institutions and the people involved, are traced here, and suggestions for future avenues of scholarship are offered.<sup>1</sup>

## *Kurt Schubert and Karl Georg Kuhn: Founders of German-language Qumran Research*

Two of the pioneers of Qumran research in German-speaking countries, namely Kurt Schubert and Karl Georg Kuhn, initiated this scholarship in a special way. The former was to become the doyen of Jewish studies in German-speaking countries, the latter to establish the renowned center for Qumran studies in Germany, the *Qumranforschungsstelle*. Unlike many early students of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Schubert and Kuhn were not originally established scholars of the Old or New Testament. Both Christian, they started their academic careers as students of Hebrew texts and Semitic languages. Yet, before investigating the Scrolls, their respective backgrounds and approaches to Jewish texts could hardly have been more different.

Kurt Schubert (1923–2007) studied Semitic philology, Oriental studies and ancient history in Vienna during World War II. There he obtained a doctoral degree in Assyriology, awarded two weeks before the liberation of the city in May 1945 (Schubert was not conscripted to the German army

---

<sup>1</sup> The article should be read in conjunction with Jörg Frey's contribution to this volume. He focuses on the close connection between Qumran and Bible studies in the German-speaking countries, while the present survey concentrates on other aspects and scholars. Still, it has not been possible to accord all the German-speaking contributors to Qumran studies the treatment they deserve. My thanks go to all who strive together for a better understanding of the Dead Sea Scrolls, and especially to Devorah Dimant for pursuing our common goal of publishing an international overview of the history of Qumran research.

because of bronchial asthma). With permission of the Russian occupation authorities, Schubert at once set about reopening the University of Vienna, and began to teach Hebrew and other Oriental languages as Assistant at the Institute for Oriental Studies.<sup>2</sup> His first lectures on Jewish history and philosophy of religion were also attended by inmates of the displaced persons camps, so the institute became the initial cornerstone of the Jewish-Christian encounter. By the end of the 1950s, Jewish studies had become a regular feature at the University of Vienna due to Schubert's efforts. From 1966 to 1993 he was Professor of Jewish Studies and head of the newly founded *Institut für Judaistik* at the university.<sup>3</sup>

Karl Georg Kuhn (1906-1976), who had studied Semitic and other Oriental languages and New Testament, played a major role at the *Reichsinstitut für Geschichte des Neuen Deutschland* in Tübingen in the Nazis' attempt to establish a scholarly foundation for their anti-Semitism.<sup>4</sup> After undergoing two denazification procedures, Kuhn received a teaching position in 1949 in New Testament at the Faculty of Protestant Theology at Göttingen University. In 1954 he was appointed Professor of New Testament Studies at Heidelberg, where he became a member of the Academy of Science in 1964.

As early as 1949 Kurt Schubert in Vienna and Karl Georg Kuhn in Göttingen started to study the Qumran manuscripts with groups of interested students. For Schubert, the intensive study of the Dead Sea Scrolls would be his actual starting point as a scholar and a catalyst for Jewish studies, a phase in his career lasting a decade; later it was to lead him to other per-

<sup>2</sup> See Schubert's description of his career (<http://www.univie.ac.at/Judaistik>): "Zum Hebräischen kam ich als Student im Wintersemester 1941/42. Der ideologische Hintergrund war mein innerer Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus, den ich aufgrund meiner austro-katholischen Einstellung entschieden ablehnte. Außerdem verspürte ich eine innere Solidarität mit dem verteuflerten und angegriffenen Judentum. Schon damals war ich der Meinung, dass eine Kenntnis der Quellen der jüdischen Religion und Geschichte die beste Waffe im Kampf gegen den Antisemitismus ist. Vor diesem Hintergrund entschloss ich mich, das Universitätsfach 'Judaistik' zu gründen. Es kann daher bei mir nie l'art pour l'art oder gar ein elfenbeinerer Turm sein, denn es ging und geht mir um die Vermittlung meiner Überzeugung, dass Christentum und Judentum, obwohl oft Gegensätze an der Peripherie, im inneren Wesen Zeugen des einen biblischen Gottes und damit Zeugen Gottes Minorität auf Erden sind."

<sup>3</sup> For detailed information on Kurt Schubert see the webpage of the *Institut für Judaistik* in Vienna, <http://www.univie.ac.at/Judaistik>.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. also Jörg Frey's article in this volume. Recently Kuhn's biography has been subjected to closer analysis. A thorough and painstaking investigation was published by Gerd Theißen, *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft vor und nach 1945: Karl Georg Kuhn und Günther Bornkamm* (Heidelberg: Winter, 2009). For further critical inquiry, the *Qumranforschungsstelle* in Göttingen runs an archive on the works of Karl Georg Kuhn and literature about him. Scholars are welcome to use the services of the institute.

spectives.<sup>5</sup> As for Karl Georg Kuhn, the Dead Sea Scrolls gave him the opportunity to remain a scholar of Jewish texts,<sup>6</sup> and in addition to being a professor of New Testament he would continue with Qumran studies for the rest of his life. Both Schubert and Kuhn founded institutions that became well-known centers for Qumran studies in German-speaking countries: respectively, the *Institut für Judaistik* at the University of Vienna and the *Qumranforschungsstelle*, then at Heidelberg University and now at Göttingen University.

Schubert maintained that Qumran research had an enormous impact on the reputation of Jewish studies in the German-speaking countries. Qumran studies apparently helped him to establish Jewish studies as a confessionally independent academic discipline at universities in the German-speaking countries from the 1960s onwards. He founded the *Institut für Judaistik* in Vienna as early as 1966, and was involved in the creation of other institutes for Jewish studies in various universities. Schubert's students Johann Maier and Günter Stemberger studied at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem from the 1970s onwards, and taught in notable institutions such as the *Martin-Buber-Institut* in Cologne, the *Institut für Judaistik* in Berlin (West), and the *Seminar für Judaistik* in Frankfurt am Main. The *Institut für Judaistik* in Vienna is presently presided over by the Qumran scholar Armin Lange.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Cf. n. 2 above. Schubert explained that he studied the Dead Sea Scrolls in order to understand the basic tenets of the world view of Jesus' contemporaries. He also saw his task as combating an anti-ecclesiastical misuse of the Scrolls by the media: Interestingly, the Roman Catholic Schubert became interested in the historio-critical method via the Dead Sea Scrolls. (Schubert at <http://www.univie.ac.at/Judaistik>).

<sup>6</sup> Kuhn found in the Scrolls a kind of Judaism influenced by Zoroastrianism, and in some way similar to parts of Early Christian literature, that differed from the Talmudic kind, which he had distorted in the most radical writing of his Nazi period, namely *Die Judenfrage als weltgeschichtliches Problem* (Hamburg: Hanseat Verlag, 1939), and elsewhere. Kuhn later disavowed this book, see his article "Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer: Zum heutigen Stand ihrer Veröffentlichung," *EvT* 11 (1951-1952): 72-75 (73 n. 4). (For the text of his renunciation, see n. 74 in Frey's article in this volume.) He refused to do likewise with other facets of his Nazi activities. After the war he re-entered the academic scene for the first time as a New Testament scholar, on the basis of his philologically oriented study *Achtzehngebet und Vaterunser und der Reim* (WUNT 1; Tübingen: Mohr, 1950). But his growing reputation as the foremost German Qumran scholar earned him a full professorship at the University of Heidelberg and further academic distinction.

<sup>7</sup> On Johan Maier and Armin Lange, see below. Günter Stemberger became a professor in Vienna in 1977 and ran the institute there until his retirement in 2009. Recent articles by Stemberger on Qumran are, among others, "Support for the Poor: Leviticus 19 in Qumran and in Early Rabbinic Interpretation," in Károly D. Dobos and Miklós Kőszeghy, eds., *With Wisdom as a Robe. Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröblich* (Hebrew Bible Monographs 21; Sheffield: Phoenix Press, 2009), 451-69. Ferdinand Dexinger of the institute in Vienna also published on Qumran; see e.g. "Der 'Prophet wie Mose' in Qumran und

Kuhn founded the *Qumranforschungsstelle* in 1957 in Heidelberg as part of the Faculty of Theology. In 1973 his successor Hartmut Stegemann transferred it first to Marburg, and in 1980 to Göttingen. In 2002 the *Qumranforschungsstelle* was formally instituted at Göttingen by the Old Testament scholar Reinhard Kratz.

*Students of Schubert and Kuhn,  
and the Qumranforschungsstelle in Heidelberg*

As different as Kuhn and Schubert were, both trained a new generation of internationally acknowledged Qumran scholars. While co-workers of Schubert became professors occupying newly founded chairs in Jewish studies, many of Kuhn's co-workers at the *Qumranforschungsstelle* became professors of New Testament studies, often in combination with studies in ancient Judaism. Schubert's Qumran successor, who fundamentally advanced Qumran research in German-speaking countries, was Johann Maier; Kuhn's was Hartmut Stegemann. Both furnished the scholarly community—Bible scholars, but also a much broader public—with fundamental and significant information for understanding the Scrolls in their context, and created the twentieth-century picture of Qumran scholarship in German-speaking countries.

Hartmut Stegemann (1933-2005) studied Protestant theology, Near Eastern studies and Semitic languages at the universities of Kiel and Heidelberg.<sup>8</sup> Stegemann joined Kuhn's *Qumranforschungsstelle* on its inauguration

---

bei den Samaritanern," in André Caquot, ed., *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de Matthias Delcor* (AOAT 215; Kevelaer-Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon u. Bercker, 1985), 97-112; "45 Jahre Qumran - Ein Überblick," in Johannes B. Bauer, ed., *Qumran: ein Symposium* (Grazer Theologische Studien 15; Graz: Institut für ökumenische Theologie, 1993), 29-62. Tal Ilan, presently teaching at the Berlin *Institut für Judaistik*, published a number of Qumran articles; see e.g. "Women's Archives in the Judaean Desert," in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years, 755-60*; "Shelamzion in Qumran - New Insights," in David M. Goodblatt, Avital Pinnick and Daniel R. Schwartz, eds., *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of the Orion Center, 27-31 January 1999* (STDJ 37; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 57-68; Review of *Meghillot 1* (2003) in *DSD* 11 (2004): 377-80.

<sup>8</sup> See Annette Steudel, "In Memoriam Prof. Dr. Dr. Hartmut Stegemann," *RevQ* 22 (2006): 327-33; Peter Porzig, "Hartmut Stegemann (1933-2005)," *Hen* 28 (2006): 198-201. For a bibliography of Hartmut Stegemann (until 1998) see Alexander Maurer, "Bibliographie Hartmut Stegemann," in Bernd Kollmann, Wolfgang Reinbold and Annette Steudel, eds., *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag* (BZnW 97; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 519-26. See Stegemann's sub-

in 1957 and wrote two dissertations on Qumran, and also a habilitation. After serving as an assistant to Philipp Vielhauer and teaching for a short period in Zurich, Stegemann became Professor of New Testament Studies, first in 1971 at the University of Marburg. In 1973 he succeeded Kuhn as head of the *Qumranforschungsstelle*, and transferred it to Marburg; thereafter he moved it again, to Göttingen, where in 1980 he succeeded Hans Conzelmann.<sup>9</sup> Until his retirement in 2002 he also served as director of the Institute for Ancient Jewish Studies there. That year too he transferred the headship of the *Qumranforschungsstelle* to Reinhard Kratz, who made it an official institution. Stegemann continued to teach and supervise examinations until his death in 2005.<sup>10</sup>

Johann Maier (1933-) was born in Carinthia (Austria) and studied in Vienna, Zurich and Jerusalem. He wrote his habilitation with Schubert. After teaching as *Privatdozent* in Berlin in 1964-1966, he became a professor at the newly founded *Martin-Buber-Institut* in Cologne, over which he presided until his retirement. Johann Maier is a world-renowned specialist in the history of Judaism.<sup>11</sup>

---

sequent publications: "269. 4QDamascus Document<sup>d</sup> frags. 10, 11 (Re-edition), 15, 16," in Stephen J. Pfann et al., *Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD XXXVI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 201-11; "The Material Reconstruction of 1QHodayot," in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years, 272-84*; "Qumran Challenges for the Next Century," in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years, 944-50*; "The Number of Psalms in 1QHodayot" and Some of Their Sections," in Esther G. Chazon, ed., *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19-23 January, 2000* (STDJ 48; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 191-234; "Towards Physical Reconstructions of the Qumran Damascus Document Scrolls," in Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon and Avital Pinnick, eds., *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February 1998* (STDJ 34; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 177-200. As an editor, see Hartmut Stegemann with Jörg Frey, eds., *Qumran kontrovers. Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer* (Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius 2003); with Ulrich Dahmen and Günter Stemberger, eds., *Qumran – Bibelwissenschaft – Antike Judaistik* (Einblicke 9; Paderborn: Bonifatius 2006). For *Hodayot* see below.

<sup>9</sup> See also Hartmut Stegemann and Gert Jeremias, "Die Qumranforschungsstelle Heidelberg 1957-1973," *Heidelberger Jahrbücher* 19 (1975): 83-99; Hartmut Stegemann, "Die Qumranforschungsstelle Marburg und ihre Aufgabenstellung. Ein Bericht," in Delcor, *Qumrân. Sa piété*, 195-217.

<sup>10</sup> On other students of Kuhn, see Jörg Frey's article in this volume.

<sup>11</sup> Among Johann Maier's articles on Qumran, see e.g. "Messias oder Gesalbter? Zu einem Übersetzungs- und Deutungsproblem in den Qumrantexten," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 585-612; "Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Literature," in Magne Saebø, ed., *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation. Vol. 1: From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (until 1300); Part 1: Antiquity* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 108-29; "Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit," (Franz-Delitzsch-Vorlesung 5; Münster: In-

Together with Johann Maier, Kurt Schubert published in 1973 a monograph that has remained for two decades the benchmark for Qumran studies in the German language.<sup>12</sup> It is a reproduction of Kurt Schubert's earlier introduction of 1958,<sup>13</sup> with translations of important Qumran texts, which were published by Maier already in 1960.<sup>14</sup> As for Stegemann, he published a general volume on Qumran only in 1993.<sup>15</sup> It was written in reaction to sensational write-ups<sup>16</sup> and new theories about Qumran.<sup>17</sup> Sev-

---

stitutum Judaicum Delitzschianum, 1996); "Purity at Qumran: Cultic and Domestic," in Alan J. Avery-Peck, Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton, eds., *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part 5: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2 vols.; HO: Abt. 1, The Near and Middle East 56. Leiden: Brill, 2001), 1:91-124; "Liturgische Funktionen der Gebete in den Qumrantexten," in Albert Gerhards, Andrea Doeker and Peter Ebenbauer, eds., *Identität durch Gebet: Zur gemeinschaftsbildenden Funktion institutionalisierten Betens in Judentum und Christentum* (Studien zu Judentum und Christentum; Paderborn: Schöningh, 2003), 59-112.

<sup>12</sup> Johann Maier and Kurt Schubert, *Die Qumran-Essener Schriftrollen und Lebensbild der Gemeinde* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1973; 3rd. ed., 1992). Also of major influence has been André Dupont-Sommer, *Die essenischen Schriften vom Toten Meer* (German trans. Walter W. Müller; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1960). The original appeared in French. This volume presents ancient reports on the Essenes, and major Qumran texts with introductions and commentaries.

<sup>13</sup> Kurt Schubert, *Die Gemeinde vom Toten Meer* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1958).

<sup>14</sup> Johann Maier, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer* (2 vols.; Munich: Reinhardt, 1960). Its second commentary volume, not included in Maier-Schubert's edition, is also of value. It is comparable to the French collection of translations and commentaries by Jean Carmignac and Pierre Guibert, eds., *Les Textes de Qumran* (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1961), vol. 1; Jean Carmignac, Édouard Cothenet and H. Lignée, eds., *Les Textes de Qumran* (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1963), vol. 2.

<sup>15</sup> Hartmut Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus. Ein Sachbuch* (Freiburg: Herder 1993; 10th ed. 2007). Stegemann's book was also translated into English, Spanish and Italian but is now out of print. The other introduction to Qumran, which is mainly used in German-speaking classes, is James C. VanderKam, *Einführung in die Qumranforschung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), translated from the English. See also Klaus Berger, *Qumran: Funde - Texte - Geschichte* (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1998).

<sup>16</sup> Such as the volume by Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh, *Verschlussache Jesus: Die Qumranrollen und die Wahrheit über das frühe Christentum* (Munich: Droemer Knauer, 1991). This is a German translation of *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception* (New York: Summit Books, 1991). Baigent's and Leigh's publisher followed the fashion at the time of preparing German translations of Qumran books in English intended for a wider audience. They dramatize and occasionally "Christianize" their titles, obviously for better marketing. Likewise, for example, Robert Eisenman and Michael Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, became in German *Jesus und die Urchristen. Die Qumranrollen entschlüsselt* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann-Club, 1993).

<sup>17</sup> Especially Norman Golb's theory that the Dead Sea Scrolls found at Qumran were not a product of the Essenes, and Robert and Pauline Donceel's hypothesis that the Qumran settlement was a private *villa rustica*. See Norman Golb, *Qumran: Wer schrieb die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer?* (Hamburg: Hoffmann and Campe, 1994), a German translation of *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (New York: Scribner, 1995); Robert Donceel, "The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran," in Michael O. Wise et al., eds.,



eral editions of Stegemann's book appeared in the following years, and it became *the* overview of Qumran in German. German-speaking Qumran students often begin by reading Stegemann's introduction and the volume of texts with translations by Lohse and Steudel,<sup>18</sup> together with Maier's 1995 two-volume translation of most of the Qumran texts.<sup>19</sup> In 1996 Maier published a third, supplementary, volume.<sup>20</sup> Stegemann in his 1993 introduction painted an overall picture of Qumran, the Essenes, and their relation to Early Christianity; Maier, in his third volume, chose a different way of responding to the newly awakened interest in Qumran: after an introduction, including a large section on calendars and concepts of time-measuring, Maier supplies important scholarly tools such as an annotated bibliography, a register of words and concepts, and an index of passages cited and referred to in the Scrolls.<sup>21</sup> Stegemann's and Maier's books are complementary, and are used profitably still today.

Kuhn's early stage at the *Qumranforschungsstelle* in Heidelberg yielded two different types of studies. One was doctoral dissertations on Qumran topics written by Kuhn's collaborators, who studied the Scrolls as a separate entity, but with an added final chapter comparing it with Early Christianity. Later on, members of Kuhn's *Qumranforschungsstelle* became professors of New Testament studies, like Kuhn himself, and often dealt with ancient Judaism also.<sup>22</sup> Thus, Qumran research in Germany has largely been linked

---

*Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site* (Annals of the American Academy of Sciences 722; New York, 1994), 1-38.

<sup>18</sup> See below.

<sup>19</sup> Johann Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1995), vols. 1-2.

<sup>20</sup> Johann Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1996), vol. 3.

<sup>21</sup> The microfiche edition of the Scrolls issued by Emanuel Tov and Stephen Pfann was another project to provide information on the Qumran documents for a wider audience. See Emanuel Tov in collaboration with Stephen Pfann, *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 1993; 2nd. rev. ed. 1995).

<sup>22</sup> E.g. Jürgen Becker, Christoph Burchard, Gert Jeremias, Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn and Hermann Lichtenberger. The last was Professor of Jewish Studies and New Testament Studies at Münster and director of the *Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum* there (1988-1993). Since 1993 he has been Professor of New Testament Studies and Ancient Judaism at Tübingen and director of the *Institut für antikes Judentum und hellenistische Religionsgeschichte*. He is the editor of the *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit* (*JSHRZ*, Gütersloh 1973ff, and of its new series 2005ff), which in a way replaces the older editions of E. Kautzsch (1900) and Paul Riessler (1928). Other students of Karl Georg Kuhn participated in the series: see *Joseph and Aseneth* (Christoph Burchard, *JSHRZ* 2/2, 1983), and *Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen* (Jürgen Becker, *JSHRZ* 3/1, 1980). Additional contributors to this series, who have also worked on Qumran, are Hans Bardtke (*Zusätze zu Esther*, *JSHRZ* 1/1, 1973), Klaus Berger (*Das Buch der Jubiläen*, *JSHRZ* II/3, 1981), Egon Brandenbur-



to New Testament studies. This is why German-language Qumran research still now focuses mainly on the non-biblical scrolls, unrelated to the fact that most biblical scrolls were published only later.

The second type of studies began when Kuhn and his students realized very early that new tools were required for studying the Scrolls properly, and they undertook to prepare them.

### *Concordances, Bibliographies, and Dictionaries*

Under Kuhn, the *Qumranforschungsstelle* at Heidelberg produced a concordance of the Dead Sea Scrolls<sup>23</sup> and a retrograde dictionary;<sup>24</sup> a Qumran dictionary has been a work in progress since 1960.

The concordance was updated with supplementary articles and remained a major critical tool until Martin Abegg's publication of a comprehensive two-volume concordance in 2003.<sup>25</sup>

For his part, Hartmut Stegemann worked every summer from 1979 to 1989 with John Strugnell at the École Biblique in Jerusalem. With the help of Hans-Peter Richter, then a co-worker at the *Qumranforschungsstelle*, he prepared a privately printed concordance which reproduced the handwritten card concordance of the first editors of texts from Qumran caves

---

ger (*Himmelfahrt Moses*, *JSHRZ* 5/2, 1976), Matthias Henze (*Syrische Danielapokalypse*, *JSHRZ* 1/4, 2006), Svend Holm-Nielsen (*Psalmen Salomos*, *JSHRZ* 4/2, 1977), Marc Philonenko (together with Belkis Philonenko-Sayar, *Apokalypse Abrahams*, *JSHRZ* 5/5, 1982), Berndt Schaller (*Paralipomena Jeremiae*, *JSHRZ* 1/8, 1998, and *Testament Hiobs*, *JSHRZ* 3/3, 1979), and Adam S. van der Woude (*Die fünf syrischen Psalmen, einschließlich Ps 151*, *JSHRZ* 4/1, 1977). Through this series, from the 1970s, insights on the Qumran Scrolls were incorporated into the general discussion in German-speaking countries on Jewish writings of the Second Temple period.

<sup>23</sup> Karl G. Kuhn, ed., *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten, hrsg. in Verbindung mit A. M. Denis, R. Deichgräber, W. Eiss, G. Jeremias und H.-W. Kuhn* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960). A forerunner is the concordance of Bilhah Habermann in Abraham Habermann, *Megilloth Midbar Yehuda. The Scrolls from the Judean Desert* (Tel Aviv: Machbaroth LeSifrut, 1959) (Hebrew), [1]-[175].

<sup>24</sup> Karl G. Kuhn, Hartmut Stegemann and Georg Klinzing, eds., *Rückläufiges hebräisches Wörterbuch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958).

<sup>25</sup> Martin G. Abegg with James E. Bowley and Edward M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance: The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2003). A list of Qumran concordances was compiled by Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, "Konkordanzen und Indizes zu den nicht-biblischen Qumrantexten auf Papier und Microfiche - aus dem Münchener Projekt: Qumran und das Neue Testament, (2., völlig neu bearb. Fassung)," in Kollmann, Reinbold and Steudel, *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum*, 197-209. Electronic concordances are listed in Martin G. Abegg, ed., *Qumran Sectarian Manuscripts* (Accordance 9, and earlier versions, Bible Software, Oaktree), and in Emanuel Tov, ed., *Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library* (FARMS, Leiden, 1999).

2-10 (Hebrew and Aramaic).<sup>26</sup> At the end of the 1980s a few copies were distributed among editors and institutions.<sup>27</sup> This concordance forms the basis of the publication by Ben Zion Wacholder and Martin Abegg, who between 1991 and 1995 reconstructed with the help of a computer many of the cave 4 manuscripts unpublished until then.<sup>28</sup> This card concordance (PC, preliminary concordance) is still of exceptional value as it records with unparalleled precision the original readings of the first scholars who worked on editions of the Scrolls in the 1950s.<sup>29</sup> In numerous cases, these readings are equally or even more valuable than those proposed in subsequent editions. This is especially the case when the physical appearance of some fragments has deteriorated over the years and the later editors of the official Scrolls publication, the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (DJD) series, had no access to the notes on readings of the first editors and/or the early photographs of these fragments.

Following the example of a Greek retrograde dictionary,<sup>30</sup> the *Qumranforschungsstelle* published in 1958 a retrograde dictionary of the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls published at the time.<sup>31</sup> With the entries arranged by their last letter, it has served generations of scholars as an excellent tool for editing lacunary manuscripts and inscriptions in cases where only the final part of a word is preserved. An updated version, including texts pub-

---

<sup>26</sup> *A Preliminary Concordance to the Hebrew and Aramaic Fragments from Qumran Caves II-X: Including Especially the Unpublished Material from Cave IV, Printed from a Card Index Prepared by Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, G. W. Oxtoby, J. Teixidor, Prepared and Arranged for Printing by Hans-Peter Richter* (5 vols.; Göttingen: privately published, 1988). For a description and the use of the preliminary concordance (= card concordance) see also Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 8-9.

<sup>27</sup> The master copy is kept at the *Qumranforschungsstelle* in Göttingen. It is currently being inserted into the database of the Göttingen Dictionary Project. Over the years, access to it has been granted to visiting scholars.

<sup>28</sup> *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic texts from Cave Four, Fascicles 1-3, and 4 (concordance)* (Washington: 1992-1996). From vol. 2 onwards, the original readings of the card concordance were amended here and there according to Wacholder/Abegg's view, who by then had been able to check the PAM photographs. See also Ben-Zion Wacholder and Martin Abegg, "Corrections to a Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls. Fascicle 1," *QC* 3 (1993): 169-72.

<sup>29</sup> The early editors also changed their readings from time to time as a matter of course, so the card concordance presents a selection of readings at a given time. Additional information, including alternative readings, parallels and the like, is included in the early editors' handwritten notes.

<sup>30</sup> Paul Kretschmer and Ernst Locker, *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1944; 2nd ed., 1963; 3rd ed., 1977).

<sup>31</sup> Kuhn, Stegemann and Klinzing, *Rückläufiges hebräische Wörterbuch*.

lished in the past 50 years, was published by Ruth Sander and Kerstin Mayerhofer in 2010. Aramaic is included, in addition to the Hebrew.<sup>32</sup>

Between 1957 and 1965 Christoph Burchardt at the *Qumranforschungsstelle* compiled a two-volume bibliography of publications on the Qumran documents.<sup>33</sup> In 1996 Johann Maier edited a selected 100-page bibliography. Besides recent literature on Qumran, Maier included important earlier studies. In his annotation to the entries, he showed, among other things, that some of the “sensational” questions related to Qumran had been answered long before.<sup>34</sup>

It was realized early on that existing dictionaries of biblical and rabbinic Hebrew were insufficient for the study of the Qumran texts in their original languages. New morphological forms occur in them, as well as Hebrew and Aramaic words of unknown meaning. So, around 1960, the members of the *Qumranforschungsstelle* at Heidelberg undertook to write a Qumran dictionary. Essentially its character was philological, but it was to include theological aspects also.<sup>35</sup> As noted, Hartmut Stegemann, Kuhn’s successor, transferred the project first to Marburg (1973) and then to Göttingen (1980). This project had to cease in 1988, mainly due to the absence of a reliable textual basis for many scrolls. At the time, numerous Qumran documents were still unpublished; the exception was the 1977 edition of the *Temple Scroll*. The great momentum and surge in publication of the 1990s still lay ahead.<sup>36</sup> In 2002 the dictionary project was taken up at Göttingen by Reinhard Kratz (director)<sup>37</sup> and Annette Steudel (leader of the

<sup>32</sup> Ruth Sander and Kerstin Mayerhofer, *Retrograde Hebrew and Aramaic Dictionary* (JAJSup 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010). A retrograde search may also be done electronically e.g. with a program available through the Accordance (Oaktree) system.

<sup>33</sup> Christoph Burchard, *Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer* (BZNW 76; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1957), vol. 1; *Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer* (BZNW 89; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1965), vol. 2.

<sup>34</sup> Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener*, 3:xii, 378-477.

<sup>35</sup> The handwritten articles are kept at the *Qumranforschungsstelle* in Göttingen.

<sup>36</sup> As a research tool, thorough studies of various Qumran compositions were undertaken by members of the *Forschungsstelle* before they began writing articles for the dictionary.

<sup>37</sup> Reinhard Kratz (1957-) is a former student of the Swiss Old Testament scholar Odil-Hannes Steck. He is Professor of Old Testament Studies at Göttingen, where he also directs the *Qumranforschungsstelle*, the Qumran Dictionary project as well as the Göttingen edition of the Septuaginta project. Among Kratz’s publications on Qumran, see e.g. “Der Pescher Nahum und seine biblische Vorlage,” “Jesaja in den Schriften vom Toten Meer,” and “Hosea und Amos in den Schriften vom Toten Meer.” All three are included in Reinhard G. Kratz, *Prophetenstudien. Kleine Schriften II* (Tübingen, 2011); “Zwischen Elephantine und Qumran: Das Alte Testament im Rahmen des Antiken Judentums,” in André Lemaire, ed., *Congress Volume: Ljubljana 2007* (VTSup 33; Brill: Leiden, 2010), 129-46, “Friend of God, Brother of Sarah, and Father of Isaac. Abraham in the Hebrew Bible and in Qumran,” in Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz, eds., *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at*

research unit). By then the situation had changed dramatically. Computers had replaced slip boxes in the process of editing dictionaries; but above all, the Dead Sea Scrolls had been published officially, many of them in several editions, and with numerous readings discussed in other publications. Furthermore, the Israel Antiquities Authority's Microfiche Edition of the Scrolls, which appeared in 1993,<sup>38</sup> provides photographs of each Qumran fragment at different times, and Qumran texts are available electronically.<sup>39</sup> Hence, the renewed work on the dictionary could be based on reliable data. Being part of the Göttingen Academy of Science, the new dictionary is a long-term project. Modeled on the Gesenius and Koehler-Baumgartner dictionaries of Biblical Hebrew,<sup>40</sup> it aims to produce a philological lexicon, providing information on the morphology and semantics of the Hebrew and Aramaic non-biblical texts from the Dead Sea.<sup>41</sup> The *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten* project, undertaken by Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Dahmen at the Universities of Bonn and Siegen, is different from the Göttingen dictionary in that it assembles the theological evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls, in the tradition of the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* (ThWAT). The first volume appeared in 2011.<sup>42</sup>

---

*Qumran* (FAT 35; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 79-105; "The Place which He has Chosen'. The Identification of the Cult Place of Deut. 12 and Lev. 17 in 4QMMT," in Moshe Bar-Asher and Emanuel Tov, eds.,: *Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Festschrift for Devorah Dimant, Meghillot 5-6* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2007), \*57-\*80; "Temple and Torah. Reflections on the Legal Status of the Pentateuch between Elephantine and Qumran," in Gary N. Knoppers and Bernhard M. Levinson, eds., *The Pentateuch as Torah. New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance* (Winona Lake: 2007), 77-103; "Mose und die Propheten. Zur Interpretation von 4QMMT C," in García Martínez, Steudel and Tigchelaar, *From 4QMMT to Resurrection*, 151-76.

<sup>38</sup> Tov with Pfann, *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche*. This edition played a crucial role in the advancement of the Qumran research.

<sup>39</sup> Tov, *Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library*.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. also Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2004) and Jacob Hoftijzer and Karel Jongeling, *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1995). David J. A. Clines, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (Sheffield: Phoenix Press, 1993-2007) includes the Dead Sea Scrolls to a certain extent.

<sup>41</sup> Ben Sira and the *Damascus Document* Genizah copies are also included, as well as the inscriptions. Etymological information is given where necessary.

<sup>42</sup> Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Dahmen, eds., *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2011), vol. 1. The volume was not yet available to me.

*Database, Electronic Tools and Projects*

The core of the Göttingen philological dictionary project is a vast online database, which apart from etymological, morphological, syntactical and semantic information on each word, has a comprehensive bibliography, a synoptic presentation of different counting systems,<sup>43</sup> and all variant readings given in the various editions and publications of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Thus it does not merely serve as a common concordance or a retrograde dictionary but also allows the user to search for linguistic aspects, parts of words, different readings and interpretations and more.

The value of collecting variant readings can be illustrated by the following example. In the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa) II, 11 the uncertain word יוֹלִיד (“will engender”) appears in the *editio princeps*, in DJD I, and in Martin Abegg’s printed concordance, but without circlets to mark the doubt.<sup>44</sup> According to this reading, the phrase in 1QSa II, 11 would mean “when God will have engendered the Messiah.” However, at least eleven other readings have been proposed for this word, all of them uncertain.<sup>45</sup> Thus, what seems in Abegg’s version (taken from DJD I) a very unusual theological idea is in fact highly conjectural. This example demonstrates that the choice of the textual basis of a given Qumran document is crucial for understanding its theological import.<sup>46</sup>

The Göttingen dictionary database was designed by the Semitist and computer specialist Ingo Kottsieper, who collaborates in the project. It is the largest searchable database for the Dead Sea Scrolls, and is constantly

<sup>43</sup> This is most helpful for the study of compositions like *Hodayot*, where different counting systems are used in various existing editions, since the initial arrangement and counting of the first edition by Eliezer Sukenik has been modified as a result of Stegemann’s and Puech’s studies. The database also records the assignment of fragments to different manuscripts or their different placement within given scrolls.

<sup>44</sup> Dominique Barthélemy and Józef T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD I; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 108-18: “ce mot apparaît pratiquement certain,” but it should be taken to be a scribal error for יוֹלִיד (117).

<sup>45</sup> Among the proposed variant readings are יתגלה (with supralinear ך; Émile Puech, “Préséance sacerdotale et Messie-Roi dans la Règle de la Congregation (1QSa ii 11-22),” *RevQ* 16 [1994]: 351-65), יתעוֹד (Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls. A Study of the Rule of the Congregation* [SBLMS 38; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1989], 53), and יונלֹד (Hartmut Stegemann, “Some Remarks to 1QSa, to 1QSB, and to Qumran Messianism,” *RevQ* 17 [1996]: 479-505).

<sup>46</sup> Unfortunately the original, which is kept in Amman, is no longer legible at this place, and the photographs might allow for different interpretations of the surviving ink traces. יוֹלִיד is one of the least probable readings. The Göttingen dictionary lists the word under different entries, with explanations and cross-references to the other possible readings.

enlarged and updated by the co-workers of the dictionary project.<sup>47</sup> For legal reasons, the database will function as an internal project tool until the print publication of the Lexicon. But access is also accorded to other scholars who are, for example, preparing new editions of the Scrolls.

In 2010 the database was enlarged to include the philological aspect of the biblical scrolls from the Dead Sea area.<sup>48</sup> With this project and the Göttingen dictionary database as the starting point, efforts are now being made toward future cooperation and coordination of computer-aided research on Bible editions, including the biblical manuscripts from Qumran.<sup>49</sup>

A very helpful tool for reading paleographically difficult passages of the Dead Sea Scrolls emerged with the opportunity to use the computer as a kind of photo-lab.<sup>50</sup> In 1993 Armin Lange wrote the first and as yet only handbook for Dead Sea Scrolls scholars on that method.<sup>51</sup> Recently the Swiss-German team of Philippe Hugo, Ingo Kottsieper and Annette Steudel demonstrated once again the advantages of such an approach in reviewing sections of the 4QSamuel text editions.<sup>52</sup> Another instance of the

<sup>47</sup> Qumran publications by co-workers are the following: Eva Jain, "Die materielle Rekonstruktion von 1QJes<sup>b</sup> (1Q8) und einige bisher nicht edierte Fragmente dieser Handschrift," *RevQ* 20 (2002): 389-409; (with Annette Steudel), "Les manuscrits psalmiques de la mer Morte et la réception du psautier à Qumran," *RSR* 77 (2003): 529-43; Peter Porzig, "The Ark of the Covenant in the Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran," in Dimant and Kratz, *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis*, 203-18; *Die Lade Jahwes im Alten Testament und in den Texten vom Toten Meer* (BZAW 397; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), and Anja Klein, "From the 'Right Spirit' to the 'Spirit of Truth': Observations on Ps 51 and 1QS," in Dimant and Kratz, *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis*, 171-91.

<sup>48</sup> Noam Mizrahi, Göttingen, is developing this part of the project.

<sup>49</sup> A workshop entitled "Bits and Bible - New Digital Approaches to Editing Biblical Texts" was held in Göttingen in March 2011 to discuss these issues. Participants came from the Hebrew Bible Project (Michael Segal), the Madrid Polyglotte Project (Andrés Piquer and Pablo Torijano), the Biblia Hebraica Quinta Project (Adrian Schenker and Innocent Himbaza), the Samaritanus Project (Stefan Schorch), the Qumran Quotations Project of Ariel and Faina Feldman, and the Göttingen Septuagint and Qumran projects.

<sup>50</sup> It nevertheless requires the eyes of an experienced paleographer. Also, computer-aided readings are not objective, and occasionally allow different interpretations as well. They should be verified with the help of the originals in the museum.

<sup>51</sup> *Computer Aided Text-Reconstruction and Transcription. CATT-Manual* (Tübingen, 1993) and "Computer Aided Text-Reconstruction and Transcription (CATT) Developed with the Dead Sea Scrolls," in George J. Brooke, ed., *New Qumran Texts and Studies* (STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 223-32. To test his method, the contested reading מעשה תורה or מרעה תורה in 4Q174 1-2 i 7 was examined. By electronic means, Armin Lange and Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn reached the same results obtained in the late 1980s by Stegemann, Puech and Steudel who looked at the original. They all read there תורה.

<sup>52</sup> Philippe Hugo, Ingo Kottsieper and Annette Steudel, "Notes paléographiques sur 4QSam<sup>a</sup> (4Q51) (le cas de 2 Sam 3)," *RevQ* 23 (2007): 93-108; "Reflections on Epigraphy and Critical Editing, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> (4Q51) Col. XI," (forthcoming); cf. Émile Puech, "4QSam<sup>a</sup> (4Q51). Notes épigraphiques et nouvelles identifications," in Hans Ausloos, Bénédicte Lemmelijn and Marc Vervenne, eds., *Florilegium Lovaniense: Studies in Septuagint and Textual*

benefits of computer techniques for photography of the Qumran Scrolls is the work on the *Hodayot* copy from cave 1 (1QH<sup>a</sup>).

The early photographs taken of the Qumran Scrolls in the Palestinian Archaeological Museum (PAM) in Jerusalem are of particular importance for establishing reliable text editions, since they show the state of the documents on their arrival at the museum some 50 years ago. In order to use them for the dictionary project at the *Qumranforschungsstelle*, Hartmut Stegemann collected the PAM photographs of the cave 4 manuscripts still unpublished at the time. He also assembled photographs of 1QHodayot<sup>a</sup> (1QH<sup>a</sup>), which he used for his reconstruction of this manuscript. Ingo Kottsieper, who had formerly worked on a material reconstruction of the Achikar papyri,<sup>53</sup> arranged these photographs on the computer according to Stegemann's material reconstruction of 1QH<sup>a</sup>. Compared with earlier more mechanically enhanced reproductions of scroll reconstructions, this was a major advance in their presentation.<sup>54</sup> However, to date there is still no electronic way to use the computer for material reconstruction of fragmentary scrolls, for example, to compare the shapes of fragments in order to find their proper location in the scroll.<sup>55</sup>

Other work is being done on the material aspects of the Scrolls. At the Federal Institute for Materials Research and Testing in Berlin, a workgroup under the direction of Oliver Hahn is conducting tests on a small sample of Qumran fragments from the Shrine of the Book.<sup>56</sup> In this context, an

---

*Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (BETL 224; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 373-86.

<sup>53</sup> See e.g. Ingo Kottsieper, *Die Geschichte und die Sprüche des weisen Achikar* (TUAT 3; Gütersloh: O. Kaiser et al ed., 1991), 320-47; "Look, son, what Nadab did to Ahikaros...". The Aramaic Ahikar Tradition and its Relationship to the Book of Tobit," in Dimant and Kratz, *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis*, 145-167 (152-6).

<sup>54</sup> Mistakes in the plate-producing process can be avoided by this procedure.

<sup>55</sup> The first contacts between the Göttingen *Qumranforschungsstelle* and computer experts in Geneva and Tel Aviv have been made. This is a promising field for fruitful interdisciplinary cooperation.

<sup>56</sup> See also Ira Rabin et al., "Characterization of the Writing Media of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Jan Gunneweg, Annemie Adriaens and Joris Dik, eds., *Holistic Qumran: Transdisciplinary Research of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 87; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 132-4; Ira Rabin and Steffen Franzka, "Microscopy and Parchment Degradation: A Comparative Study," in Jan Gunneweg, Charles Greenblatt and Annemie Adriaens, eds., *Bio- and Material Cultures at Qumran: Papers from a COST Action G8 Working Group Meeting Held in Jerusalem, Israel on 22-23 May 2005* (Stuttgart: Fraunhofer IRB, 2006), 269-76; Ira Rabin et al., "On the Origin of the Ink of the Thanksgiving Scroll (1QHodayot<sup>a</sup>)," *DSD* 16 (2009): 97-106.



international conference was held in Berlin in 2010 on “Archaeometry on the Dead Sea Scrolls.”<sup>57</sup>

In recent years, Armin Lange and Matthias Weigold from the University of Vienna have presented results of their project “The Meaning of Ancient Jewish Quotations and Allusions for the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible” via internet.<sup>58</sup>

### *Editions*

#### *DJD*

Although the Heidelberg *Qumranforschungsstelle* was oriented to basic research, it did not participate directly in the publication of the Scrolls. In 1955, in the context of Kuhn’s invitation to join the Faculty of Theology in Heidelberg the previous year, the German federal state of Baden-Württemberg purchased Qumran fragments for Kuhn’s university for publication. Later, however, they were returned to Israel. Kuhn published only some phylactery fragments from Qumran, which were subsequently edited by Józef Milik in DJD VI (1977).<sup>59</sup>

Karl Georg Kuhn played a major role in recognizing the character of the *Copper Scroll*, discovered in Qumran cave 3. He was the first to observe that this scroll contains a list of hiding places. In 1954, even before it was opened, Kuhn examined the visible part of the scroll on display at the Palestine Archaeological Museum. He recognized numbers, the words “gold” and “silver,” as well as names of buildings.<sup>60</sup> He first concluded that it was a list of caches for the riches belonging to the Essenes,<sup>61</sup> but later suggested that the scroll listed hiding places of the treasures of the Temple.

<sup>57</sup> At present there is no cooperation between the Berlin project and the Qumran Institute in Göttingen on Scroll reconstruction.

<sup>58</sup> See <http://www.univie.ac.at/judaistik/Forschungsprojekte.htm>, a list of quotations and allusions, presently from Gen-2Kgs.

<sup>59</sup> See Karl G. Kuhn, *Phylakterien aus Höhle 4 von Qumran* (AHAW Philosophisch-Historische Klasse (Abhandlung 1; Heidelberg: Winter, 1957). Kuhn’s 4QPhyl<sup>a</sup> = Milik’s Phyl J; Kuhn’s 4QPhyl<sup>b</sup> = Milik’s Phyl B; Kuhn’s 4QPhyl<sup>c</sup> = Deut 11:10-17 - fragment of Milik’s Phyl A.

<sup>60</sup> Karl G. Kuhn, “Les rouleaux de cuivre de Qumran,” *RB* 61 (1954): 193-205.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Dupont-Sommer, and later also Émile Puech, who re-edited the *Copper Scroll* with the assistance of the EDF (which made a new copy, and x-ray photographs). See Daniel Brizemeure, Noel Lacoudre and Émile Puech, eds., *Le Rouleau de cuivre de la grotte 3 de Qumrân (3Q15)* (2 vols.; STDJ 55; Leiden: Brill, 2006); “Some Results of a New Examination of the Copper Scroll (3Q15),” in George J. Brooke and Philip R. Davies, eds., *Copper Scroll Studies* (JSPSup 40; Sheffield: Academic Press, 2002), 58-89.

Kuhn's opinions were hotly debated. André Dupont-Sommer and John Allegro shared his assumption that the treasures were real, whereas Roland de Vaux and Józef Milik thought that they were fictional. Milik published the *Copper Scroll* in 1962.<sup>62</sup>

Claus-Hunno Hunzinger was the first German scholar invited to join the team of Scroll editors.<sup>63</sup> Born in 1929, Hunzinger, subsequently Professor of New Testament Studies and Late History of Religions in Hamburg (1962-1991), studied in Heidelberg and also in Göttingen. There he participated in Kuhn's Qumran study groups, from the very first in the 1949 summer semester and thereafter. It was actually the idea of Albrecht Alt, taken up by Hunzinger's teachers Joachim Jeremias and Kuhn, to send him to Jerusalem to work on the Scrolls. Roland de Vaux and Lankester Harding assigned him to the team of scholars deciphering the fragments from cave 4. The *Deutsche Evangelische Institut für Altertumswissenschaft des Heiligen Landes* assumed responsibility for Hunzinger's project, so he traveled to Jerusalem in 1954 with the financial support of the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (DFG). He worked at the Palestine Archaeological Museum from October 1954 to October 1955, in "harmonischer Eingliederung in das siebenköpfige internationale Team," and returned for a second year beginning in the fall of 1956.<sup>64</sup> For a period of time there was no access to the original scrolls, which had been removed due to the Suez War. When the fragments arrived back in Jerusalem in spring 1957, Hunzinger (in the absence of most members of the team) engaged in a huge cleaning project to save the partially moldy material. He worked mainly on two manuscripts, 4Q491 and 4Q503, which were later published by Maurice Baillet in DJD VII. In his introduction to these manuscripts, Baillet acknowledged Hunzinger's groundwork.<sup>65</sup> Studying the cave 4 manuscript related to the *War Scroll* (4QM<sup>a</sup>), Hunzinger determined that it came from a pre-Qumranic

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Józef T. Milik, "Le rouleau de cuivre provenant de la grotte 3Q (3Q15)," in Maurice Baillet, Józef T. Milik and Roland de Vaux, *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân* (DJD) III; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 201-314.

<sup>63</sup> Hunzinger describes his time working with the Dead Sea Scrolls as an "incredibly exciting, scholarly fascinating and personally formative time!" ("unglaublich aufregende, wissenschaftlich faszinierende und menschlich prägenden Zeit!"). I thank Prof. Hunzinger for kindly telling me this in an oral communication.

<sup>64</sup> Hunzinger devoted the interim year to his ordination, his habilitation, and last but not least his betrothal. He met his future wife while guiding her group through the excavations at Qumran.

<sup>65</sup> Hunzinger arranged the numerous fragments of the *Daily Prayers* (4Q503). See the comment by Maurice Baillet, *Qumrân grotte 4.III (4Q482-4Q520)* (DJD VII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 105.

version, earlier than that of cave 1 (1QM).<sup>66</sup> With this observation Hunzinger showed that one of the large Qumran texts had undergone a redactional process, which can be traced in different manuscripts among the Scrolls; only decades later did this scholarly perspective begin to be discussed broadly in Qumran research.<sup>67</sup> The final word on the literary development of the *War Scroll* text is yet to be spoken: only a material reconstruction of cave 4 manuscripts may be able to provide a definite answer.<sup>68</sup> The same applies to the role and literary development of the unique so-called “Self-Glorification Hymn” (4QM<sup>a</sup> 11 i), which, significantly, occurs not only in the *War Scroll* but also in the *Hodayot* manuscripts.<sup>69</sup>

With the enlarging of the editorial team of the Scrolls in the early 1990s, German scholars were again invited to participate in the official publication of the Scrolls in the DJD volumes. Annette Steudel was assigned 4Q410-4Q412 and 4Q425-4Q426 along with 4Q408 from John Strugnell’s lot. She cooperated with Strugnell on these texts, and took into account also

<sup>66</sup> See Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, “Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milhama aus Höhle 4 von Qumran,” *ZAW* 69 (1957): 131-51; “Aus der Arbeit an unveröffentlichten Texten von Qumrân,” *ThLZ* 85 (1960): 151-2. Hunzinger’s first publication was “Neues Licht auf Luk. 2,14,” *ZNW* 44 (1952-1953): 85-90, where he hinted at Qumran parallels to clarify the old debate on the meaning of this Lukan passage. Apart from rabbinic material, Hunzinger used a great deal of Qumran material in his unpublished study *Jüdisches Erbe in der urchristlichen Kirchengründung* (both dissertation and habilitation).

<sup>67</sup> The literary development of the *Community Rule* material was researched by Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997). Metso was the first Qumran doctoral student of Raija Sollamo in Helsinki. She also studied with the late Old Testament scholar Timmo Vejiola, and hence became familiar with the redactional criticism of the Hebrew Bible. Metso wrote the major part of her dissertation with Hartmut Stegemann and his team in Göttingen and Jerusalem. Among earlier studies of the Scrolls from the redactional criticism viewpoint are those by Jerome Murphy O’Connor. See his summary article on the *Community Rule* in David Noel Freedman, ed., *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (Doubleday, New York 1992), 1:1110-11. Murphy O’Connor did his post-doctoral research with Karl Georg Kuhn and his team at the *Qumranforschungsstelle* at Heidelberg in 1965-1966. Another member of Kuhn’s group was the Dutch scholar Adam van der Woude, who published his well-known surveys of Qumran research in German in the *Theologische Rundschau*, see e.g. “Fünfzehn Jahre Qumranforschung (1974-1988),” *ThR* 54 (1989): 212-61. For a detailed description of van der Woude’s scientific activities, see Eibert Tigchelaar’s chapter in this volume.

<sup>68</sup> A reconstruction of 4QM<sup>a</sup> has been attempted by Roman Vielhauer and Peter Porzig (Göttingen). Their results are still preliminary. At present, research on the *War Scroll* and related materials seeks to explain the recensional differences in the various copies. See, e.g., the unpublished dissertation of Roni Ishay, *The Literature of War at Qumran. Manuscripts 4Q491-4Q496. Edition and Commentary and their Comparison to the War Scroll (1QM)*, (Haifa, 2006) (Hebrew). On Yishai’s work, see Devorah Dimant’s chapter in this volume.

<sup>69</sup> For this text, see Eileen M. Schuller’s chapter, “Research on the Sectarian Scrolls in North America,” in this volume.

his earlier handwritten notes.<sup>70</sup> They are published in DJD XX and DJD XXXVI.<sup>71</sup>

Armin Lange (Münster, Tübingen and Vienna) edited 4Q440<sup>a,b</sup>, 4Q468<sup>f,l,m-bb</sup> and XQ7 in DJD XXXVI.<sup>72</sup> In DJD XXXIX he published the “Annotated List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert Classified by Content and Genre.” Donald Parry and Emanuel Tov were to use this list in their arrangement of the Qumran texts according to genre in their edition entitled *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader* (DSSR).

Uwe Gleßner (Hamburg) reconstructed and edited 4Q334 (Ordo), a fragmentary text concerned with songs and praises related to certain days, in DJD XXI.<sup>73</sup> Together with Matthias Albani, with whom he cooperated, he is one of the very few experts on calendrical and astronomical texts from Qumran.<sup>74</sup> Both studied these manuscripts in Jerusalem in the mid-1990s, and also frequently exchanged ideas with James VanderKam and Shemaryahu Talmon. They also had contact with Józef Milik, whom they visited in Paris.<sup>75</sup>

<sup>70</sup> As a doctoral student of Hartmut Stegemann, Annette Steudel (1963-) started to work on the originals of the Scrolls in the summer of 1988, at first mainly for her dissertation on 4Q174 and 4Q177.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Annette Steudel, “4Q411. 4QSapiential Hymns,” “4Q412, 4Q425. 4QSapiential-Didactic Work A-B,” “Sapiential-Hymnic Work A,” in Torleif Elgvin et al., in consultation with Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Qumran Cave 4.XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1* (DJD XX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 159-62, 163-7, 203-10, 211-24; “4Q408. 4QApocryphon of Moses?,” “4Q410. 4QVision and Interpretation,” in Philip S. Alexander et al., in consultation with James C. VanderKam and Monica Brady, *Cave 4.XXVI: Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD XXXVI, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 298-315, 316-19.

<sup>72</sup> See Armin Lange, “4Q440a. 4QHodayot-like Text D”; “4Q440b. 4QFragment Mentioning a Court”; “4Q468m-bb. 4QUnidentified Fragments D, m-bb”; “XQ7. XQUnidentified Text,” in Philip S. Alexander et al., in consultation with James C. VanderKam and Monica Brady, *Cave 4.XXVI: Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD XXXVI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 347-8, 349-50, 423-32, 492-3. XQ7 was identified later by Puech and Steudel as belonging to the large Wisdom composition of 4Q417 or 4Q418. See Émile Puech and Annette Steudel, “Un nouveau fragment du manuscrit 4QInstruction (XQ7 = 4Q417 ou 418),” *RevQ* 19 (2000): 623-7.

<sup>73</sup> See Uwe Gleßner, “4Q334 (Ordo),” in Shemaryahu Talmon, Jonathan Ben-Dov and Uwe Gleßner, *Qumran Cave 4.XVI: Calendrical Texts* (DJD XXI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), 167-94. Gleßner reconstructed the manuscript according to its formulaic structure and physical criteria. Uwe Gleßner is a former student of Klaus Koch in Hamburg and mainly worked on the late biblical period.

<sup>74</sup> Matthias Albani (formerly in Leipzig, now Professor of Theology in Moritzburg in Saxony) studied Protestant theology in East Germany. The fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, right after his examination, opened up new possibilities for scholarly cooperation, such as the contacts between the Universities of Leipzig and Hamburg. In addition, he was able to go to Jerusalem and work on the Scrolls together with the Stegemann's Göttingen team.

<sup>75</sup> See e.g. Uwe Gleßner, “The Otot-Texts (4Q319) and the Problem of Intercalations in the Context of the 364-Day Calendar,” in Heinz-Josef Fabry, Armin Lange and Hermann

In summer 1995 Gleßmer and Albani visited the still unpublished collection of archaeological artifacts from the original dig at Qumran, kept in the basement of the Rockefeller Museum in Jerusalem (in the charge of Jean-Baptiste Humbert of the École Biblique). They noticed an unidentified stone object and recognized at once that it was an instrument for time measurement, a kind of sundial.<sup>76</sup> Subsequent comparisons with similar objects confirmed their initial identification. The object became well known and was placed on display in the Shrine of the Book at the Israel Museum in Jerusalem.<sup>77</sup>

Hartmut Stegemann was occupied for decades with the originals of the Scrolls in Jerusalem, working there every summer. But apart from his re-edition of the *Hodayot* he did not wish to edit other Qumran texts. He was happy to help other editors with his extraordinary skill in material reconstruction of the Scrolls.<sup>78</sup> However, while working at the Rockefeller Museum he came across unidentified fragments that he determined to belong to a copy of the *Damascus Document* (4Q269 [4QD<sup>d</sup>]). He later pub-

---

Lichtenberger, eds., *Qumranstudien: Vorträge und Beiträge der Teilnehmer des Qumranseminars auf dem internationalen Treffen der Society of Biblical Literature, Münster, 25-26 Juli 1993* (Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 125-64; "Explizite Aussagen über kalendarische Konflikte im Jubiläenbuch: Jub 6,22-32.33-38," in Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey and Armin Lange, eds., *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 127-64; "Calendars in the Qumran Scrolls," in Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (Leiden: Brill, 1998-1999), 2:213-78. See Matthias Albani, "Die lunaren Zyklen im 364-Tage-Festkalender von 4QMischmarot/4QSe," *Mitteilungen und Beiträge der Forschungsstelle Judentum der Kirchlichen Hochschule Leipzig* 4 (1992): 3-43; "Der Zodiakos in 4Q318 und die Henoch-Astronomie," *Mitteilungen und Beiträge der Forschungsstelle Judentum der Theologischen Fakultät Leipzig* 7 (1993): 3-42; "Horoscopes in the Qumran Scrolls," in Flint and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*, 279-330. The *Mitteilungen und Beiträge der Forschungsstelle Judentum der Theologischen Fakultät Leipzig* (= MuB 1-19), which since June 2001 have appeared under the title *LEQACH*, are published by the *Forschungsstelle Judentum an der Theologischen Fakultät Leipzig*, edited by Albani with others. The *Forschungsstelle* was founded in 1988 by the Old Testament scholar Hans Seidel.

<sup>76</sup> See e.g. Uwe Gleßmer and Matthias Albani, "Un instrument de mesures astronomiques à Qumrân," *RB* 104 (1997): 88-115, and "An Astronomical Measuring Instrument from Qumran," in Donald W. Parry and Eugene C. Ulrich, eds., *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 407-42. Gypsum copies of the object were made; two of them are kept at Göttingen.

<sup>77</sup> It is rarely noted that an  $\nu$  is inscribed on the back of the instrument. This corroborates the assumption that it was used by Jews. The discussion on the "sundial" continues: see e.g. George M. Hollenback, "The Qumran Roundel: An Equatorial Sundial?" *DSD* 7 (2000): 123-9; "More on the Qumran Roundel as an Equatorial Sundial," *DSD* 11 (2004): 289-92.

<sup>78</sup> See below on material reconstruction. For further information see Steudel, "In Memoriam Prof. Dr. Dr. Hartmut Stegemann," 327-33.

lished them in DJD XXXVI.<sup>79</sup> Stegemann would gladly share his knowledge and experience. For example, on generously agreeing to read the proofs of 4Q408, one of the texts allocated to Annette Steudel for publication, he realized that it was another copy of the work known as the *Apocryphon of Moses*, formerly known as “Tongues of Fire.”<sup>80</sup> Many Qumran texts were edited with the benefit of his expertise in material reconstruction; examples are the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*,<sup>81</sup> the *Non-Canonical Psalms* and the cave 4 copies of the *Hodayot*.<sup>82</sup>

Stegemann’s re-edition of the *Hodayot* copy from cave 1 (1QHodayot<sup>a</sup>), on which he worked so many years, appeared in DJD XL after his death. Eileen Schuller, who previously edited the *Hodayot* copies from cave 4 and cooperated with Stegemann, selflessly undertook to prepare his edition for publication.<sup>83</sup>

In conclusion, it would be beneficial to assemble the still available original manuscripts of the first editorial team, now scattered across various locations. They often contain very useful information that is included neither in the DJD volumes nor in the preliminary card concordance. Collecting these documents would also be of interest for the history of Qumran research. The *Qumranforschungsstelle* in Göttingen preserves Hartmut Stegemann’s handwritten notes, as well as copies of those of Józef Milik, related to the cave 4 manuscripts of the *Damascus Document*. The old and often excellent photographs of the Scrolls, sometimes accompanied with notes by the earlier editors on the correct placement of certain (parts of) fragments, also merit assembly.

<sup>79</sup> Fragments 10, 11 (re-edition), 15, and 16. See fragments 10 and 11 in Hartmut Stegemann, “4Q269. 4QDamascus Document<sup>d</sup>,” in Alexander et al., *Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD XXXVI), 201-11. Joseph Baumgarten’s study on the 4Q fragments of the *Damascus Document* had appeared earlier. See Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)* (DJD XVIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

<sup>80</sup> See Alexander et al., *Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD XXXVI), 298-315. For recent insights into the *Apocryphon of Moses* proposed by Liora Goldman, see the chapter by Devorah Dimant in this volume.

<sup>81</sup> Carol Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (Harvard Semitic Studies 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985).

<sup>82</sup> Eileen M. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran. A Pseudepigraphic Collection* (HSS 28; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986); “Hodayot,” in Esther Chazon et al., in consultation with James C. VanderKam and Monica Brady, *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XXIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 69-254.

<sup>83</sup> Schuller went to Göttingen as a Humboldt-laureate for 2005-2006 to work with Stegemann in preparing his edition for publication, but Stegemann passed away just two days after her arrival. The re-edition is published in Hartmut Stegemann and Eileen M. Schuller, *Qumran Cave 1.III. 1QHodayot<sup>a</sup>. With Incorporation of 1QHodayot<sup>b</sup> and 4QHodayot<sup>a-f</sup>*, *Translation of Texts by Carol Newsom* (DJD XL; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009).



### *Further Editions and Re-Editions*

Several editions and re-editions have been prepared by German-speaking scholars. A comprehensive edition of major Hebrew Qumran texts was published in the early stages of research by Eduard Lohse with the assistance of Peter von der Osten-Sacken.<sup>84</sup> Another comprehensive edition of the Aramaic texts was published by Klaus Beyer.

Eduard Lohse's edition presents important Qumran compositions published up until 1968 in vocalized Hebrew, together with an annotated German translation and short introductions to the texts. The addition of vocalization to the unvocalized Scrolls renders this edition unique among those in European languages.<sup>85</sup> It remains the foremost study manual for the Scrolls, especially for German-speaking beginners and non-specialists. It has been used by other editions of the Scrolls, such as those in Scandinavia, as a model. Lohse's single volume was later supplemented by another containing texts published more recently, such as the *Temple Scroll*; the volume was edited by Annette Steudel and several assistants.<sup>86</sup>

Klaus Beyer's large edition of Aramaic texts from Qumran appeared in 1984. Beyer updated and supplemented it in 1994 and 2004,<sup>87</sup> and these

<sup>84</sup> Eduard Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran: Hebräisch-Aramäisch und Deutsch* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964). See also Peter von der Osten-Sacken, Gott und Belial. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran (SUNT 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969). Von der Osten-Sacken studied Protestant theology in Göttingen, Kiel and Heidelberg. From 1973 to 1993 he was Professor of New Testament Studies at the *Kirchliche Hochschule* in Berlin (West), and afterwards Professor of New Testament Studies and Christian-Jewish Studies at the *Humboldt-Universität* in Berlin. From 1974 to 2007 he directed the *Institut Kirche und Judentum*. He received the Buber-Rosenzweig Medal in 2005. The prestigious award named after the German-Jewish philosophers Martin Buber (1878-1965) and Franz Rosenzweig (1886-1929), honors people who engage in a special way in the Christian-Jewish dialogue. Among laureates are Schalom Ben-Chorin (1982) and Yehudi Menuhin (1989). Note Eileen M. Schuller, "The Discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Jewish-Christian Relations," in Patricia Walters, ed., *From Judaism to Christianity: Tradition and Transition. A Festschrift for Thomas H. Tobin, S.J., on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (NovTSup 136; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 43-58.

<sup>85</sup> The forerunner and role model of Lohse's edition was the vocalized edition of Abraham Habermann; see Habermann, *Megilloth Midbar Yebuda*. Recently Ursula Schattner-Rieser published a vocalized edition of Aramaic texts from Qumran. See Ursula Schattner-Rieser, *Textes araméens de la mer Morte: Édition bilingue, vocalisée et commentée* (Langues et cultures anciennes 5; Brussels: Safran, 2005).

<sup>86</sup> Annette Steudel in cooperation with Hans-Ulrich Boesche, Birgit Brederke, Christoph Gasser and Roman Vielhauer, *Die Texte aus Qumran II, Hebräisch-Aramäisch und Deutsch* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001). The decision to vocalize (anachronistically) the texts according to the Masoretic system was upheld, but a second apparatus on the readings was added.

<sup>87</sup> Klaus Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zita-*



volumes long remained the only source for textual and philological data on these documents, in fact until the recent official publication of most of the Qumran Aramaic texts by Émile Puech.<sup>88</sup> Beyer studied Protestant theology and Semitic and other oriental languages: in Heidelberg from 1948 with the Old Testament scholar Gustav Hölscher and others; and from 1951 in Göttingen.<sup>89</sup> There he came into contact with Qumran studies in the classes of Karl Georg Kuhn. He never joined the *Qumranforschungsstelle*, but Kuhn inspired and directed his dissertation on Semitic syntax in the New Testament, which was published as the first volume of Kuhn's series *Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments*.<sup>90</sup> In 1967 he completed his habilitation in Semitic studies. He has been Professor of Semitic Studies at the University of Heidelberg since 1979.

Johann Maier's three-volume publication presents translations without transcriptions of the originals. Yet the comprehensiveness of the collection, the richness of the textual data and subtlety of the measured and thorough comments render his volumes in many respects an actual edition.<sup>91</sup>

The potential for a comprehensive edition of all the Dead Sea Scrolls, together with the Genizah manuscripts of the *Damascus Document* and Ben Sira,<sup>92</sup> in fact exists in the database of the Göttingen Qumran Dictionary project. With its continuous updating, this database presents the texts with variant readings for each word that occurs in the Qumran documents, together with its grammatical and syntactical analysis, in addition to the German translation.

As far back as the early 1970s, Klaus Beyer suggested the compilation of a supplementary volume to the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, which would list all the variants of the biblical manuscripts found among the Dead Sea

---

*ten. Aramaistische Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Deutung, Grammatik-Wörterbuch, Deutsch-aramäische Wortliste, Register* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984; 2nd ed. 1986; supplementary vol. 1994; vol. 3, 2004). See also the section on Philology below.

<sup>88</sup> See Émile Puech, *Qumran Grotte 4.XXII: Textes araméens, première partie: 4Q529–549* (DJD XXXI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001); *Qumran Cave 4.XXVII: Textes araméens, deuxième partie: 4Q550–575, 580–582* (DJD XXXVII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009). See also the earlier publication by Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Daniel J. Harrington, *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts (Second Century B.C. - Second Century A.D.)* (BibOr 34; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978).

<sup>89</sup> Cordial thanks to Klaus Beyer, who kindly supported me with biographical information.

<sup>90</sup> Klaus Beyer, *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament* (SUNT 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962; 2nd ed. 1968).

<sup>91</sup> Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer*, vols 1-3. On volume 3, see below.

<sup>92</sup> Information on inscriptions is also provided, as are etymological data where necessary.

Scrolls.<sup>93</sup> But due to the delays in publication of these texts it took another three decades to take up this idea and develop it in a different form. The first volume presented the Minor Prophets texts from Qumran synoptically with the Masoretic Text and the Seputagint.<sup>94</sup>

Re-editions of single texts have also been issued in German-speaking countries. Entire texts have been newly published;<sup>95</sup> portions of texts have been re-edited with new readings of the original documents or suggestions for the re-location of fragments.<sup>96</sup>

Although presented without the Hebrew text, Johann Maier's translation and commentary of the *Temple Scroll* is in fact a re-edition. It was also translated into English, and is still today one of the best editions with commentary of that scroll.<sup>97</sup>

Recent re-editions of Qumran texts by German-speaking scholars are often based on material reconstructions. This applies to Stegemann and Schuller's edition of the *Hodayot* mentioned above, Steudel's *Midrash on Eschatology* (4Q174 + 4Q177) and Vielhauer's re-edition of the *Pesher of Hosea*.<sup>98</sup>

A recent contribution of three scholars discusses the probability of the identification of small fragments, how far reconstruction of lacunae may be permitted, and the need for particular caution in this respect. Philippe Hugo, Ingo Kottsieper, and Annette Steudel have rethought the question

<sup>93</sup> See Klaus Beyer, "Für einen Ergänzungsband zur Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia," *ZAW* 85 (1973), 231; "Althebräische Syntax in Prosa und Poesi," in Jeremias, Kuhn and Stegemann, eds., *Tradition und Glaube*, 93 n. 77.

<sup>94</sup> Armin Lange et al., *Minor Prophets* (Biblia Qumranica 3b; Leiden: Brill, 2005).

<sup>95</sup> See e.g. on 4Q242 Rudolf Meyer, *Das Gebet des Nabonid. Eine in den Qumran-Handschriften wiederentdeckte Weisheits Erzählung* (Sitzungsberichte der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-Historische Klasse 107; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962); officially published later by Émile Puech, "4Q242. 4QPrayer of Nabonidus ar," in George J. Brooke et al., in consultation with James C. Vanderkam, *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD XXII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 83-93. See also Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran*.

<sup>96</sup> See e.g. Annette Steudel, "The Houses of Prostration CD XI, 21-XII,1. Duplicates of the Temple," *RevQ* 16 (1993): 49-68, based on her new reading of כִּי בֵית instead of שֶׁבַח in CD XI, 21-XII,1.

<sup>97</sup> Johann Maier, *Die Tempelrolle vom Toten Meer. Übersetzt und erläutert* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1978; 2nd ed. 1992); *The Temple Scroll. An Introduction, Translation & Commentary* (JSOTSup 34; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1985), and *Die Tempelrolle vom Toten Meer und das 'Neue Jerusalem': 11Q19 und 11Q20; 1Q32, 2Q24, 4Q554-4Q555, 5Q15 und 11Q18. Übersetzung und Erläuterung mit Grundrissen der Tempelhofanlage und Skizzen zur Stadtplanung* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1997; 3rd ed.). Cf. the recent study on the *Temple Scroll* by Simone Paganini, "Nicht darfst du zu diesen Wörtern etwas hinzufügen": *Die Rezeption des Deuteronomiums in der Tempelrolle: Sprache, Autoren, Hermeneutik* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte 11; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009).

<sup>98</sup> See the survey on material reconstruction, below.

of what users of a critical (re-)edition need, thus reflecting on methodological aspects of future editing techniques.<sup>99</sup> Taking the example of a biblical Qumran text, fragments of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, they discuss problems such as the probability of the identification of small fragments, the extent of reconstruction of lacunae, and sound a note of caution in these matters.

Finally, mention must be made of substantial publication projects with German-language publishers. A new annotated translation of major Qumran texts will be edited by Reinhard Kratz in collaboration with others at the *Suhrkamp Verlag*, in a series of sources of world religions. The largest project engaged in re-editing Qumran texts, the Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project (PTSDSSP), is undertaken by the German publishing house Mohr Siebeck of Tübingen in collaboration with an American publisher. The two publishers have issued re-editions of the Qumran texts, the entire series being edited by James Charlesworth.<sup>100</sup> The series often includes editions of texts first published in the DJD series, and the same editors re-edit their documents, occasionally with new variants. The volumes already published in this series include editions of the texts and English translations,<sup>101</sup> accompanied by short introductions and notes.

### *Philology of the Dead Sea Scrolls*

Besides producing editions, translations and commentaries, German-speaking scholars have also contributed to the study of the language and grammar of the Scrolls. An extensive semantic study by Heinz-Josef Fabry on the

<sup>99</sup> They discuss it in relation to fragments of the book of Samuel. See Hugo, Kottsieper and Steudel, "Reflections on Epigraphy and Critical Editing."

<sup>100</sup> See James H. Charlesworth, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* (vols. 1-3, 4, 6; Tübingen-Louisville: Mohr Siebeck-Wesminster John Knox Press, 1994-2006). Other publishers in German-speaking countries that participate to a larger extent in the publication of Dead Sea Scrolls studies are, firstly at the initiative of Karl Georg Kuhn and now with the *Orbis Antiquus*, Series Archaeologica (NTOA.SA, Fribourg and Göttingen) series, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht in Göttingen, and Walter de Gruyter in Berlin. Among others involved are Kohlhammer, and the Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft Darmstadt. In the future, Suhrkamp-Verlag too will edit Qumran texts. Note that from the late 1980s onwards especially, German-speaking authors in Qumran research have increasingly tended to publish their articles in English (dissertations and habilitations are usually still presented in German). Nevertheless, the *Revue de Qumran* continues to publish articles in all the major European languages. For a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of abandoning the mother tongue in scholarly publications, see <http://www.zeit.de/wissen/2010-04/deutsch-forschungssprache>.

<sup>101</sup> Not always edited by the same person; see e.g. the first volume (1994), on 1QS.

word שׁוּב was published in 1973.<sup>102</sup> Klaus Beyer's grammatical studies of the Aramaic of Qumran and related texts since the 1980s are internationally known and appreciated. Wilhelm Nebe, Beyer's colleague in Heidelberg, produced a steady stream of philological studies of the Scrolls.<sup>103</sup> He discussed their grammatical aspects, and wrote philological and epigraphic notes on Qumran texts unpublished at the time.<sup>104</sup> During the 1980s, the Thorions published several articles in the *Revue de Qumran* on various linguistic features of the Scrolls. At the time, Yochanan Thorion and his wife Talia were at Stegemann's *Qumranforschungsstelle*.<sup>105</sup> Their untimely death sadly cut this activity short. The aforementioned Semitist Ingo Kottsieper, a member of the Göttingen dictionary project since 2002, published a number of philological articles on Qumran texts.<sup>106</sup> He also contributed to the

<sup>102</sup> Heinz-Josef Fabry, *Die Wurzel Šûb in der Qumran-Literatur: Zur Semantik eines Grundbegriffes* (BBB 53; Cologne: Hanstein, 1975).

<sup>103</sup> Wilhelm Nebe was a co-worker of Karl G. Kuhn in Heidelberg. He has been a docent in Semitic languages at the University of Heidelberg (since 1993) and in Hebrew philology at the *Hochschule für Jüdische Studien* in Heidelberg (since 1999). In his studies, he focuses on Canaanite and Aramaic languages and culture, the history and literature of ancient Judaism, Hebrew and Aramaic epigraphy and philology, and the Dead Sea Scrolls together with the manuscripts from the Cairo Genizah.

<sup>104</sup> See Wilhelm Nebe, "Vom Umgang mit den Photo- und Konkordanztext-Veröffentlichungen der Handschriften vom Toten Meer," *Judaica* 50 (1994): 83-86, and the series "Qumranica. Zu unveröffentlichten Handschriften aus Höhle 4 von Qumran," I. in *ZAW* 106 (1994): 307-22; II. in *ZAH* 10 (1997): 134-8; III. in *ZAH* 11 (1998): 205-9; IV. in *ZAH* 12 (1999): 96-103; V. in *ZAW* 111 (1999): 622-5. Note also the continuous bibliographical documentaion of the Dead Sea Scrolls in the *Zeitschrift für Althebräistik* (*ZAH*).

<sup>105</sup> Yochanan Thorion, "אדם ו אדם בן אדם in den Qumrantexten," *RevQ* 10 (1980): 305-8; "The Use of Prepositions in 1Q Serek," *RevQ* 10 (1981): 405-33; "Zur Bedeutung von גבורי חיל למלמה in 11QT LVII,9. Zur Bedeutung von חטא in 11QT," *RevQ* 10 (1981): 597-9; "Der Vergleich in 1Q Hodayot," *RevQ* 11 (1983): 193-217; "Die Sprache der Tempelrolle und die Chronikbücher," *RevQ* 11 (1983): 423-6; "Tempelrolle LIX,8-11 und Babli, Sanhedrin 98a," *RevQ* 11 (1983): 427-8; "Neue Bemerkungen über die Sprache der Qumran-Literatur," *RevQ* 11 (1984): 579-82; "Die Syntax der Präposition B in der Qumranliteratur," *RevQ* 12 (1985): 17-63; "Beiträge zur Erforschung der Sprache der Kupfer-Rolle," *RevQ* 12 (1986): 163-76. See also his dissertation, *The Complex Sentence in the Biblical Prose of the First Temple Period* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1976) (Hebrew), and his *Studien zur klassischen hebräischen Syntax* (Marburger Studien zur Afrika- und Asien Kunde 6; Berlin: Reimer, 1984). Talia Thorion-Varda, "A Note on 1Q Hodayot IX,5," *RevQ* 11 (1983): 429-430; "Die adversativen Konjunktionen in der Qumran-Literatur," *RevQ* 11 (1984): 571-7; "MWR' in Pešer Habaquq VI,5," *RevQ* 12 (1986): 282; "Noch zu K'S in 1QH IX,5," *RevQ* 12 (1986): 279-281; "The Personal Pronoun as Syntactical Glide in the Temple Scroll and in the Masoretic Text," *RevQ* 12 (1986): 421-2; "The Use of the Tense in the Zadokite Documents," *RevQ* 12 (1985): 65-88; "T nominative in the Qumran Literature?," *RevQ* 12 (1986): 423-4; see also *Ultraposition. Die getrennte Apposition in der alttestamentlichen Prosa* (Judentum und Umwelt 18; Frankfurt a.M.: Lang, 1987).

<sup>106</sup> See Ingo Kottsieper, "Zur Syntax von 1QS II 24f. und seiner Bedeutung in 1QS II 19-III 12," *RevQ* 21 (2003): 285-95; "11Q5 (11QP<sup>s</sup>) XIX: A Plea of Deliverance?" in

lively discussion on whether Hebrew was a spoken language in Hellenistic times, and concluded that it was not.<sup>107</sup>

*Hartmut Stegemann and the Method of Material Reconstruction*

On his regular trips to Israel from 1964, Hartmut Stegemann had the opportunity to meet Yigael Yadin. It was Yadin who immediately recognized Stegemann's gift for and profound interest in working with the original fragments of the Scrolls. As chairman of the Shrine of the Book at the Israel Museum, Yadin invited him to come to the museum at his own convenience and work on the fragments. First Stegemann studied the Dead Sea Scrolls in Jerusalem by himself, and later with his students. The method of material reconstruction, also known as the "Stegemann Method" or even "Hartmut's Magic" (coined by Carol Newsom), is a method for reconstructing damaged scrolls using the physical appearance of their respective fragments.<sup>108</sup> Since only about 1 percent of all the Qumran Scrolls have survived more or less intact, Stegemann saw the need to devise a method to reconstruct the original scrolls on objective grounds, namely on the material evidence. The application of his method helps in avoiding textual speculations, and fosters a grasp of the structure and meaning

---

García Martínez, Steudel and Tigchelaar, *From 4QMMT to Resurrection*, 125-50; "מאמר וברב ערב. Ein Beitrag zum hebräischen Lexikon und zum Verhältnis von CD zu 1QS," *RevQ* 95 (2010): 405-19; Hugo, Kottsieper and Steudel, "Notes paléographiques sur 4QSam<sup>a</sup> (4Q51)"; "Reflections on Epigraphy and Critical Editing." Ingo Kottsieper (1959-) is a linguist specialized in Semitic languages. He was a student of Otto Rössler at Marburg and wrote a Ph.D. dissertation on the language of the *Proverbs of Abiqar*. Now he is a co-worker of the Göttingen Qumran dictionary, where he also designed the database of the project; see above. He is one of the editors of the series *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments* (TUAT.NF). See also his own contributions there: Ingo Kottsieper, "Hebräische, aramäische und phönizische Texte," in Bernd Janowski and Gernot Wilhelm, eds., *Texte zum Rechts- und Wirtschaftsleben* (TUAT.NF 1; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2004), 249-94; "Nordwestsemitische Texte," in Bernd Janowski and Gernot Wilhelm, eds., *Staatsverträge, Herrscherinschriften und andere Dokumente zur politischen Geschichte* (TUAT.NF 2; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2005), 307-30; "Hebräische, transjordanische und aramäische Briefe," in Bernd Janowski and Gernot Wilhelm, eds., *Briefe* (TUAT.NF 3; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2006), 357-83.

<sup>107</sup> Ingo Kottsieper, "And They Did Not Care to Speak Yehudit.' On Linguistic Change in Judah during the Late Persian Era," in Oded Lipschitz, Gary N. Knoppers and Rainer Albertz, eds., *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 95-124.

<sup>108</sup> Stegemann described the method, for example, in his article, "Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments," in Lawrence H. Schiffman, ed., *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (JSPSup 8; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 189-220.

of texts in unexpected ways. Stegemann tried this method first in reconstructing *Hodayot* (1QH<sup>a</sup>) in his 1963 dissertation.<sup>109</sup> When Émile Puech independently reconstructed the *Hodayot* (1QH<sup>a</sup>) and obtained the same results, Stegemann was delighted, and saw this as proof of the soundness of his method.<sup>110</sup> In the following years, Stegemann continued to develop it, never failing to point out that it was not he who invented it but Józef Milik, who had applied it as early as 1955 in assembling the fragments of the *Rule of Blessings* (1QSb).<sup>111</sup> Besides the *Hodayot*, Stegemann was working on the material reconstructions of two other major Qumran compositions, cave 4 copies of the *Damascus Document* and *Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (4QMMT). He undertook the work on the cave 4 copies of the *Damascus Document* in the early 1990s in order to assist Joseph Baumgarten with his edition.<sup>112</sup> The job involved extremely complicated material, and he was unable to complete it in time for Baumgarten's publication in DJD XVIII (1996).<sup>113</sup> Later Stegemann described some aspects of his reconstruction, which are important especially for the sequence of passages in the middle part of the composition, for which there is no overlap in the Genizah copies.<sup>114</sup>

Stegemann began to work on the material reconstruction of 4QMMT long before its publication in DJD X (1994). In this volume, edited by John Strugnell and Elisha Qimron, Stegemann's arrangement of the text is mentioned briefly in an appendix. For material reasons, Strugnell preferred Stegemann's version of the text, which disagrees with the DJD text presented by Qimron.<sup>115</sup> The difference in arranging the fragments concerns the transition from the halakhic section (B) to the epilogue (C) of 4QMMT, and affects especially the understanding of part C. In March 2005 Stegemann studied the originals of the 4QMMT manuscripts in

<sup>109</sup> Hartmut Stegemann, *Rekonstruktion der Hodayot. Ursprüngliche Gestalt und kritisch bearbeiteter Text der Hymnenrolle aus Höhle 1 von Qumran* (Ph.D. diss.; Heidelberg 1963; unpublished). See also Hartmut Stegemann, "The Material Reconstruction of 1QHodayot," in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years*, 272-84.

<sup>110</sup> See Émile Puech, "Quelques aspects de la restauration du Rouleau des Hymnes (1QH)," *JJS* 39 (1988): 38-55.

<sup>111</sup> Józef T. Milik, "28b. Recueil des bénédictions," (DJD I; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 118-30.

<sup>112</sup> In cooperation with Alexander Maurer and Annette Steudel.

<sup>113</sup> Baumgarten, "Preface," *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document* (DJD XVIII), xiii.

<sup>114</sup> Hartmut Stegemann, "Towards Physical Reconstructions of the Qumran Damascus Document Scrolls," in Baumgarten, Chazon and Pinnick, *The Damascus Document. A Centennial of Discovery*, 177-200. The Göttingen *Qumranforschungsstelle*, which holds Stegemann's material, continues to work on the reconstruction of the 4QD manuscripts.

<sup>115</sup> See John Strugnell, "Appendix 3," in Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (DJD X; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 203-6 (205-6).



Jerusalem for the last time. He was able to draw his final conclusions, which he planned to publish in the *Revue de Qumrân* in 2006, accompanied by a new transcription of the text.<sup>116</sup>

As for the *Hodayot* (1QH<sup>a</sup>) text, Stegemann envisaged publishing his reconstruction from the 1960s. At first he intended to print his reworked dissertation on the *Hodayot* in collaboration with John Strugnell, who was working with the cave 4 copies of the *Hodayot* in his lot. When Strugnell submitted this material to Eileen Schuller for publication, Stegemann collaborated intensively with her in working on these manuscripts.<sup>117</sup> By then he was also engaged in a fruitful scholarly exchange on 1QHodayot with Puech, a connection that continued over the years. Stegemann was pleased to be able to incorporate *Hodayot* fragments put in place by Puech into his edition. Only lack of time prevented Stegemann and Puech from publishing the *Hodayot* edition together. Stegemann had also hoped to find more evidence on the beginning of 1QHodayot, which he expected to come from the scroll's handle-sheet, lost somewhere in the museum. With regard to some debated questions on the incipits of certain psalms in the *Hodayot*, he achieved important new results, which he presented at the Orion Conference in 2000.<sup>118</sup> In the early 2000s, a plan was drawn up to publish the Stegemann *Hodayot* in the DJD series, before it was terminated. Eileen Schuller promised to help Stegemann in preparing this edition but, as noted above, after his sudden death she had to do so alone.

### *Further Material Reconstructions*

From 1987 Stegemann began training a small but growing number of people in Göttingen, with a visit to Jerusalem every summer, in the application of the material reconstruction method.<sup>119</sup> He conducted this activity

<sup>116</sup> Reinhard Kratz, who worked with him on 4QMMT in March 2005, might publish Stegemann's MMT text. See Reinhard Kratz, "Mose und die Propheten. Zur Interpretation von 4QMMT C," in García Martínez, Tigchelaar and Steudel, *From 4QMMT to Resurrection*, 151-76, and "The Place which He has Chosen.' The Identification of the Cult Place of Deut. 12 and Lev. 17 in 4QMMT," in Bar-Asher and Tov, *A Festschrift for Devorah Dimant, Meghillot 5-6* (2007): \*57-\*80.

<sup>117</sup> See Schuller, "Hodayot" (DJD XXIX); see above.

<sup>118</sup> Hartmut Stegemann, "The Number of Psalms in 1QHodayot<sup>a</sup> and Some of Their Sections," in Chazon, *Liturgical Perspectives*, 191-234.

<sup>119</sup> See Annette Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschata.b). Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994). A "Qumran Day" has been



together with Annette Steudel, his doctoral student at the time, who was working on a material reconstruction of 4Q174, and later also of 4Q177. Sarianna Metso came to Göttingen and wrote parts of her dissertation on the material reconstruction of the cave 4 Community Rule copies.<sup>120</sup> As members of the Göttingen team, Roman Vielhauer, Eva Jain and Dirk Stoll worked on reconstructions of the *Pesher of Hosea*, 1QIsa<sup>b</sup> and the *Pesher of Nahum*; Jonathan Norton came from overseas and studied the material aspects of 11Q14 and 4Q285.<sup>121</sup>

Discussions of this methodology were published,<sup>122</sup> and a number of projects came into being such as a reconstruction of 4Q416-4Q418,<sup>123</sup> a reconstruction of 4Q510 and 4Q511,<sup>124</sup> a reconstruction of the numerous Psalms manuscripts from the Dead Sea,<sup>125</sup> and a reconstruction of

---

held regularly in Göttingen (Berndt Schaller participated in this as well) with Qumran students first from Göttingen, Hamburg (Uwe Gleßmer) and Leipzig (Matthias Albani), and later from abroad (Bilhah Nitzan was the first). This tradition still goes on today, albeit in a slightly different form.

<sup>120</sup> Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*.

<sup>121</sup> Roman Vielhauer, "Materielle Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der beiden Pescharim zum Hoseabuch (4QpHos<sup>a</sup> und 4QpHos<sup>b</sup>)," *RevQ* 20 (2002): 39-91; Eva Jain, "Die materielle Rekonstruktion von 1QJes<sup>b</sup> (1Q18) und einige bisher nicht edierte Fragmente dieser Handschrift," *RevQ* 20 (2002): 389-409; Dirk Stoll, "Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer - mathematisch oder Wie kann man einer Rekonstruktion Gestalt verleihen?" in Heinz-Josef Fabry, ed., *Qumranstudien. Vorträge und Beiträge der Teilnehmer des Qumranseminars auf dem internationalen Treffen der Society of Biblical Literature, Münster 25.-26. Juli 1993. Hans-Peter Müller zum 60. Geburtstag* (Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 205-18; Jonathan Norton, "Observations on the Official Material Reconstructions of Sefer Ha-Milhamah (11Q14 and 4Q285)," *RevQ* 21 (2003): 3-27.

<sup>122</sup> Annette Steudel, "Assembling and Reconstructing Manuscripts," in Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years. A Comprehensive Assessment* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1:516-34; "Probleme und Methoden der Rekonstruktion von Schriftrollen," in Michael Fieger, Konrad Schmid and Peter Schwagmeier, eds., *Qumran - Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer, Vorträge des St. Galler Qumran-Symposiums vom 2./3. Juli 1999* (NTOA 47; Göttingen: 2001), 97-109; Stoll, "Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer," 205-18.

<sup>123</sup> On 4QD and 4QMMT see above. Preliminary results by Birgit Lucassen (Bredereke) and Annette Steudel are included in John Strugnell and Daniel Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV: Sapiential Texts. Part 2: 4QInstruction* (DJD XXXIV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), as well as in Eibert Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones. Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44; Leiden: Brill, 2001). In recent years Mika Payunen from Helsinki has taught himself the method of material reconstruction. He is working on a reconstruction of 4Q381.

<sup>124</sup> By Alexander Maurer, who had also tried a material reconstruction of 11QNew Jerusalem. He left university to become a pastor, so both reconstructions remain unfinished.

<sup>125</sup> Dissertation project of Eva Jain. See meanwhile the most recent studies from Switzerland on the Psalms from Qumran: Christoph Gasser, *Apokryphe Psalmen aus Qumran: ihr Beitrag zur Frage nach dem Kanon* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag Zurich, 2010); Mat-

4Q491.<sup>126</sup> A doctoral dissertation on the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifices* will consider aspects of material reconstruction.<sup>127</sup>

At present, a group of able young assistants at the *Qumranforschungsstelle* in Göttingen is working on several specific problems of scroll reconstruction. In the past years they were able to establish whether the surviving fragments of 4Q522 should be placed at the beginning or the end of the original scroll.<sup>128</sup>

In the future, material reconstruction will probably provide solutions for specific problems rather than reconstruct whole manuscripts. Such material work is time-consuming, and at the beginning it is not always clear whether a reconstruction will work.<sup>129</sup> But the Göttingen *Qumranforschungsstelle* is prepared to support attempts at material reconstruction by teaching the proper application of the method.<sup>130</sup> Apart from the inevitable consultation of the originals in the museum, the microfiche edition helps a lot in reconstructing manuscripts, also of course any photograph in electronic form. Thus, projects to digitize the microfiche edition, which is especially valuable for the older sets of photographs, plus projects which would re-photograph the originals (ideally also from the back) and put them on the internet, as intended presently by the Israel Antiquities Authority, are highly recommendable.

### *Archaeology*

In earlier as in recent decades of Qumran research, most German-speaking Qumran scholars have accepted the classical hypothesis about the ruins of Qumran and their relation to the Scrolls in the nearby caves. Except for the

---

tias Brütsch, *Israels Psalmen in Qumran: eine textarchäologischer Beitrag zur Entstehung des Psalters* (BWANT 193; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2010).

<sup>126</sup> By Roman Vielhauer and Peter Porzig (reconstruction in progress).

<sup>127</sup> By René Enzenauer (dissertation in progress). Hartmut Stegemann suggested a material reconstruction of this earlier.

<sup>128</sup> Their results will be published in the *Revue de Qumran*. On 4Q522 (*Prophecy of Joshua*, 4QapocrJosh?) and the problem of the placement in the scroll of its scattered fragments, see Émile Puech, *Qumran Cave 4.XVIII: Textes hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)* (DJD XXV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 39–74; Devorah Dimant, “The Apocryphon of Joshua-4Q522 9 ii: A Reappraisal,” in Paul et al., *Emanuel*, 179–204.

<sup>129</sup> Yet even an unsuccessful attempt at reconstruction is valuable. Such attempts and the reasons for their failure should be communicated; they might be helpful in future reconstruction efforts.

<sup>130</sup> This prevents misunderstandings and wasting of time.

dissenting voice of Karl-Heinrich Rengstorff,<sup>131</sup> it is usually agreed that the Qumran settlement was inhabited by the Essenes, who owned the scrolls found in the caves. Yet Hartmut Stegemann, followed by the majority of German-speaking Qumran scholars, saw Qumran as only one of many Essene settlements.<sup>132</sup> German-speaking Qumran scholarship has also been of the opinion that only some of the Scrolls were written at Qumran.<sup>133</sup> Furthermore, on the basis of internal evidence<sup>134</sup> Stegemann and others did not deem the members of the Qumran movement ascetics or secluded from the external world, as Hirschfeld and Zangenberg seem to have assumed in criticizing the classical Essene hypothesis.<sup>135</sup> Stegemann's later idea, namely that Qumran functioned as a kind of publishing house as well as a center for studies,<sup>136</sup> added a nuance of its own.<sup>137</sup> A conference held at the Katholische Akademie in Schwerte (Germany) brought together German-speaking scholars and permitted various opinions to be voiced, for example, those of Heinz-Josef Fabry<sup>138</sup> and Jürgen Zangenberg.<sup>139</sup>

<sup>131</sup> Karl-Heinrich Rengstorff, *Hirbet Qumran und die Bibliothek vom Toten Meer* (Leiden: Brill, 1960).

<sup>132</sup> The ancient historiographers and 4QMMT have been interpreted in this direction.

<sup>133</sup> This is clear on account of manuscripts that are paleographically earlier than the settlement.

<sup>134</sup> On criteria for relevant internal texts see Charlotte Hempel, "Kriterien zur Bestimmung essenischer Verfasserschaft von Qumrantexten," in Jörg Frey and Hartmut Stegemann, eds., *Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer* (Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 71-85, and Armin Lange in the same volume, 59-69. On the classification of Qumran texts, see especially Devorah Dimant, "The Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts," in Jörg Frey, Carsten Claußen and Nadine Kessler, eds., *Qumran und die Archäologie* (WUNT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011; forthcoming), but also her earlier contributions "Qumran Sectarian Literature," in Michael E. Stone, ed., *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 483-550; "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," in Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman, eds., *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness* (STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23-58. The wilderness in 1QS VIII, 13-14 is interpreted by Stegemann and others as an "inner" emigration, so to speak, and not as a physical move to a location remote from the rest of the world. It is not identified with the Qumran settlement. For a similar interpretation offered by Devorah Dimant, see her chapter on Israeli scholarship in this volume.

<sup>135</sup> The German version of Hirschfeld's book is Yizhar Hirschfeld, *Qumran - die ganze Wahrheit. Die Funde der Archäologie neu bewertet* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag-Haus, 2006). And see e.g. Jürgen Zangenberg, "Region oder Religion? Überlegungen zum interpretatorischen Kontext von Chirbet Qumran," in Max Küchler and Karl Matthias Schmidt, eds., *Texte - Fakten - Artefakte. Beiträge zur Bedeutung der Archäologie für die neutestamentliche Forschung* (NTOA/SUNT 59; Fribourg-Göttingen: Academic Press-Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 25-67.

<sup>136</sup> Stegemann, *Die Essener*.

<sup>137</sup> But see the methodological considerations of Ferdinand Rohrhirsch, *Wissenschaftstheorie und Qumran* (Fribourg: Universitätsverlag, 1996).

<sup>138</sup> See e.g. Heinz-Josef Fabry, "Archäologie und Text. Versuch einer Verhältnisbestimmung am Beispiel von Chirbet Qumran," in Max Küchler and Karl Matthias Schmidt,

Since 1998 the anthropologist Olav Röhrer-Ertl (Munich) has contributed to the question of the Qumran cemeteries, much debated at the time. According to his scientific analyses of the Qumran skeletal remains in the Kurth collection, there could have been more tombs of women in the Qumran cemetery than assumed by Roland de Vaux.<sup>140</sup>

Alexander Schick, a former student of Hunzinger, established an exhibition on Qumran for the wider public.<sup>141</sup> He collaborated with Weston Fields in research on the history of Qumran Scrolls, and assembled a rare archive of photographs on the subject. Together with Uwe Gleßmer he published a general book on Qumran.<sup>142</sup>

### *Approaches to the History of the Qumran Community*

For decades the historical approach to Qumran has dominated the understanding of the texts, both in German-speaking and other countries. Sev-

---

eds., *Texte - Fakten - Artefakte. Beiträge zur Bedeutung der Archäologie für die neutestamentliche Forschung* (NTOA/SUNT 59; Fribourg-Göttingen: Academic Press-Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 69-101. Max Küchler (Fribourg, Switzerland) is also editor of the series *Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus. Series Archaeologica* (NTOA.SA, Fribourg); see its first volumes by Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Alain Chambon, eds., *Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân et de Ain Feshkha I* (NTOA.SA 1; Fribourg-Göttingen: Academic Press-Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994); *The Excavations of Khirbet Qumran and Ain Feshka* (NTOA.SA 1B; Fribourg-Göttingen: Academic Press-Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003); Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Jan Gunneweg, eds., *Khirbet Qumrân et Ain Feshkha II* (NTOA.SA 3; Fribourg-Göttingen: Academic Press-Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004). Max Küchler wrote the introduction to James C. Vanderkam's *Einführung in die Qumranforschung. Geschichte und Bedeutung der Schriften vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 9-16.

<sup>139</sup> See Frey, Claußen and Kessler, *Qumran und die Archäologie*. Both sides have at times mixed up internal evidence (scrolls) and external evidence (mainly Philo, Josephus, and Pliny the Elder). A critical study of Josephus' reports on the Essenes was published by the German scholar Roland Bergmeier, *Die Essener-Berichte des Flavius Josephus. Quellenstudien zu den Essenertexten im Werk des jüdischen Historiographen* (Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1993).

<sup>140</sup> See e.g. Olav Röhrer-Ertl, "Facts and Results Based on Skeletal Remains from Qumran Found in the 'Collectio Kurth': A Study in Methodology," in Katharina Galor, Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Jürgen Zangenberg, eds., *The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates. Proceedings of the Conference Held at Brown University, November 17-19, 2002* (STDJ 57; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 181-93.

<sup>141</sup> The exhibition is entitled "Qumran- und Bibel-Ausstellung Sylt." Sylt is a small German island in the North Sea. Alexander Schick lends his exhibition to interested churches, communities, and museums, and hence it is well known in the German-speaking world.

<sup>142</sup> Uwe Gleßmer and Alexander Schick, *Die Schriftrollen vom Toten, das Alte Testament und der geheime Bibelcode* (Wuppertal-Kassel: Oncken, 2000). See <http://www.bibelausstellung.de>.

eral major aspects of the historical reconstruction related to Qumran were forged in the context of Kuhn's *Qumranforschungsstelle*. Thus, several figures mentioned only by epithets in the Scrolls, especially in the *Pesharim* biblical commentaries, were variously identified with historical personalities. Gert Jeremias introduced the idea that the Teacher of Righteousness was a former high priest.<sup>143</sup> In his unpublished but well-known dissertation, Hartmut Stegemann identified the opponent of the Qumran group, the Wicked Priest, with the Hasmonean Jonathan; the Lion of Wrath mentioned in the *Pesher of Nahum* with Alexander Jannaeus; and the Seekers of Smooth Things, along with their leader the Man of Lies, with the Pharisees.<sup>144</sup> Jeremias based his analysis mainly on the *Hodayot*, where he distinguished autobiographical poems composed by the Teacher from poems recited by the community. He attributed the more individual poems to the so-called Teacher of Righteousness, known from the *Pesharim* and the *Damascus Document*. For Stegemann, the *Pesharim* were the main source of his identifications. 4QMMT, then still unpublished yet already known to Stegemann, seemed to support this view, especially in combination with 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> IV, 8-9: its addressee must have been the High Priest Jonathan.<sup>145</sup>

<sup>143</sup> Gert Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963).

<sup>144</sup> Hartmut Stegemann, *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde* (Ph.D. diss.; Bonn, 1971). He had planned to write further chapters for the final publication of his dissertation (see his "Geleitwort"), one of them on the early history of the Pharisees and Sadducees. (The history of the Essenes [meaning the Qumran community] is treated in the existing chapters.) Not being able to do so, he was very pleased with the fine, methodical book by Günter Stemberger, *Pharisäer, Sadduzäer und Essener* (SBS 144; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1991).

<sup>145</sup> See e.g. Stegemann, *Die Essener*; "Die Weisung des Lehrers an Jonathan," 148-51. Interestingly, although there are some publications by scholars in German-speaking countries on 4QMMT, the laws in CD, and of course that of Johann Maier on the *Temple Scroll*, no one specializes in Halakhah at Qumran apart from Lutz Doering (at present in Durham, UK), a former student of Berndt Schaller (Göttingen). Lutz Doering mainly worked on the Sabbath law, and formulated some methodological considerations: see e.g. *Schabbat: Sabbathalacha und -praxis im antiken Judentum und Urchristentum* (TSAJ 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999); "Überlegungen zum Ansatz der Halacha in den Qumran," in Frey and Stegemann, *Qumran kontrovers*, 89-113; "Parallels without 'Parallelomania': Methodological Reflections on Comparative Analysis of Halakhah in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Steven D. Fraade, Aharon Shemesh and Ruth A. Clements, eds., *Rabbinic Perspectives: Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 7-9 January, 2003* (STDJ 62; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 13-42; "Purity and Impurity in the Book of Jubilees," in Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba, eds., *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 261-75; "Marriage and Creation in Mark 10 and CD 4-5," in Florentino García Martínez, ed., *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament* (STDJ 85; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 133-64.

Taking the 390 years and the 20 years in the *Damascus Document*<sup>146</sup> as historical data would yield a time frame lasting from the community's predecessors around 172 BCE, through the expulsion of the Teacher of Righteousness by the High Priest Jonathan in 152 BCE, to the death of the Teacher of Righteousness at about the end of the second century BCE.<sup>147</sup> This conclusion has remained valid even though other theories on the history of the Qumran community have been advanced, such as the so-called "Groningen Hypothesis" or the suggested Sadducee background of the Qumran halakhah.<sup>148</sup>

In the past few years there has been a shift, at least at the Göttingen *Qumranforschungsstelle*, to a more literary rather than historical approach to the texts.<sup>149</sup> Different reasons might have concatenated for this to happen. This shift is partly influenced by the study of the literary development of the *Community Rule* and by the change in the study of the Scrolls from a New Testament to an Old Testament orientation.<sup>150</sup> The *Community Rule* copies attest to a reworking process, a feature already observable in the Hebrew Bible.<sup>151</sup> This promotes a view of the literary development of other Qumran texts, and of their literary history as a whole.<sup>152</sup> The analysis of the literary growth of the texts would thus precede their historical inter-

<sup>146</sup> See CD I, 5-11.

<sup>147</sup> Johann Maier preferred a scenario 20 years earlier, which better fits the calculation of the 390 years after Nebuchadnezzar; see e.g. his vol. 3. On time calculations, see recently also Christoph Berner, *Jahre, Jahrwochen und Jubiläen. Heptadische Geschichtskonzepte im Antiken Judentum* (BZAW 363; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007); "Jubilees and Beyond? Some Observations on the Chronological Structure of the Book of Jubilees," *Hen* 31 (2009): 17-23.

<sup>148</sup> On the Groningen Hypothesis, see Eibert Tigchelaar's article in this volume. On the Sadducean background of the halakhah see the articles by Alex Jassen and Aharon Shemesh in this volume.

<sup>149</sup> See e.g. Reinhard Kratz, "Innerbiblische Exegese und Redaktionsgeschichte im Lichte empirischer Evidenz," in Manfred Oeming, Konrad Schmid and Michael Welker, eds., *Das Alte Testament und die Kultur der Moderne. Beiträge des Symposiums "Das Alte Testament und die Kultur der Moderne" anlässlich des 100. Geburtstags Gerhard von Rads (1901-1971) Heidelberg, 18.-21. Oktober 2001* (Altes Testament und Moderne 11; Münster: Lit, 2004), 37-69 (also in his *Das Judentum im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels* [FAT 42; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004]); "Abraham, mein Freund. Das Verhältnis von inner- und außerbiblischer Schriftauslegung," in Anselm C. Hagedorn and H. Pfeiffer, eds., *Die Erzwäter in der biblischen Tradition (Festschrift M. Köckert)* (BZAW 400; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 115-36.

<sup>150</sup> In Göttingen this was brought about with the change from Hartmut Stegemann to Reinhard Kratz. Hartmut Stegemann himself was extremely open to studying the Qumran Scrolls in the context of the Old Testament.

<sup>151</sup> See e.g. Kratz, "Innerbiblische Exegese."

<sup>152</sup> See the exemplarily study by Reinhard Kratz, "Der *Penal Code* und das Verhältnis von *Serekh ha-Yachad* (S) und Damaskusschrift (D)," *RevQ* (forthcoming). For a step in this direction, see also Annette Steudel, "Dating Exegetical Texts from Qumran," in Dimant and Kratz, *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis*, 39-53.

pretation. Regarding the Teacher of Righteousness, it is still too early to reach a final conclusion, but this figure seems to enter the Qumran texts at a later stage.<sup>153</sup> This does not mean that he was fictional, but that he perhaps acquired his later authority only in the literary formulation of the community's identity. Roman Vielhauer's study has recently shown that the interpretation of the book of Hosea at Qumran is linked to the subsequent process of reworking of the biblical prophecies themselves. This feature may be probed in other Qumran texts as well.<sup>154</sup> The shifting emphasis from a historical to a literary perspective in the study of the Scrolls may not change significantly our view of the community's history but it may become more nuanced in part and even more colorful.

---

<sup>153</sup> This deserves further investigation. The analysis assumes that the Teacher passages in CD and in the *Pesharim* are younger than the *Community Rule*. See the article by Kratz, "Der Penal Code" for a step towards proving that the literary relation of S and D might have gone in this direction, as Stegemann and many others in the German-speaking countries assumed early on.

<sup>154</sup> See Roman Vielhauer, *Das Werden des Buches Hosea. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (BZAW 349; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007). Processes like this have also been studied in a project on the reception of the book of Genesis at Qumran, directed by Devorah Dimant (Haifa) together with Reinhard Kratz (Göttingen). For the first conference volume, see Dimant and Kratz, *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis*.





## QUMRAN RESEARCH IN ITALY

CORRADO MARTONE

Italian scholars did not participate actively in the publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls either in the initial pioneering phase or in the next phase starting in the 1990s. However, many Italian scholars have made important contributions to a better understanding of many facets of this literature and its historical context. Several significant studies devoted to these issues have been published since the early years of the discoveries.

It is a little-known fact that the very first edition of Józef Milik's seminal volume *Dix ans de decouverts dans le Désert de Juda* was first published in Italian, with an Introduction by the late Giovanni Rinaldi.<sup>1</sup> There Rinaldi writes that the book was written at his invitation, for he was well aware of the importance of the Dead Sea findings and of Milik's scholarly skills.<sup>2</sup>

Two brief notes on the Scrolls were published by the Bible and Semitics scholar Umberto (David Moses) Cassuto in 1950.<sup>3</sup> Sadly Cassuto died in 1951 and could not pursue his study of the Scrolls. A short article by him on matters related to them was published posthumously in 1961.<sup>4</sup>

### *General Introductions and Text-Editions*

The first general Italian introduction to the Dead Sea Scrolls was published by Sabatino Moscati in 1955.<sup>5</sup> In this lucid, substantial and cogent work

<sup>1</sup> Józef T. Milik, *Dieci anni di scoperte nel Deserto di Giuda* (Turin: Marietti, 1957).

<sup>2</sup> Rinaldi himself published an important study on the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa) with the first Italian translation of this text. Giovanni Rinaldi, "L'ultimo periodo' della storia: Considerazioni sulla Regola a (1QSa) di Qumran," *BeO* 7 (1965): 161-85.

<sup>3</sup> Umberto Cassuto, "Gli antichi manoscritti ebraici testé scoperti in Palestina," *Accademia nazionale dei Lincei: Rendiconti della classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, Serie VIII*, 5 (1950): 18-21; "Saggi degli antichi Salmi testé scoperti nei pressi di Gerico," *RasIsr* 16 (1950): 54-57. On Cassuto, see now Robert Bonfil, ed., *Umberto (Moshe David) Cassuto* (Jerusalem: Magnes/Kedem, 2007), especially the contributions by Alexander Rofé, "Cassuto biblista: Il suo programma nel 1939 in uno sguardo dal 2002," 56-72 (Hebrew), and by Ida Zatelli, "Umberto Moše Dawid Cassuto e la cattedra fiorentina di lingua ebraica," 43-56. See also Alexander Rofé, "Moshe David Cassuto: The Impressions of the Youngest of His Students," *Beit Migra* 30 (1985): 234-41 (Hebrew).

<sup>4</sup> Umberto Cassuto, "Letteratura Ebraica antica," *RasIsr* 27 (1961): 480-528 (492-4).

<sup>5</sup> Sabatino Moscati, *I Manoscritti Ebraici del Deserto di Giuda* (Rome: Istituto per

Moscato covers the history of the findings, the texts, and the main features of the Qumran community. As for the identity of the sect, Moscato summarizes some hypotheses put forward at the time and cautiously concludes that while the most likely identification of the Scrolls is Essene, new elements may present fresh perspectives.

Another important introduction is contained in the volume *I manoscritti di Qumran*, Italian translations of the Scrolls published by Luigi Moraldi.<sup>6</sup> This is a detailed survey of the Scrolls in terms of both the history of the group who possessed this literature and the theology of the writings. Also included is an annotated Italian translation of all the classical sources on the Essenes, a small monograph in itself.

Some 25 years later Jan Alberto Soggin published another important general introduction to the Scrolls.<sup>7</sup> The book is divided into two sections, preceded by a brief preface by Sabatino Moscato. The first section is devoted to the history of Second Temple Judaism, the second to its main religious ideas. Both sections apply masterly treatment to all the data then available and present, in addition to a general, informative introduction, several original observations. Soggin was a renowned historian of ancient Israel, and his *History of Israel* is well known to the English-speaking public.<sup>8</sup> The main value of this introduction is in its careful and detailed reconstruction of the origins and development of the Qumran group. The book was painstakingly updated, and reprinted in 1993. The well-balanced appendix relates to the debates on the Scrolls which galvanized the scholarly world in the 1990s.

The first Italian translation of a fair number of Qumran texts was by Franco Michellini Tocci in 1967.<sup>9</sup> The texts are grouped by literary genre: rules, liturgical texts, exegetical works and apocalyptic writings. The volume concludes with a chapter on miscellaneous works, such as the so-called

---

l'Oriente, 1955). Sabatino Moscato (1922-1997) was Professor of Semitic Philology at the University of Rome. He was a well-known archaeologist and linguist and worked on Phoenician and Punic civilizations.

<sup>6</sup> Luigi Moraldi, *I Manoscritti Di Qumran* (Turin: UTET, 1971). Luigi Moraldi (1915-2001) was Professor of Semitic Philology at the University of Pavia. He mainly worked on Qumran, the Nag Hammadi texts and Josephus.

<sup>7</sup> Jan Alberto Soggin, *I Manoscritti del Mar Morto* (Rome: Newton Compton, 1978). Jan Alberto Soggin (1926-2010) was Professor of Hebrew Language and Literature at the University of Rome.

<sup>8</sup> Jan Alberto Soggin, *An Introduction to the History of Israel and Judah* (2d ed.; London: SCM Press, 1993).

<sup>9</sup> Franco Michellini Tocci, *I Manoscritti del Mar Morto* (Bari: Laterza, 1967). Franco Michellini Tocci was formerly Professor of History of Religions at the University "Ca' Foscari" of Venice.

*Horoscopes*, the *Wiles of the Wicked Woman* and the *Copper Scroll*. The great merit of this book at the time was its provision of the first translation of most of the Qumran texts for the Italian public. However, the translations and interpretations offered by the volume are at times speculative as they reflect the translator's untenable theory that these texts contain esoteric doctrines.

For many years the standard Italian translation of the Qumran texts was the aforementioned *I Manoscritti di Qumran* by Moraldi.<sup>10</sup> The first edition of this volume dates back to 1971. As noted, it also contains a valuable introduction. The translations are literal and precise and the author makes good use of the most updated studies on each text, to provide a detailed and painstaking commentary that resolves (or attempts to resolve) the many obscurities and problems of these ancient documents. The volume has been often reprinted, and in each reprint Moraldi took account of newly published texts and studies. Of special note is the 1986 edition, which contains the *Targum of Job* and the *Temple Scroll*, both masterfully translated and annotated by Moraldi's pupil Elio Jucci. This volume too groups the texts according to their literary genre: rules, hymns, biblical commentaries and miscellaneous texts.

An Italian translation of the Spanish volume *Textos de Qumrán* by Florentino García Martínez appeared in 1996.<sup>11</sup> The translator, Corrado Martone,<sup>12</sup> followed the original in presenting the documents by genre: rules, halakhic texts, literature with eschatological content, exegetical literature, parabiblical literature, poetic texts, liturgical texts, astronomical texts, calendars and horoscopes. A special section is devoted to the *Copper Scroll*. The volume concludes with an updated list of manuscripts from Qumran, with references to the *editio princeps* of each text and a brief description of its content. Taking the original translations as guidelines for readings and restorations of problematic fragments, Martone nevertheless furnishes additional independent research. He translated the texts from their original languages and added notes, in which he indicates the paleographic dating of each fragment, identifies biblical allusions and parallels in other Qumran texts, and provides references and illuminating annotations. This volume,

<sup>10</sup> L. Moraldi, *I Manoscritti di Qumran*.

<sup>11</sup> Florentino García Martínez, *Testi di Qumran* (trans. C. Martone; Brescia: Paideia, 1996).

<sup>12</sup> Corrado Martone (1963-) teaches Jewish history and Hebrew language and literature at the University of Turin. His work is focused on Qumran texts and Second Temple Judaism.

though less copiously annotated than Moraldi's *Manoscritti di Qumran*, remains the most complete collection of Qumran texts in Italian translation.

### *Qumran Biblical Texts*

The importance of the Qumran documents for the study of the history and development of the biblical text is well known. In Eugene Ulrich's words, "[t]he more than two hundred biblical manuscripts discovered in the Judaean Desert fifty years ago have revolutionized our understanding of the Bible and the text of the Scriptures in antiquity."<sup>13</sup> Several Italian scholars have contributed to the ongoing study of the biblical manuscripts from Qumran.

As early as 1965 Paolo Sacchi<sup>14</sup> published an important and innovative study on the *Great Isaiah Scroll* from cave 1 (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>),<sup>15</sup> in which the manuscript's variant readings were critically analyzed and evaluated along the lines of the classical philology. Sacchi, a pupil of Giorgio Pasquali,<sup>16</sup> argues that the rules of classical philology are valid not for Greek and Latin texts alone but are universal.<sup>17</sup> With his study of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> Sacchi opened the way for this type of approach to the biblical text in Italy.<sup>18</sup> For a long time Sacchi's work was not properly known outside Italy. In his seminal 1982 article Emanuel Tov states that "a methodology [to ascertain the affiliation of the various sources of the biblical text] has not yet been established."<sup>19</sup> However, in his contribution to the Qumran Congress in Madrid in 1992 Bruno Chiesa drew attention to Sacchi's pioneer work and stressed that a

<sup>13</sup> Eugene Ulrich, "The Scrolls and the Study of the Hebrew Bible," in Kugler and Schuller, *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty*, 31-41 (31).

<sup>14</sup> Paolo Sacchi (1930-) was Professor of Biblical Philology at the University of Turin until his retirement in 1999. He teaches intertestamental literature at the Faculty of Theology of Central Italy, Florence. In 1979 Sacchi founded the Journal *Henoch*.

<sup>15</sup> Paolo Sacchi, "Il Rotolo A di Isaia: Problemi di storia del testo," *Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere 'La Colombaria'* 30 (1965): 31-111.

<sup>16</sup> Giorgio Pasquali (1885-1952) was a prominent Italian classical scholar. He taught Greek and Latin literature at several Italian universities. Especially important are his innovative views on textual criticism.

<sup>17</sup> Following his teacher's views. See Giorgio Pasquali, preface to *Critica del Testo*, by Paul Maas (Italian trans. Nello Martinelli; Florence: Le Monnier, 1984), V.

<sup>18</sup> A number of Sacchi's pupils have produced major studies along these lines. See Bruno Chiesa, *L'Antico Testamento Ebraico secondo la tradizione 'palestinese'* (Turin: Bottega d'Erasmus, 1978); Pier Giorgio Borbone, *Il libro del profeta Osea: Edizione critica del testo ebraico* (Turin: Zamorani, 1990); Gianfranco Miletto, *L'Antico Testamento ebraico nella tradizione 'babilonese': I frammenti della Genizah* (Turin: Zamorani, 1992).

<sup>19</sup> Emanuel Tov, "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls," *HUCA* 53 (1982): 11-27 (20).

methodology “does exist.” He upheld Sacchi’s principle that “one must start from an analysis of the corrupted passages. . . not from a scrutiny of the variant readings.”<sup>20</sup> Chiesa has devoted several important studies to the history of the biblical text as well as to its interpretations over the centuries.<sup>21</sup>

Applying philological methodology to the biblical text, and taking the Qumran evidence into account, Alessandro Catastini has produced a number of studies.<sup>22</sup> Among them, his critical edition of Nehemiah is to be published as part of the Oxford Hebrew Bible project. This project intends to publish a new critical edition of the Hebrew Bible, different from other major textual editions (the *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* and the Hebrew University Bible project).<sup>23</sup> The participation of Italian scholars in this project<sup>24</sup> signifies that the approach to the biblical text developed in Italy is gaining ground abroad.<sup>25</sup>

As a working tool in this field, in 2001 Corrado Martone published an index of the biblical manuscripts from the Judean desert.<sup>26</sup> It lists all the biblical verses attested in biblical manuscripts found there (Masada, Wadi

<sup>20</sup> Bruno Chiesa, “Textual History and Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Old Testament,” in Trebelle Barrera and Vegas Montaner, *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 1:257-72 (2006). Bruno Chiesa (1949-) is Professor of Hebrew Language and Literature at the University of Turin. He has written numerous studies on biblical textual criticism and Judeo-Arabic literature.

<sup>21</sup> See, e.g., Bruno Chiesa, “Il testo dell’Antico Testamento: Rassegna di studi,” *Hen* 15 (1993): 299-324; “Il testo dell’Antico Testamento: Rassegna di studi,” *Hen* 6 (1984): 313-46; “Appunti di storia della critica del testo dell’Antico Testamento ebraico,” *Hen* 12 (1990): 3-14; “Il testo dell’Antico Testamento: Rassegna di studi,” *Hen* 3 (1981): 25-72; “Il testo dell’Antico Testamento: Rassegna di studi,” *Hen* 4 (1982): 225-40. “Il testo dell’Antico Testamento: Rassegna di studi,” *Hen* 5 (1983): 257-67; “Il testo dell’Antico Testamento: Rassegna di studi,” *Hen* 7 (1985): 343 - 68; “Il Testo dell’Antico Testamento: Rassegna di studi,” *Hen* 9 (1987): 353-87. His studies are now assembled in a two-volume edition. See Bruno Chiesa, *Filologia storica della Bibbia ebraica*. Vol. 1: *Da Origene al Medioevo* (Brescia: Paideia, 2000); Vol 2: *Dall’età moderna ai giorni nostri* (Brescia: Paideia, 2002).

<sup>22</sup> See, e.g., Alessandro Catastini, “Su alcune varianti qumraniche nel testo di Samuele,” *Hen* 2 (1980): 267-84; “4Q Sam<sup>a</sup>: I. Samuele il ‘Nazireo,’” *Hen* 9 (1987): 161-95; “4QSam<sup>a</sup>: II. Nahash il ‘Serpente,’” *Hen* 10 (1988): 17-49; *Isaia ed Ezechia: Studio di storia della tradizione di 2. Re 18-20, Is. 36-39* (Rome: Università degli studi La Sapienza, 1989); “Da Qumran al testo masoretico dell’Antico Testamento: Spunti metodologici per la valutazione delle varianti,” *RevQ* 15 (1991): 303-13; *Storia di Giuseppe: Genesi 37-50* (Venice: Marsilio 1994). Alessandro Catastini is Professor of Hebrew Language and Literature at the University of Rome. He researches the history of the text of the Hebrew Bible.

<sup>23</sup> See the remarks of the editor-in-chief Ron Hendel at the Oxford Hebrew Bible website, n.p. [cited 16 December 2010]. Online: ohb.berkeley.edu.

<sup>24</sup> Bruno Chiesa is on the project’s advisory board, Alessandro Catastini edits the book of Nehemiah, Pier Giorgio Borbone edits Hosea, and Corrado Martone edits Ezra.

<sup>25</sup> Pier Giorgio Borbone, “Prospettive recenti di ecdotica biblica: L’edizione ‘Quinta’ dell’Antico Testamento ebraico e il progetto ‘Oxford Hebrew Bible,’” *Materia Giudaica* 6 (2001): 28-35.

<sup>26</sup> Corrado Martone, *The Judaean Desert Bible: An Index* (Turin: Zamorani, 2001).

Murabba'at, Wadi Sdeir, Naḥal Ḥever, Naḥal Ṣe'elim), including Qumran. The volume is equipped with references to the first editions of the quoted manuscripts and short palaeographic descriptions. Also, in several studies Martone has compared Qumran biblical manuscripts with the Septuagint readings.<sup>27</sup>

As mentioned above, no Italian scholar took an active role in the preparation of first editions of the Scrolls. Nevertheless, several subsequent editions of the main Qumran texts were published by Italian scholars and appeared as early as the 1950s. Pietro Boccaccio and Guido Berardi published annotated editions of the major manuscripts found in cave 1: the *Community Rule* (1QS), the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa), the *War Scroll* (1QM) and the *Pesher of Habakkuk* (1QpHab). These were edited in individual booklets, each containing the Hebrew text, a Latin translation, and some perceptive critical notes.<sup>28</sup> Of interest here is the early Latin translation of the *Community Rule*, published by Józef Milik in 1951.<sup>29</sup> Milik's translation, even of the most difficult passages, is strictly literal, since, as he writes, his work "mavult servilis esse quam rei obscurae incertam dare interpretationem."<sup>30</sup>

Applying classical philological principles to the Qumran texts, a number of doctoral dissertations were written at the University of Turin; those published are mentioned here. Corrado Martone produced an edition of the *Community Rule* with a tentative reconstruction of the text based on all the available manuscript evidence. The edition is accompanied by an annotated Italian translation, and an Introduction touching on the many problems surrounding the *Rule*, and its place in the development of the Qumran group.<sup>31</sup> Another major Qumran text has been critically edited

<sup>27</sup> See Corrado Martone, "Qumran Readings in Agreement with the Septuagint against the Masoretic Text: Part One: The Pentateuch," *Hen* 27 (2005): 53-113; "Qumran Readings in Agreement with the Septuagint against the Masoretic Text: Part Two: Joshua Judges," in Hilhorst, Puech, and Tigchelaar, *Flores Florentino*, 141-5.

<sup>28</sup> Pietro Boccaccio and Guido Berardi, *Regula unionis seu manuale disciplinae (DSD): Transcriptio et versio latina cum permissione The American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1953); *Interpretatio Habacuc (DSH): transcriptio et versio latina cum permissione the American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1955); *Regula Congregationis [1QSa]. Fac Simile: Transcriptio et Versio Latina Cum Notis* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1959); Pietro Boccaccio, *Regula Belli seu Bellum Filiorum Lucis Contra Filios Obscuritas (1QM+4QMa): Transcriptio et Versio Latina* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1960).

<sup>29</sup> Józef T. Milik, "Manuale disciplinae," *VD* 29 (1951): 129-58.

<sup>30</sup> "prefers to be slavishly literal than to give an uncertain interpretation of obscure passages" (134).

<sup>31</sup> Corrado Martone, *La "Regola della Comunità": Edizione critica* (Turin: Zamorani, 1995).



by Giovanni Ibba.<sup>32</sup> His edition of the *War Scroll* is based mainly on the manuscript 1QM and the small fragments of 1Q33, but the author also evaluates the variant readings offered by other witnesses of the same work or by works similar in content (4Q491-4Q496; 4Q285; 11Q14; 4Q471; 4Q529; 4Q497; 6Q18). The result, again, is not a diplomatic edition of the best manuscript but an attempt at a critical edition.<sup>33</sup>

Two other studies are not text editions but they deserve mention as they are careful and detailed annotated translations of two important Qumran texts, the *Temple Scroll* and the *Community Rule*. Angelo Vivian's translation of the *Temple Scroll* has a detailed commentary. Although it deals mainly with philological and palaeographic matters, it also addresses numerous problems arising in this text. Of great value are the two appendixes of the volume, devoted to the calendar and the sacrificial system of the *Temple Scroll*.<sup>34</sup> Paolo Sacchi's recent translation of the *Community Rule* is a revised version of his 1996 translation, published in a multi-language volume edited by James Charlesworth.<sup>35</sup> The Introduction to the volume is a comprehensive outline of Second Temple Jewish theology. The translation is in itself a commentary.<sup>36</sup>

### *The Circumstances and History of the Qumran Scrolls*

The historical circumstances of the Qumran Scrolls are described and analyzed in the general introductions and in many of the works cited above. Among studies on more specific issues, the following should be mentioned.

In 1971 Luigi Moraldi published a monograph on the Teacher of Righteousness,<sup>37</sup> in which he tries to portray this founder of the Qumran group. Starting from the few and uncertain facts deemed relevant to his life, he moves to a more general consideration of what the modern historian is able to know about this figure. By today's perspective this volume is overconfident in attributing to the Teacher of Righteousness some Qumran

---

<sup>32</sup> Giovanni Ibba teaches biblical Hebrew at Central Italy Theological Seminary in Florence, and history of religions at the University of Siena. His research concentrates on the theology of the Qumran group.

<sup>33</sup> Giovanni Ibba, *Il "Rotolo della Guerra": Edizione critica* (Turin: Zamorani, 1998).

<sup>34</sup> Angelo Vivian, *Rotolo del Tempio* (Brescia: Paideia, 1990).

<sup>35</sup> James H. Charlesworth, ed., *Rule of the Community: Photographic Multi-Language Edition* (Philadelphia: American Interfaith Institute, 1996).

<sup>36</sup> Paolo Sacchi, *Regola della Comunità* (Brescia: Paideia, 2006).

<sup>37</sup> Luigi Moraldi, *Il Maestro di Giustizia: L'innominato dei Manoscritti di Qumran* (Fossano: Esperienze, 1971).

texts. Still, this is undoubtedly a well-balanced analysis of all the evidence then available about this enigmatic character.

Angelo Penna's monograph on the Sons of Light concentrates on the group itself, rather than its founder.<sup>38</sup> The author's main aim is to demonstrate the group's monastic character. Many of Penna's conclusions may be questionable today, but the vast amount of material on ancient monasticism gathered in this book remains valuable. This volume enjoys the merit of being the first collection of ancient sources on Essenism to appear in Italian.<sup>39</sup>

In the context of ancient monasticism in light of the Second Temple Jewish sects, a recent volume by Laura Gusella should be mentioned.<sup>40</sup> Although centered on the Egyptian sect of the Therapeutae, the book contains a substantial chapter on the Essenes and the Qumran group, two bodies that the author rightly keeps separate.

Note should be taken again of Paolo Sacchi, for his novel perspectives on the historical development of the Qumran group and its relation to the apocalyptic literature. In his *L'apocalittica giudaica e la sua storia*, a collection of studies published between 1979 and 1989 and translated into English in 1997,<sup>41</sup> Sacchi comments that the Enochic *Book of the Watchers* (= *1 Enoch* 1-36) expresses some ideas that were new in Jewish culture. In his opinion these new concepts were adopted by Judaism but were especially developed in the Essene circles. In Sacchi's view this circumstance connected the apocalyptic tradition to some of the main constituents of the Qumranic ideology. Sacchi discerns in both the Jewish apocalyptic tradition and the Qumran sect a concern with the nature and the origin of evil. He views the Qumranic ideas as the original way in which Qumranic Essenism modifies ideas already present in the Enochic *Book of the Watchers*. For the Qumranites, Sacchi believes, man is contaminated so his salvation depends on a free pardon from God. The Essenism of Qumran takes this ideology to its extreme, completely denying the freedom of man, as clearly evinced in the well-known "instruction on the two spirits" (1QS III, 13-IV,

<sup>38</sup> Angelo Penna, *I Figli della Luce* (Fossano: Esperienze, 1971).

<sup>39</sup> See also Angelo Penna, "Il reclutamento nell'Essenismo e nell'antico monachesimo cristiano," *RevQ* 1 (1959): 345-64.

<sup>40</sup> Laura Gusella, *Esperienze di Comunità nel Giudaismo Antico: Esseni, Terapeuti, Qumran* (Florence: Nerbini, 2003).

<sup>41</sup> Paolo Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (JSPSup 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).

26).<sup>42</sup> Sacchi continues to offer new perspectives on the ongoing debate on these questions.<sup>43</sup>

His views have been developed further by his pupil Gabriele Boccaccini. The greater part of Boccaccini's academic career has been pursued in the United States, and most of his studies on Qumran are in English. However, some brief observations on the main differences between the American and the Italian editions of his *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis* are in order.

In Boccaccini's view,<sup>44</sup> the Essene movement, which for him is separate from the Qumran sect, was in fact the parent movement from which the sect emerged. This Essene movement, in his opinion, is to be identified with Enochic Judaism. Boccaccini believes that this movement produced the Enochic apocalyptic literature, which makes Enoch its chief character. He notes the absence of works that stress human moral responsibility from the Qumran corpus. He concludes that the Qumranites rejected works that did not match their own denial of free moral choice. Boccaccini avers that his thesis sheds new light on the Qumran community, but also on the Judaism of the late Second Temple period. The Italian edition of *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, though maintaining the foremost conclusions of the English original, shifts the perspective from the strictly ideological level to a more concrete sociological one by identifying distinct groups (Enochians, Essenes, Qumranites) within this specific ideological tradition.<sup>45</sup>

To conclude, mention should be made of a valuable study of Qumran messianism recently published by Ludwig Monti,<sup>46</sup> a young scholar at the University of Turin. Monti inquires into the historical and ideological origins of the Qumran community's messianic teaching, and their chronological development. He holds that the specific features of the Qumran community's messianism are rooted in the collective messianic personality of the Qumran community itself.

This brief survey of the main results of 60 years of Qumran scholarship in Italy is far from exhaustive. Space constraints prevented the inclusion of many young Italian scholars working on Qumran literature. Instead the reader is referred to the bibliography of the Orion Center website, which

<sup>42</sup> See Corrado Martone, "Beyond the Essene Hypothesis? Some Observations on the Qumran Zadokite Priesthood," *Hen* 25 (2003): 267-75.

<sup>43</sup> Paolo Sacchi, "Collins, io e l'apocalittica: o anche gli apocrifi?," in Hilhorst, Puech and Tigchelaar, *Flores Florentino*, 569-85.

<sup>44</sup> Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

<sup>45</sup> Gabriele Boccaccini, *Oltre l'ipotesi essenica* (Brescia: Morcelliana, 2003).

<sup>46</sup> Ludwig Monti, *Una comunità alla fine della storia: Messia e messianismo a Qumran* (Brescia: Paideia, 2006).

lists about 200 Italian titles published between 1995 and 2008.<sup>47</sup> This list also includes original works of foreign scholars who published papers in Italian that were read at Italian conferences.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> See online <http://orion.mssc.huji.ac.il/resources/bib/language/Ital.shtml>. Cited 16 December 2010.

<sup>48</sup> See Florentino García Martínez, “Qumran: Le ultime scoperte e lo stato delle pubblicazioni,” *RSB* 9 (1997): 11-47; “Il Rotolo del Tempio e la Nuova Gerusalemme: Quanti esemplari possediamo?,” *Hen* 29 (1999): 159-90; “Guerra e pace in prospettiva escatologica e apocalittica,” in Piero Stefani and Giovanni Menestrina, eds., *Pace e Guerra nella Bibbia e nel Corano* (Brescia: Morcelliana, 2002), 47-64; Émile Puech, “Note sull’identificazione di 7Q5 con Mc 6,52-53,” *HTh* 17 (1999): 73-84; “Qohelet a Qumran,” in Giuseppe Bellia and Angelo Passaro, eds., *Il libro del Qohelet: Tradizione, redazione teologia* (Milan: Paoline, 2001), 144-70; Alexander Rofé, “Note sul testo ebraico e la traduzione greca dei libri di Giosuè e Giudici: Correzioni nomistiche,” *Annali di scienze religiose* 8 (2003): 23-36; “Lo studio del testo biblico alla luce della critica storico-letteraria: La reprimenda dell’uomo-profeta (*‘iš nabi*) in Gdc 6,7-10,” *Hen* 27 (2005): 137-48; “Giosuè figlio di Nun nella storia della tradizione biblica,” *RSB* 18 (2006): 53-90.

## QUMRAN RESEARCH IN NORDIC COUNTRIES

SARIANNA METSO\*

The history of Nordic research on the Dead Sea Scrolls, it turns out, can be said to have begun prior to the discovery of the Scrolls at Qumran. Early in the twentieth century two doctoral dissertations on the subject were written and accepted at the University of Copenhagen: one by Flemming Friis Hvidberg on the *Damascus Document* found in the Cairo Genizah, the other by Holger Mosbech on the Essenes. Both researchers were later to become professors at the University of Copenhagen: Hvidberg in Old Testament studies and Mosbech in New Testament studies. Neither of them, however, saw a connection between the *Damascus Document* and the Essenes; considering the scarcity of historical sources at the time this is by no means surprising. Hvidberg believed the *Damascus Document* to be a Pharisaic text, and it did not occur to him to consider the possibility of an Essene connection. Mosbech, on the other hand, based his work on the Essenes on the classical sources of Philo, Josephus, and Pliny the Elder, and he nowhere mentions the *Damascus Document* as a potential source on the Essenes. Not until the discovery of the Scrolls at Qumran in 1947 was the connection generally made.<sup>1</sup>

The significance of the Qumran discovery was quickly recognized by Nordic biblical scholars. As early as 1952 translations of Qumran texts

---

\* I wish to thank my Nordic colleagues Håkan Bengtsson, Bodil Ejrnæs, Torleif Elgvin, Søren Holst, Raija Sollamo and Cecilia Wassen for the material and helpful comments they provided when I was preparing this article.

<sup>1</sup> Flemming Friis Hvidberg, *Menigheden af den nye Pagt i Damascus, nogle Studier over de af Salomo Schechter fundne og under Titlen "Fragments of a Zadokite work" udgivne Genizafragmenter ("Damascusskriftet")* (Copenhagen: Gad Forlag, 1928); Holger Mosbech, *Essæismen, et bidrag til Senjødedommens Religionshistorie* (Copenhagen: Schultz, 1916). The information about these two works is based on the catalogue of the Royal Library and Copenhagen University Library Service (CULIS) and on the foreword by Mogens Müller in Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thompson, eds., *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments* (JSOTSup 290 and Copenhagen International Seminar 6; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1998), 7-10. An additional study on the *Damascus Document* prior to the Qumran discoveries was published in Sweden by Bo Reicke, *The Jewish "Damascus Documents" and the New Testament* (SymbU Supplementhäften till Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok 6; Uppsala: Wretmans Boktryckeri A.-B., 1946).

in Nordic languages and introductions to the Qumran finds began to appear, often combined into single volumes: the first, in Swedish, were published by Bo Reicke and Helmer Ringgren,<sup>2</sup> soon followed in Norwegian by Arvid Kapelrud,<sup>3</sup> in Danish by Eduard Nielsen and Benedikt Otzen<sup>4</sup> and in Finnish by Esko Haapa.<sup>5</sup> Since the Scrolls discovery was as interesting to the wider public as it was to scholars, these volumes were designed to cater to a wider audience. Accordingly, many of the introductions focus largely on the significance of the Scrolls for understanding the background of Christianity. But the authors and editors of these volumes recognized the importance of informing the readers on wider issues connected with the Scrolls as well, such as their dating and provenance, the history of the Jewish group behind the texts, and the textual evidence for the history of the biblical text.

The relation of the Scrolls to the New Testament was of interest particularly to Krister Stendahl and Bertil Gärtner, both of whom held professorships at North American universities, Stendahl at Harvard and Gärtner at Princeton, before becoming bishops in Sweden. The collection of essays *The Scrolls and the New Testament* edited by Stendahl (1957) was one of the first larger assessments of the Scrolls for New Testament scholarship, with essays by Bo Reicke, William Brownlee, Karl Georg Kuhn, and Joseph Fitzmyer among others.<sup>6</sup> Bertil Gärtner's book *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* became in 1965 the first volume in the Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series (SNTSMS).<sup>7</sup> Yet

<sup>2</sup> Bo Reicke, *Handskrifterna från Qumran (eller 'Ain Feshcha) 1-3* (Lund: Gleerup, 1952); Helmer Ringgren, *Handskrifterna från Qumran (eller 'Ain Feshcha) 4-5* (Uppsala: Wretmans boktr., 1956).

<sup>3</sup> Arvid Kapelrud, *Dødehavsrullene: funnene som kaster nytt lys over Bibelen og Jesu samtid* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1956). This volume has long been popular among Norwegian readers, as is evident from its reprints in 1971 and 1996.

<sup>4</sup> Eduard Nielsen and Benedikt Otzen, *Dødehavsteksterne: Skrifter fra den jødiske menighed i Qumran, i oversættelse og med noter* (Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad, 1959). See also the popular introduction by Eduard Nielsen, *Håndskriftfundene i Juda Ørken: Dødehavsteksterne* (Copenhagen: Gad Forlag, 1956).

<sup>5</sup> Esko Haapa, ed., *Qumran: Kuolleen meren löydöt 1950-luvun tutkimuksissa* (Porvoo and Helsinki: WSOY, 1960). In addition to translated samples of Qumran texts, the volume includes essays on the Scrolls by Aarre Lauha, Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, Eero Repo, Esko Haapa, and Aimo T. Nikolainen.

<sup>6</sup> Krister Stendahl, ed., *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Brother, 1957). The volume contains articles by Oscar Cullmann, William H. Brownlee, Karl Georg Kuhn, Ernest Vogt, Kurt Schubert, Sherman E. Johnson, Bo Reicke, William D. Davies, Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Nahum H. Glatzer, as well as one by Stendahl himself.

<sup>7</sup> Bertil Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* (SNTSMS 1; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965).

another early thematic study of the Scrolls deserves mention here: *Tro och liv enligt Döda-havsrollarna*, published in 1961 by Helmer Ringgren, a professor first at Åbo Akademi in Finland and later at Uppsala University in Sweden. Two years later the book was published in English under the title *The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. An expanded edition of the book with a new introduction by James Charlesworth was published in 1995. Topics discussed by Ringgren include the view of God and of human nature, angels and demons, dualism, eschatology, and the community and cult.<sup>8</sup>

In addition to the SNTSMS series mentioned above, another important scholarly series was initiated with a book by a Scandinavian scholar. Preben Wernberg-Møller's monograph about the *Community Rule* (1QS) became the first volume in the Brill series *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* (STDJ),<sup>9</sup> which by now has established itself as the leading forum for Qumran scholarship. Wernberg-Møller was a Danish student at Oxford University, and his book is an abridged version of his doctoral dissertation. In its preface he recognizes "help and advice" from Godfrey Driver, Harold Rowley, Samuel Stern and Pinkas Weis. At Scandinavian universities, however, relatively few doctoral dissertations were written specifically on the Scrolls during the first few decades following their discovery. A notable exception is the Copenhagen dissertation by Svend Holm-Nielsen entitled *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran*, published in 1960, which is one of the pioneering studies on the *Hodayot*.<sup>10</sup>

With the opening up of the Scrolls archives and re-organization of the international publication project in the early 1990s, a new era also began for Nordic Qumran scholarship. As editions of new Qumran texts were published, fresh interest in the Scrolls emerged among Nordic scholars, new translation projects were launched,<sup>11</sup> and teachers at Nordic universi-

<sup>8</sup> Helmer Ringgren, *Tro och liv enligt Döda-havsrollarna* (Stockholm: Diakonistyrelsens bokförlag, 1961); English edition: *The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (trans. Emilie T. Sander; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963); expanded English edition with a new introduction by James Charlesworth (New York: Crossroad, 1995).

<sup>9</sup> Preben Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline* (STDJ 1; Leiden: Brill, 1957).

<sup>10</sup> Svend Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran* (ATDan 2; Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960). Additional doctoral dissertations include, e.g., a University of Helsinki dissertation by Per Wallendorff on the Teacher of Righteousness entitled *Rättfärdighetens lärare: en exegetisk undersökning* (privately published in Helsinki, 1964), and a University of Lund dissertation by Göran Forkman, *The Limits of the Religious Community: Expulsion from the Religious Community within the Qumran Sect, within Rabbinic Judaism, and within Primitive Christianity* (translated from the author's manuscript by Pearl Sjölander; ConBNT 5; Lund: Gleerup, 1972).

<sup>11</sup> New translations include Raija Sollamo, ed., *Kuolleen meren kirjäkääröt: Qumranin tekstit suomeksi* (Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1991) and *Qumranin kirjasto: Va-*



ties started encouraging their students to write dissertations on the Scrolls. When a conference on them was organized in Copenhagen in 1995, the more than twenty papers that were read attested to a new wave of Qumran scholarship in Nordic countries.<sup>12</sup>

The new generation of Nordic Qumran scholars emerging in those years was eager to establish ties with the broader international community of Qumran scholars, and some spent long periods at universities abroad. Torleif Elgvin studied at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and wrote a doctoral dissertation (1998) on 4QInstruction under the supervision of Emanuel Tov and Moshe Weinfeld.<sup>13</sup> Sarianna Metso's dissertation (1996) on the cave 4 manuscripts of the *Community Rule* was supervised by Raija Sollamo in Helsinki, Hartmut Stegemann in Göttingen and Michael Knibb in London.<sup>14</sup> Both Elgvin and Metso were eventually invited to edit manuscripts for the official publication series Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (DJD).<sup>15</sup>

Additional doctoral dissertations initiated during this period and subsequently published include two from Uppsala University: Björn Frennesson studied the liturgical communion with angels in Qumran texts (1999), and Håkan Bengtsson the sobriquets in the *Pesharim* (2000).<sup>16</sup> Gregory Doudna at the University of Copenhagen prepared a new critical edition of 4QPesherNahum (2001).<sup>17</sup> At the University of Helsinki, Erkki Ranta

---

*likoima teoksia* (Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1997); a third Finnish volume of more translations under the editorship of Raija Sollamo is in preparation; Bodil Ejrnæs, Niels Peter Lemche and Mogens Müller, eds., *Dødehavsskrifterne og de antikke kilder om essæerne* (Fredriksberg: Anis, 1998; 2<sup>nd</sup> enlarged and revised edition by Bodil Ejrnæs, Søren Holst and Mogens Müller, eds.; Copenhagen: Anis, 2003); Torleif Elgvin et al., eds., *Dødehavsrullene* (Oslo: De norske bokklubbene, 2004); a new Swedish translation is in preparation by Mikael Winninge et al., eds., *Dödabavsrullarna: Svensk översättning med inledning och kommentarer* (Stockholm: Atlantis).

<sup>12</sup> The conference papers were subsequently published in Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thompson, eds., *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments* (JSOTSup 290; Copenhagen International Seminar Series 6; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).

<sup>13</sup> The full title of his doctoral dissertation is *An Analysis of 4QInstruction* (Hebrew University in Jerusalem, 1998).

<sup>14</sup> Published under the title *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

<sup>15</sup> Elgvin contributed to DJD XIII, XX, XXII, XXIX, and XXXIV-XXXVI, and Metso to DJD XVI.

<sup>16</sup> Björn Frennesson, *"In a Common Rejoicing": Liturgical Communion with Angels in Qumran* (Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 14; Uppsala: University of Uppsala Press: 1999); and Håkan Bengtsson, *What's in a Name? A Study of Sobriquets in the Pesharim* (Uppsala: Uppsala University, 2000).

<sup>17</sup> Gregory L. Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum: A Critical Edition* (JSPSup 35; Copenhagen International Series 8; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

wrote a thesis on the text and interpretation of Hebrew Bible quotes in the *Damascus Document* (1999), and Magnus Riska focused on the Hebrew Bible textual traditions underlying columns II–XIII, 19 of the *Temple Scroll* (2001).<sup>18</sup> A new wave of Nordic Qumran scholarship had clearly emerged due to the recognition that the Dead Sea Scrolls, as a major corpus of newly found texts, cried out for exploration.

The dissertations written in Nordic universities most recently cover a wide methodological range and reflect the shift in research interest more toward the cave 4 texts, which have recently become available: Søren Holst, *Verbs and War Scroll: Studies in the Hebrew Verbal System and the Qumran War Scroll* (Copenhagen, 2004);<sup>19</sup> Juhana Saukkonen, *The Story Behind the Text: Scriptural Interpretation in 4Q252* (Helsinki, 2005); Jutta Jokiranta, *Constructing and Expressing Sectarian Social Identity in Qumran Serakhim and Pesharim* (Helsinki, 2005);<sup>20</sup> Hanne von Weissenberg, *4QMMT—The problem of the Epilogue* (Helsinki, 2006);<sup>21</sup> Årstein Justnes, *The Time of Salvation: An Analysis of 4QApocryphon of Daniel (4Q246), 4QMessianic Apocalypse (4Q521 2), and 4QTime of Righteousness (4Q215a)* (Oslo, 2007).<sup>22</sup> A sixth dissertation, by Cecilia Wassen, a Swedish scholar, can be added to the list, although she conducted her doctoral work in Canada. The title of her

<sup>18</sup> Erkki Ranta, *Vanhan testamentin lainausten teksti ja tulkinta Damaskon kirjassa* (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 73; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 1999); Magnus Riska, *The Temple Scroll and the Biblical Text Traditions: A Study of Columns 2-13:9* (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 81; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2001).

<sup>19</sup> Published under the same title in the series *Studia Semitica Upsaliensia* 25 (Uppsala: University of Uppsala, 2008).

<sup>20</sup> This dissertation consists of an extensive introduction to the social-scientific method she uses and five published articles: “The Sectarianism of the Qumran ‘Secr’: Sociological Notes,” *RevQ* 78 (2001): 224-39; Cecilia Wassen and Jutta Jokiranta, “Groups in Tension: Sectarianism in the Damascus Document and the Community Rule,” in David Chalcraft, ed., *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (London: Equinox, 2007), 205-45; “Pesharim: A Mirror of Self-Understanding,” in Kristin de Troyer and Armin Lange, eds., *Reading the Present: Scriptural Interpretation and the Contemporary in the Texts of the Judean Desert* (Atlanta: SBL, 2005), 23-34; “Social Identity Approach: Identity-Constructing Elements in the Psalms Pesharim,” in Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović, eds., *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Others in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of IOQS in Groningen* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008), 85-109; “Prototypical Teacher in the Qumran Pesharim: A Social Identity Approach,” in Philip F. Esler, ed., *Ancient Israel: The Old Testament in Its Social Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006), 254-63.

<sup>21</sup> Published under the title *4QMMT: Reevaluating the Text, the Meaning, and the Function of the Epilogue* (STDJ 82; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009).

<sup>22</sup> Published under the same title (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2009).

dissertation is *Women in the Damascus Document* (McMaster University, 2003).<sup>23</sup>

At conferences and symposia, and through individual contacts, seeds were sown among Nordic scholars for greater collaboration, which came to fruition especially under the auspices of the Nordic Network in Qumran Studies. At the initiative of Raija Sollamo of the University of Helsinki, Qumran scholars from Nordic countries were invited to a planning meeting in Helsinki in 2002.<sup>24</sup> Subsequently, a steering committee was formed of scholars who had emerged as leading figures in their respective countries in fostering Qumran scholarship: Håkan Bengtsson (Uppsala, Sweden), Bodil Ejrnæs (Copenhagen, Denmark), Torleif Elgvin (Oslo, Norway), Raija Sollamo (Helsinki, Finland), and Håkan Ulfsgard (Linköping, Sweden). The group elected Torleif Elgvin (Oslo, Norway) as Coordinator of the Network and Hanne von Weissenberg (Helsinki, Finland) as the Secretary. Approximately 40 scholars and doctoral students from four Nordic countries joined the Network.<sup>25</sup> Crucial for its establishment was funding from NordForsk, a Nordic research board under the Nordic Council of Ministers for Education and Research. This support was essential for creating an electronic contact forum ([www.nnqs.org](http://www.nnqs.org))<sup>26</sup> as well as for stimulating and fostering Nordic Qumran research in a variety of ways.

The funding permitted the Network to organize five Qumran symposia: in Helsinki (2003), Oslo (2004), Jerusalem (2005), Copenhagen (2006) and Uppsala (2007). In each of the first four symposia, approximately ten papers by Nordic scholars as well as additional papers by one or two international guest speakers were presented.<sup>27</sup> The symposium in Jerusalem was unique, for it lasted for an entire week and included additional lectures by scholars from Israeli universities and a trip to Qumran.<sup>28</sup> Preceding the

---

<sup>23</sup> Published under the same title in the Brill (hardcover) and SBL (paperback) Academia Biblica Series (21; Leiden: Brill; Atlanta: SBL, 2005).

<sup>24</sup> Present at the meeting were Håkan Bengtsson, Bodil Ejrnæs, Torleif Elgvin, Raija Sollamo, and Hanne von Weissenberg.

<sup>25</sup> Profiles of the members of the steering committee as well as a full list of the members of the Network are available at [www.nnqs.org/members.html](http://www.nnqs.org/members.html).

<sup>26</sup> Juhana Saukkonen served as the primary webmaster from 2003 until Søren Holst assumed the task in 2009.

<sup>27</sup> The guest speaker at the Helsinki symposium was Emanuel Tov (Hebrew University in Jerusalem), at the Oslo symposium George Brooke (University of Manchester), at the Copenhagen symposium Esther and Hanan Eshel (Bar Ilan University), and at the Uppsala symposium Annette Steudel (University of Göttingen), Hans-Georg Mutius (Ludwig-Maximilians-University of Munich), and Sarianna Metso (University of Toronto). Programs and abstracts of symposium papers are available at [www.nnqs.org/symposiums.html](http://www.nnqs.org/symposiums.html).

<sup>28</sup> The guest speakers at the Jerusalem symposium included Esther Eshel, Stephen Pfann, Ada Yardeni, Hanan Eshel, Esther Chazon, Jonathan Ben-Dov, and Michael Segal.

symposium, students enjoyed a week-long study session of original fragments under the guidance of Torleif Elgvin in the scroller of the Israel Antiquities Authority. During their stay in Israel, the participants stayed at the École Biblique et Archéologique Française in Jerusalem, where the symposium sessions were held too. Papers from the first four symposia were later published.<sup>29</sup>

The Nordic Network has been instrumental in planning and fostering translation projects of Qumran texts into Nordic languages, and new translations of Qumran texts exist now in Danish, Norwegian and Finnish; a new Swedish translation is in preparation.<sup>30</sup> An additional fruit of the Network's collaborative labor is a textbook entitled *Treasure in Clay Jars: Content, History and Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, published in Danish, Finnish, Norwegian and Swedish.<sup>31</sup>

The Nordic Network has served as an important peer support group for Nordic scholars serving as educators at their respective universities, and the members furnish mutual assistance in planning and delivering courses on the Scrolls. They are also acutely aware of their responsibility for disseminating their work to a larger public through popular publications and lectures. Doctoral students as well as more mature scholars have benefited from the so-called mobility scholarships that have facilitated visits to conferences and universities, for example, in Göttingen, Manchester, Groningen, Vienna, Ljubljana (Slovenia), Camaldoli (Italy), Jerusalem, Philadelphia (Pennsylvania), Ann Arbor (Michigan), Atlanta (Georgia), and San Antonio (Texas). The NordForsk funding has also made it possible to invite guest speakers from all over the world to participate in the Network's symposia. Through

---

<sup>29</sup> Anders Klostergaard Petersen et al., eds., *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 80; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

<sup>30</sup> See note 11 above.

<sup>31</sup> The book is divided into five sections and deals with the discovery and publication of the Scrolls; their historical, sociological and religious contexts; the identity of the group behind the texts; ideology and practices reflected in them; and the significance of the Scrolls for biblical scholarship as well as for the study of rabbinic Judaism and the Hebrew language. The chapters are by Håkan Bengtsson, Torleif Elgvin, Kasper Bro Larsen, Cecilia Wassen, Jutta Jokiranta, Hanne von Weissenberg, Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Juhana Saukkonen, Søren Holst, Årstein Justnes, Bodil Ejrnæs, Jesper Høgenhaven, Ellen Juhl Christiansen, Håkan Ulfsgård, Raija Sollamo, Mikael Winninge, and Sarianna Metso. One of the chapters includes a brief history of Nordic Scrolls research by Torleif Elgvin (originally in Norwegian "Proessen med å publisere og tolke skriftene"), which proved most helpful for writing the present article. See Jutta Jokiranta, ed., *Aarre saviastioissa: Qumranin tekstit avautuvat* (Helsinki: Kirjapaja, 2009); Årstein Justnes, ed., *Dødehavsrullene: Deres innhold, historie og betydning* (Kristiansand: Norwegian Academic Press, 2009); Bodil Ejrnæs, ed., *Dødehavsrullerne: Innhold, historie og betydning* (Copenhagen: Forlaget Anis, 2009); Cecilia Wassen, ed., *Dödahavsrullarna* (forthcoming).

their contributions, Nordic scholars are very much part of the international scene of Qumran scholarship.

Since its inception in 2003, members of the Nordic Network in Qumran Studies have brought out over 80 publications on the Scrolls, with 25 more currently in press.<sup>32</sup> Scholars and students working in collaborative Dead Sea Scrolls research projects in various Nordic countries have found the Network a solid sounding board for new theories and ideas, and they continue to share reports of their progress through its electronic contact forum. Still, primary responsibility for training individual scholars of the new generation rests with the various national universities, in terms of both funding and academic training; several Scrolls projects independent of the Network are flourishing at individual universities as well.

In Denmark, both the University of Aarhus and the University of Copenhagen have named Qumran Studies as an official priority research area; scholars in the Aarhus project have already produced a volume entitled *The Discursive Fight over Sacred Texts in Antiquity*,<sup>33</sup> and at Copenhagen scholars are involved in the re-publication of DJD V, originally edited by John Allegro.<sup>34</sup> Raija Sollamo at the University of Helsinki leads a Finnish Academy project entitled *Conflicting Identities: Social and Religious Identities in Light of the Qumran Material from the Judaean Desert*, and under the auspices of this project several new dissertations are in progress. Juhana Saukkonen, a member of this project, has also joined a research team at the École Biblique et Archéologique Française in Jerusalem, focusing on the ceramic objects found at Qumran. Torleif Elgvin is preparing an edition of 20 Qumran fragments in the Norwegian Schøyen Collection, 15 of which are previously unpublished.<sup>35</sup> Scrolls scholars and post-graduate students in Sweden gather regularly to discuss their work at a Qumran seminar at the University of Uppsala headed by Bo Isaksson and Stig Norin. The seminar also functions as a center of the new Swedish translation project of Qumran

---

<sup>32</sup> A list of publications is available at [www.nnqs.org/publications.html](http://www.nnqs.org/publications.html).

<sup>33</sup> Anders-Christian Jacobsen, ed., *Religion and Normativity, 1: The Discursive Fight over Sacred Texts in Antiquity* (Acta Jutlandica 84:1, Teologisk Serie 23; Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag, 2009). The Aarhus project and the volume focus on the processes whereby texts became normative, sacred and canonized.

<sup>34</sup> The revised edition is being prepared under the leadership of George Brooke (University of Manchester), Moshe Bernstein (Yeshiva University, New York), and Jesper Høgenhaven (University of Copenhagen). In addition to the last named, other Nordic scholars involved in the project are Trine Bjørnung Hasselbalch and Søren Holst of the University of Copenhagen, and Jutta Jokiranta of the University of Helsinki.

<sup>35</sup> Torleif Elgvin, ed., *Gleanings from the Caves: Dead Sea Scrolls and Artifacts from the Schøyen Collection* (London: T&T Clark, forthcoming in 2011).

texts, now in its final stages of completion.<sup>36</sup> Clearly, Nordic scholars studying the inkstrokes of the ancient Qumran scribes are leaving a significant mark in new manuscripts of their own.

---

<sup>36</sup> See n. 11 above.





## QUMRAN RESEARCH IN EASTERN AND CENTRAL EUROPE

IDA FRÖHLICH

The present survey discusses developments in Qumran research in Russia (former USSR), Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia (former Czechoslovakia), Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Serbia, Croatia, and Slovenia (former Yugoslavia) on the basis of scholarly works published in local languages; publications in English, French, etc., are included only occasionally. A short overview is devoted to East Germany, which is also part of the survey of German Qumran research.<sup>1</sup> However, the activities of East German scholars in their country, and their contacts with colleagues in other Eastern countries, at times made them a bridge between the Eastern bloc and the Western world. They were therefore part of the Eastern scene and hence are included in the present survey.<sup>2</sup>

The Scrolls were discovered at a time of tumult in the central and eastern European countries. By 1948 communist regimes ruled Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria. Yugoslavia was also dominated by a communist-type government. Germany was divided into west and east, the latter under Soviet control and governed by a communist regime.

From the 1950s Eastern bloc politics placed two significant limitations on scientific activities. First, research institutions in these countries formed closed systems, and scholarly contacts with the external world were minimal. Travel to the Western world or scholarships awarded by Western sources were very rare in the beginning. From the 1960s onward this policy gradually changed. Publishing academic research in Western media was also extremely difficult. In the Eastern countries scholarly presentations had to be published first in local journals in the native or another language. Bibliographies of Eastern bloc scholars show that only very few were able to publish their work in international journals. Secondly, research in the humanities was strictly controlled by the official ideology of the communist regimes of the Eastern bloc, characterized by overt and relentless anti-

---

<sup>1</sup> See also the chapter by Jörg Frey in this volume.

<sup>2</sup> Since the geographical expanse of the Eastern bloc was vast, and included many countries and languages, the present survey is confined to research conducted in languages known to the present author.

religiousness and covert anti-Semitism. In such a context Qumran studies were a sensitive matter; neither Christianity nor Judaism was among the research fields supported or encouraged in these countries.

Given these facts, the countries of the Eastern bloc were naturally not represented in the pioneering work of publication and research on the Scrolls.<sup>3</sup> Yet these countries had scholarly histories and facilities. The Oriental Institute in St. Petersburg, created and supported by the tsars, with its precious manuscript collections and library, continued to function after 1917. The library was kept updated until that year, but less during the 1920s and 1930s. However, continuity of facilities and research activity was maintained. In Hungary, research organizations of biblical and Jewish themes, such as IMIT (Izraeliták Magyar Irodalmi Társasága [Literary Association of Hungarian Israelites], since 1894) and the Catholic Szent István Akadémia (St. Stephen Academy), ceased to exist during World War II and were not revived for several decades thereafter.<sup>4</sup> Teaching of Hebrew and Aramaic, however, continued in certain institutions, such as the Rabbinical Seminary in Budapest (the only one in central and eastern Europe), the theological institutions of various Christian denominations, and the Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest where Semitic languages were taught (with the focus on Arabic).<sup>5</sup> At European and American universities Qumran research often was, and still is, conducted at theological faculties. However, at the universities of the Eastern bloc such faculties were as a rule subject to neglect.

### *East Germany*

Hans Bardtke from Leipzig was one of the prominent scholars in Dead Sea Scrolls research. From the inception of this field of inquiry he published regular overviews of German Qumran research in German journals.<sup>6</sup> His

<sup>3</sup> Józef Milik from Poland took part in Qumran research mainly while staying at the École Biblique in Jerusalem. See the survey by Émile Puech in this volume.

<sup>4</sup> The St. Stephen Academy has been re-established since 2002, with a wider profile.

<sup>5</sup> With Károly Czeglédy and Gyula Germanus in the 1950s; Hebrew was taught by Károly Czeglédy and István Hahn. Since 1989 a program majoring in Jewish studies has been offered by Géza Komoróczy. Hebrew studies were introduced in the Pázmány Péter Catholic University in 1995 by Ida Fröhlich.

<sup>6</sup> Between 1956 and 1976 Bardtke published a series of articles in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (TLZ) and the *Theologische Rundschau* (TRu): "Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften, 31. Die Loblieder von Qumrán," TLZ 81 (1956): 150-54; "Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften, 34. Die Loblieder von Qumrán II,"

Introduction was one of the first general surveys of the Qumran findings and their problems.<sup>7</sup> Several scholars from the Eastern bloc took the opportunity to attend a conference he organized in Leipzig in 1961, as reflected in the content of the conference proceedings published two years later.<sup>8</sup> Bardtke's central position in Qumran research is attested by his *Festschrift*, which contained several articles on Qumran issues.<sup>9</sup> Beside the general surveys, Bardtke was particularly interested in the *Hodayot*, and produced the first German translation of this Qumran collection of hymns.<sup>10</sup> His research aimed at demonstrating didactic values in the *Hodayot*.<sup>11</sup> Another topic on which he focused was the nature of the Qumran community, the Yahad. He drew attention to similarities between its organization and that of Greco-Roman voluntary associations, both communities being organized internally, with their own juridical system. Both maintained a common

---

*TLZ* 81 (1956): 589-604; "Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften, 36. Die Loblieder von Qumrân III," *TLZ* 81 (1956): 715-24; "Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften, 39. Die Loblieder von Qumrân IV," *TLZ* 82 (1957): 339-48; "Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften, 42. Zwischen Chirbet Qumrân und En Feschcha," *TLZ* 85 (1960): 263-74; "Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften, 44. Die Rechtsstellung der Qumrân-Gemeinde," *TLZ* 86 (1961): 93-104; "Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften, 46. Qumrân-Probleme im Licht einiger neueren Veröffentlichungen," *TLZ* 87 (1962): 813-26.

<sup>7</sup> Hans Bardtke, *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer*, 1; *Mit einer kurzen Einführung in die Text- und Kanongeschichte des Alten Testaments* (Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1952), with the translation of four texts from cave 1, namely the *Community Rule* (1QS), the *Pesher of Habakkuk* (1QpHab), the *War Scroll* (1QM) and the *Hodayot* (1QH<sup>a</sup>). The third edition of the book was enlarged considerably (with the *Damascus Document*, and some texts from cave 4); see *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer. Die Sekte von Qumrân* (Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1958; 2nd ed., 1961). In the following years Bardtke published a book on recent finds in the Dead Sea region: *Die Handschriftenfunde in der Wüste Juda* (Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1962).

<sup>8</sup> Hans Bardtke, ed., *Qumran-Probleme; Vorträge des Leipziger Symposions über Qumran-Probleme vom 9. bis 14. Oktober 1961* (Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft; Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin 42; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963).

<sup>9</sup> See Siegfried Wagner, ed., *Bibel und Qumran: Beiträge zur Erforschung der Beziehungen zwischen Bibel- und Qumranwissenschaft. Hans Bardtke zum 22.9.66* (Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1968).

<sup>10</sup> The translation was published in *TLZ* 81 (1956): 149-54, 589-604, 715-24; 82 (1957): 339-48; *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer*. See further Hans Bardtke, "Spezialuntersuchungen zu den Lobliedern: Das Ich des Meisters in den Hodajoth von Qumran," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift d. Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig* 6 (1956-1957): 93-104; "Wüste und Oase in den Hodajoth von Qumran," in Hans Bardtke, ed., *Gott und die Götter; Festgabe für Erich Fascher zum 60. Geburtstag* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlag, 1958), 44-55.

<sup>11</sup> Hans Bardtke, "Considérations sur les Cantiques de Qumrân," *RB* 63 (1956): 220-33.

treasury, established by members' contributions, and among their officials was a treasurer. In both types of organization this official had jurisdictional authority over the members.<sup>12</sup> The ceremonies conducted by the Qumran sectaries, and their particular festival calendar to which members were bound, were additional similar features. Also, initiation procedures in the two types of community included examination and education.<sup>13</sup>

Another important scholar from East Germany was Rudolf Meyer of Jena. He was a member of the editorial board of *Biblia Hebraica*, and among the editors of the translation and commentary of the Mishna. He was the author of a Hebrew grammar and several studies on Hellenistic Judaism.<sup>14</sup> Meyer published a seminal study on the *Prayer of Nabonidus*, pointing out its Mesopotamian background and literary motifs.<sup>15</sup>

### *Czech Republic (Czechoslovakia)*

Miloš Bič (1910-2004), professor at the Theological Faculty of the Charles University in Prague, was the first to publish a book on the Scrolls, with a translation of those from cave 1.<sup>16</sup> His junior colleague Stanislav Segert (1921-2005), who participated in Bardtke's symposium *Qumran-Probleme*, published widely on Qumran Hebrew and Aramaic in international journals, and used Qumran language material in his Aramaic grammar.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Hans Bardtke, "Die Rechtsstellung der Qumrân-Gemeinde," *TLZ* 86 (1961): 93-104; "Soziologie und Rechtsstellung der Gemeinde von Qumrân," *TRu* 33 (1968): 217-36.

<sup>13</sup> Common features of the Yahad and Greek organizations were further examined by Carl Schneider, "Zur Problematik des Hellenistischen in den Qumrântexten," in Bardtke, *Qumran-Probleme*, 299-314.

<sup>14</sup> See Waltraut Bernhardt, "Biographie Rudolf Meyer (1909-1991)," in Rudolf Meyer, *Beiträge zur Geschichte von Text und Sprache des Alten Testaments* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993), 1-6 (5). Rudolf Meyer, *Hellenistisches in der rabbinischen Anthropologie: Rabbinische Vorstellungen vom Werden des Menschen* (BWANT 74; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1937); *Zur Geschichte und Theologie des Judentums in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989).

<sup>15</sup> Rudolf Meyer, *Das Gebet des Nabonid: Eine in den Qumran-Handschriften wiederentdeckte Weisheitszählung* (Sitzungsberichte der sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, phil.-hist. Klasse 107/3, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962).

<sup>16</sup> Miloš Bič, *Poklad v Jidské pousti (Kumranske nalezky)* (A Treasure in the Judaean Desert [Qumran Finds]), (Prag: Katedra biblicke theologie na Komenskeho evangelicke bohoslovecke fakulte v Praze, 1960).

<sup>17</sup> Stanislav Segert, *Altaramäische Grammatik; mit Bibliographie, Chrestomathie und Glossar* (4th ed.; Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1986). See the chapter on research in North America in Aramaic and Hebrew in this volume.

Among other writings Segert authored a book on the *War Scroll*.<sup>18</sup> Although living from 1969 in the USA he continued to publish in his native language as well, and with his team translated Qumran texts into Czech.<sup>19</sup> The younger generation of Czech scholars is represented by Jan Dušek, who prepared a complete edition of the Wadi Daliyeh manuscripts, with historical and legal commentary.<sup>20</sup>

### Poland<sup>21</sup>

In Poland, Witold Tyloch (1927-1990) was the first to develop an ongoing interest in Qumran research and to provide information about it.<sup>22</sup> Most of his articles were published in Polish, but some of them appeared in international journals such as one on the *Florilegium* in the *Revue de Qumran*.<sup>23</sup> Tyloch's main interest was the organization of the Qumran community. This was the topic of his lecture at the conference organized by Bardtke.<sup>24</sup> Besides exploring the similarities of the *thiasos* communities and the Qumran community, he was able to demonstrate some similarities between the latter and the organization of Christian communities.<sup>25</sup> He also wrote on

<sup>18</sup> Stanislav Segert, *Synove sveta a synove tmy. Svedectvi nejstarsich biblickych rukopisu* (The Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness. The Testimony of the Oldest Biblical Manuscripts) (Prag: Orbis, 1970).

<sup>19</sup> Stanislav Segert, Robert Řehák, Šárka Bažantová, Jan Dušek, *Rukopisy od Mrtvého moře: hebrejsko-česky* (Knihovna antické tradice 4; OIKOYMENH, 2007).

<sup>20</sup> Jan Dušek, *Les manuscrits araméens du Wadi Daliyeh et la Samarie vers 450-332 av. J.-C.* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 30; Leiden: Brill, 2007).

<sup>21</sup> On research in Poland until 1991 see Zdzisław J. Kapera, "The Present State of Polish Qumranology," in Treballe Barrera and Vegas Montaner, *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 1:307-15.

<sup>22</sup> Witold J. Tyloch, "Symposium poświęcone problematyce qumrańskiej (A Symposium on Qumran Problems)," *Euhemer - przegląd religioznawczy* 6 (27) (1962): 98-101, a report on the Berlin symposium *Qumran-Probleme*.

<sup>23</sup> Witold J. Tyloch, *Florilegium z IV grotty Qumran* (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1973); "Qumrańskie Florilegium (4QFlor)," *Filomata* 412 (1992): 308-13.

<sup>24</sup> Witold J. Tyloch, "Quelques remarques sur le caractère social de [sic] mouvement de Qumrán," in Bardtke, *Qumran-Probleme*, 341-51.

<sup>25</sup> Witold J. Tyloch, "Tiazy a gmina z Qumran (Voluntary Associations and the Qumran Community)," *Euhemer przegląd religioznawczy* 10 (51) (1966): 13-19; "Gmina z Qumran a wczesne chrześcijaństwo (The Community of Qumran and Early Christianity)," in Józef Keller, ed., *Katolicyzm starożytny jako forma rozwoju pierwotnego chrześcijaństwa* (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1969), 41-67; *Aspekty społeczne gminy z Qumran: w świetle rękopisów znad Morza Martwego i tekstów autorów starożytnych (Social Aspects of the Qumran Community, in the Light of the Dead Sea Manuscripts and Texts of Classical Authors)* (Rozprawy Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego 29; Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1968); "Gmina z Qumran: jej dzieje, organizacja, poglądy (The Qumran Community: its History, Organization, and Views)," *Przegląd orientalistyczny* 1 (65) (1968): 15-23; 2 (66)

the Teacher of Righteousness and the messianism of the Qumran community.<sup>26</sup> Two regular forums were open for his publications on Qumran: the *Przegląd orientalistyczny* (Orientalist Review), which he edited, and the Polish review of religious studies (*Euhemer przegląd religioznawczy*). In the latter he published translations of important Qumran texts (with discussions of their problems), such as the *pesharim*,<sup>27</sup> the *Genesis Apocryphon*,<sup>28</sup> the messianic texts,<sup>29</sup> the *Melchizedek Pesher*,<sup>30</sup> and discussions on the relation of Qumran to the New Testament.<sup>31</sup> He also presented there a survey of two decades of Qumran research.<sup>32</sup> Following the publication of the *Temple Scroll* he discussed it in Polish (with translation), and in a French contribution to the *Polish Annual of Oriental Studies*.<sup>33</sup> Thereafter the *Temple Scroll* became his main focus of interest.<sup>34</sup> He published a final article in

---

(1968): 117-32; "The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Testimony of Social Ideas of the Antiquity," *Dialectics and Humanism* 4 (1979): 93-104.

<sup>26</sup> Witold J. Tyloch, "Nauczyciel Sprawiedliwości w dokumentach z Qumran (The Teacher of Righteousness in the Documents from Qumran)," *Euhemer - przegląd religioznawczy* 5 (24) (1961): 3-11; "Mesjasze gminy qumrańskiej (Messianic Figures in the Qumran Community)," *Euhemer - przegląd religioznawczy* 10 (50) (1966): 17-22; "Protest esseńskiej gminy z Qumran przeciw niesprawiedliwości społecznej (Protest of the Qumran Essene Community against Social Injustice)," *Euhemer - przegląd religioznawczy* 13 (71-72) (1969): 55-69.

<sup>27</sup> Witold J. Tyloch, "Peszer Nahum z IV groty w Qumran (The Pesher Nahum from Cave 4 of Qumran)," *Euhemer - przegląd religioznawczy* 9 (46) (1965): 65-73; "Komentarz do Psalmu 37 z Qumran (4Q pPs 37) (A Commentary on Psalm 37 [4Q pPs 37])," *Euhemer - przegląd religioznawczy* 11 (59-60) (1967): 105-12; "Komentarze (pěšārīm) z Qumran (Commentaries (pěšārīm) from Qumran)," *Euhemer - przegląd religioznawczy* 12 (67) (1968): 23-35; French trans. "L'importance historique de [sic] pěšārīm de Qumran," *Rocznik orientalistyczny* 32 (1968): 21-29; "Florilegium z IV groty Qumran (Florilegium from Cave 4 of Qumran)," *Euhemer - przegląd religioznawczy* 17 (89) (1973): 87-94.

<sup>28</sup> Witold J. Tyloch, "Aramejski apokryf Księgi Rodzaju (An Aramaic Apocryphon on the Book of Genesis)," *Euhemer - przegląd religioznawczy* 15 (81) (1971): 13-22.

<sup>29</sup> Witold J. Tyloch, "Zbiór tekstów mesjańskich z IV groty Qumran (4Q Testimonia) (A Collection of Messianic Texts from Cave 4 of Qumran)," *Euhemer - przegląd religioznawczy*, 17 (90) (1973): 25-32.

<sup>30</sup> Witold J. Tyloch, "Midrasz eschatologiczny Malkicedek (11Q Melch) (The Eschatological Melchizedek Midrash [11Q Melch])," *Euhemer-przegląd religioznawczy* 24 (117) (1980): 35-45.

<sup>31</sup> Witold J. Tyloch, "Ewangelia Markowa w Qumran? (The Gospel of Mark in Qumran?)," *Euhemer - przegląd religioznawczy* 20 (99) (1976): 15-18.

<sup>32</sup> Witold J. Tyloch, "Rękopisy znad Morza Martwego po dwudziestu latach (The Dead Sea Scrolls, after Two Decades)," *Euhemer-przegląd religioznawczy* 12 (68) (1968): 21-38.

<sup>33</sup> Witold J. Tyloch, "Zwoj świątynny (The Temple Scroll)," *Euhemer-przegląd religioznawczy* 27 (129) (1983): 3-20; 28 (131) (1984): 3-20; 28.2 (132) (1984): 11-28; 28.3 (133) (1984) 9-27; "Le 'Rouleau du Temple' et les Esséniens," *Rocznik orientalistyczny* 41 (1980): 139-43.

<sup>34</sup> See Kaperka, "The Present State of Polish Qumranology," 314.

French on Qumran literature,<sup>35</sup> and an expanded volume in Polish.<sup>36</sup> It was re-edited posthumously by Stanisław Medala, who added a long study of his own.<sup>37</sup> To mark the 45th anniversary of the Qumran Scrolls discovery Polish biblical scholars held a symposium in Czestochowa. The conference proceedings contain surveys of past studies by Zdzisław Kapera, Stanisław Medala, and Waldemar Chrostowski.<sup>38</sup> Jerzy Chmiel wrote on Qumran and Christianity,<sup>39</sup> Marian Golebiewski examined the biblical interpretation at Qumran,<sup>40</sup> and Gabriel Witaszek discussed the separatism of the sect.<sup>41</sup>

Historical problems also appeared in Polish research. Stanisław Medala published papers on the possible connection of John the Baptist to the Qumran movement and related historical and literary questions.<sup>42</sup> In an overview of the Polish research in intertestamental literature Medala included the problems of Qumran.<sup>43</sup> Jerzy Ciecielag wrote on its coins,<sup>44</sup>

<sup>35</sup> Witold J. Tyloch, "L'importance de la littérature de Qoumrân," in Witold J. Tyloch, ed., *Problemy literatur orientalnych: Materiały II Międzynarodowego Sympozjum, Warszawa-Kraków, 22-26 maja, 1972* (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1974), 183-91.

<sup>36</sup> Witold J. Tyloch, *Rękopisy z Qumran nad Morzem Martwym* (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1963), with translations of texts from cave 1 (1QS, 1QSa, 1QM, 1QH<sup>a</sup>, and 1QpHab), and the *Damascus Document*.

<sup>37</sup> Witold J. Tyloch, *Rękopisy z Qumran nad Morzem Martwym* (Warsaw: Książka i Wiedza 1997; repr. 2001). Translations of the *Temple Scroll*, 4QpNah, 4QpPsalm, 11Q13, and the *Genesis Apocryphon* were added to the volume, as well as Medala's essay "Aktualny stan badań problematyki qumrańskiej (The Present State of the Qumran Problems)," 9-78.

<sup>38</sup> Zdzisław J. Kapera, "45 lat qumranologii (45 Years of Qumranology)," *ColT* 65 (1995): 7-30; Stanisław Medala, "Kluczowe problemy w aktualnych badaniach pism qumrańskich (The Key Problems in Present Studies of the Qumran Writings)," *ColT* 65 (1995): 31-67; Waldemar Chrostowski, "45 lat qumranologii. Materiały z 32 Sympozjum Bibliotów Polskich, Czestochowa, 15-16.09.1994 (45 Years of Qumranology. 32nd Symposium of Polish Biblical Scholars, Czestochowa, Sept. 15-16, 1994)," *ColT* 65 (1995): 5-6.

<sup>39</sup> Jerzy Chmiel, "Chrześcijaństwo a Qumran (Christianity and Qumran)," *ColT* 65 (1995): 69-78.

<sup>40</sup> Marian Gołębiewski, "Żdowska i chrześcijańska interpretacja pierwszych wierszy Księgi Rodzaju. Od Qumran do Nowego Testamentu (The Jewish and Christian Interpretation of the First Verses of Genesis - from Qumran to the New Testament)," *ColT* 65 (1995): 95-109.

<sup>41</sup> Gabriel Witaszek, "Separatyzm gminy qumrańskiej (Separatism of the Qumran Community)," *ColT* 65 (1995): 79-94; "Tendencje partykularystyczne w gminie qumrańskiej (Particularist Tendencies in the Qumran Community)," *RBL* 48 (1995): 169-81.

<sup>42</sup> Stanisław Mędała, "The Alcimus of History and the Author of 1QH X-XVII," *QC* 12 (2004): 127-43.

<sup>43</sup> Stanisław Medala, "A Review of Polish Research on Intertestamental Literature in the Last Ten Years (1986-1995)," *QC* 6 (1996): 17-38; "Przegląd badań nad literaturą międzytestamentalną w Polsce w ostatnim dziesięcioleciu (1986-1995)," in Krzysztof Pilarczyk, ed., *Żydzi i judaizm we współczesnych badaniach: materiały z konferencji Kraków 21-23 XI 1995* (Wydawnictwa "Księgarni Akademickiej" 41; Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 1997), 91-104.

<sup>44</sup> Jerzy Ciecielag, "Monety z tzw. osiedli essenskich nad Morzem Martwym - próba



Stanisław Cinal evaluated the data on the Teacher of Righteousness,<sup>45</sup> Antoni Tronina contributed a discussion of Psalm 151,<sup>46</sup> and Zdzisław Kapera published a survey of Qumran research and archaeology.<sup>47</sup> A translation of the Qumran texts into Polish with a commentary was prepared by Piotr Muchowski.<sup>48</sup> A linguist, Muchowski wrote widely on Qumran Hebrew, Polish and English, among other issues also on the *Copper Scroll*.<sup>49</sup> A separate translation of the *Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice* was prepared by Paweł Zdun.<sup>50</sup> Recently Henryk Drawnel has published on the *Aramaic Levi Doc-*

---

przedstawienia aktualnego stanu badan (Coins from the So-Called Essene Settlements on the Dead Sea: A Presentation of the Current State of Research),” in Maciej Salamon and Zdzisław Jan Kapera, eds., *Studia Classica et Byzantina Aleksandro Krawczuk Oblata* (Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński Instytut Historii, 1996), 87-98; “Skarby monet z tzw. osiedli essenskich nad Morzem Martwym (Coin Hoards from the So-Called Essene Settlements at the Dead Sea),” *Filomata* 435-436 (1996): 182-91.

<sup>45</sup> Stanisław Cinal, “Nauczyciel Sprawiedliwości i początki wspólnoty esseńskiej z Qumran w świetle nowych dokumentów (The Teacher of Righteousness - The Origins of the Essene Community from Qumran according to Recent Findings),” *Przegląd Religioznawczy* 175 (1995): 49-63.

<sup>46</sup> Antoni Tronina, “Psalm 151- Poetycki midrasz do dziejów Dawida (Psalm 151 – A Poetical Midrash on David’s Deeds),” *Roczniki teologiczne* 43 (1996): 81-87.

<sup>47</sup> Zdzisław J. Kapera, “Rekopisy znad Morza Martwego: Qumrańskie kontrowersje z lat 1991-1994 (Manuscripts from the Dead Sea: Qumran Controversies of the Years 1991-1994),” *Filomata* 429-430 (1995); “Chirbet Qumran: osiedle mnichów czy villa rustica? (Hirbet Qumran: A Monastic Settlement or a Villa Rustica?),” *RBL* 49 (1996): 18-28; “Półwiecze sporu o zwoje znad Morza Martwego (Half a Century of Scrolls Controversy),” in Salamon and Kapera, *Studia Classica et Byzantina Aleksandro Krawczuk Oblata*, 237-80; “Wycieczka do qumrańskiego akweduktu (A Visit to the Qumran Aqueduct),” *Filomata* 437-438 (1996): 336-44.

<sup>48</sup> Piotr Muchowski, *Rękopisy znad Morza martwego: Qumran - Wadi Murabba'at - Masada (Manuscripts from the Dead Sea: Qumran - Wadi Murabba'at - Masada)* (Kraków: Enigma Press, 1996; 2nd rev. and enl. ed. Kraków: Enigma Press, 2000); *Komentarze do rękopisów znad Morza Martwego (Commentaries to the Dead Sea Manuscripts)* (Kraków: Enigma Press, 2000; 2nd rev. and enl. ed. Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu Seria Judaica i Hebraica; Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 2005).

<sup>49</sup> Piotr Muchowski, *Zwój miedziany (3Q15). Implikacje spornych kwestii lingwistycznych (The Copper Scroll [3Q15]. Implications of Debated Questions)* (International Institute of Ethnolinguistic and Oriental Studies, Monograph Series 4; Poznań, 1993); “Dysorthographic Form *ḥapôn* and *ʾakôn* in 3Q15,” in Zdzisław J. Kapera, ed., *Qumranica Mogilaniensis* 6 (Kraków: Enigma Press, 1992), 131-3; “Two Proposals of Readings in the Eighth Column of 3Q15,” *QC* 4 (1994): 183-5; “Język hebrajski qumrański, jego zasięg i status społeczny (Qumran Hebrew: Its Impact and Social Status),” *RBL* 51 (1998): 161-80; “Le statut de l’hébreu qumranien comme une langue parlée,” in Dariusz Długosz, ed., *Józef Tadeusz Miliński et cinquanteenaire de la découverte des manuscrits de la Mer Morte de Qumrân* (Warsaw: Centre Scientifique de l’Académie Polonaise des Sciences à Paris, 2000), 63-68; *Hebrajski qumrański jako język mówiony (Qumran Hebrew as a Spoken Language)*, (Uniwersytet im Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu Seria Językoznawstwo 23; Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 2001).

<sup>50</sup> Paweł Zdun, *Pieśni Ofiary Szawbatowej z Qumran i Masady (Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice from Qumran and Masada)* (Teksty z Pustyni Judzkiej 1; Kraków: Enigma Press,

ument, and on Qumran astronomical and wisdom texts.<sup>51</sup> He is the editor of a volume on Qumran, published in Polish with contributions by Polish and international scholars.<sup>52</sup>

### *Southern Slavic languages*

Eugen Werber (Verber), the editor and commentator of the famous *Sarajevo Haggada*,<sup>53</sup> prepared a comprehensive and fully annotated translation of the Dead Sea Scrolls into Serbian.<sup>54</sup> In a separate booklet he treated the relation of the Qumran community to Christianity; a critique of Werber's hypothesis was published in Croatian by Ivo Bagarić.<sup>55</sup>

### *Romania*

Constantin Daniel (1914-1988) should be mentioned for he extensively treated in Romanian and French the references to the Essenes in Philo's work and various New Testament sources.<sup>56</sup>

---

1996).

<sup>51</sup> Henryk Drawnel, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 2004); *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran: A New Interpretation of the Levi Document* (JSJSup 86; Leiden: Brill, 2004); "The Visions of Levi and Priestly Education in Israel," *FO* 42-43 (2006-2007): 237-40; "Moon Computation in the Aramaic Astronomical Book (1)," *RevQ* 23 (2007): 3-42.

<sup>52</sup> Henryk Drawnel, Andrzej Piwowar, eds., *Qumran: pomiędzy Starym a Nowym Testamentem* (Qumran: Between the Old and New Testament), (Analecta Biblica Lublinensia 2; Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2009).

<sup>53</sup> Eugen Werber, *The Sarajevo Haggadah* (Sarajevo: Svjetlost 1983; Belgrad: Prosveta, 1985; Sarajevo, 1999). The manuscript of the *Sarajevo Haggadah* is accompanied by a survey by Eugen Werber of the historical and theological significance of this unique manuscript.

<sup>54</sup> Eugen Werber, *Kumranski rukopisi iz pećina kraj Mrtvog mora* (The Qumran Manuscripts from the Desert of the Dead Sea Region) (Belgrad: Beogradski izdavačko-grafički zavod, 1982; 2nd ed. 1983).

<sup>55</sup> Eugen Werber, *Kršćanstvo prije Krista?* (Christianity before Christ?) (Zagreb: Liber 1972); Ivo Bagarić, *Kumran ili Betlehem: rukopisi Mrtvog mora - pokop mrtvih teorija* (Qumran or Bethlehem: The Dead Sea Scrolls – Funeral of a Dead theory) (Zagreb: Kršćanska, 1975).

<sup>56</sup> Constantin Daniel, "Vederea lui Dumnezeu in Noul Testament și teofaniile esenienilor (Views on God in the New Testament and Essene Theophanies)," *ST* 25 (1973): 188-206; "Esenienii sçi Biserica Primară (The Essenes and the Primeval Church)," *ST* 26 (1974): 707-16; "Filon din Alexandria membru de seamă al mișcării eseniene din Egipt (Philo of Alexandria, a Member of the Essene Movement in Egypt)," *ST* 27 (1975): 602-25; "Nu toate sectele iudaice au luat parte la osîndirea Mîntuitorului (Not Every Jewish Sect Participated at the Condemnation of the Redeemer)," *ST* 28 (1976): 714-25. A few articles were published in Daniel's volume *Orientalia Mirabilia* (Bucharest: Editura Științifică și Enciclo-

*Bulgaria*

Slavcho Valchanov (Slawtscho Waltschanow), from the Theological Academy St. Kliment Ohridsky, now at the Faculty of Theology of the University of Sofia, discussed the biblical canon as reflected in Ben Sira and the *Genesis Apocryphon* from Qumran. He also examined possible links between the Qumran documents and apocryphal literature preserved in Old Slavonic translations.<sup>57</sup>

*Russia (USSR)*

St. Petersburg (Leningrad), with its Institut Vostokovedeniia of the Academy of the USSR (Institute of Oriental Studies [IOS]), is a long-standing center of Oriental studies. The history of the IOS goes back to 1818 when the Asiatic Museum was founded in the city. At the time, the structure and activities of Russian science in general and of Oriental studies in particu-

---

pedica, 1976): "Din enigmele manuscriselor de la Marea Moarta (From the Enigmas of the Dead Sea Scrolls)"; "Două mentiuni revelatoare despre esenieni de la Marea Moartă (Two Revelatory Mentions on the Essenes of the Dead Sea Region)"; "Filon din Alexandria și esenienii (Philo of Alexandria and the Essenes)". See also Constantin Daniel, "O importantă menționare a esenienilor făcută de sfântul apostol Pavel (An Important Mention of the Essenes by the Apostle St. Paul)," *ST* 29 (1977): 148-59. His publications in French are the following: "Une mention des Esséniens dans un texte syriaque de l'Apocalypse," *Le Muséon* 79 (1966): 155-64; "Esséniens, zélotes et sicaires et leur mention par paronomie dans le Nouveau Testament," *Numen* 13 (1966): 88-115; "Une mention paulinienne des Esséniens de Qumrân," *RevQ* 5 (1966): 553-67; "Les 'Hérodiens' du Nouveau Testament sont-ils des Esséniens?" *RevQ* 6 (1967): 31-53; "Les Esséniens et 'ceux qui sont dans les maisons des rois' (Matthieu 11,7-8 et Luc 7,24-25)," *RevQ* 6 (1967): 261-77; "La mention des Esséniens dans le texte grec de l'épître de S. Jude," *Le Muséon* 81 (1968): 503-21; "Esséniens et eunuques, Matthieu 19:10-12," *RevQ* 6 (1968): 353-79; "'Faux prophètes': surnom des Esséniens dans le sermon sur la montagne," *RevQ* 7 (1969): 45-79; "Nouveaux arguments en faveur de l'identification des Hérodiens et des Esséniens," *RevQ* 7 (1970): 397-402; "Un Essénien mentionné dans les Actes des Apôtres: Barjésu," *Le Muséon* 84 (1971): 455-76; "Le voyant,' nom cryptique des Esséniens dans l'oeuvre de Philon d'Alexandria," *Studi di Teologia Evangelico* 9 (1977): 25-47.

<sup>57</sup> Slawtscho Waltschanow, "Der Prolog zum griechischen Sirach-buch und seine Bedeutung für die Geschichte des alttestamentlicher Kanons," *Annuaire de l'Academie de Theologie "St. Clement d'Ochrida,"* 22 (1972-1973): 389-413; "Der haggadischer Midrasch von Qumran IQGAp ar über das Leben der biblischen Stamväter. I. Das Ehepaar Abram und Sara (Col. XIX, XX)," *Annuaire de l'Academie de Theologie "St. Clement d'Ochrida,"* 21 (1973): 375-403 (in Bulgarian, with summary in German); "Die Pseudepigraphischen Texte von Qumran und die altslawischen Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments," *Annuaire de l'Academie de Théologie "St. Clément d'Ochrida,"* 23 (49) (1973-1974): 175-302 (in Bulgarian, with summary in German); "Qumran in der bulgarischen Forschung," in Kaperá, *Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 169-74.

lar were divided into two main branches, the “academic” and the “university”. Universities were responsible for undergraduate and graduate teaching whereas academic institutes conducted doctoral training and awarded doctoral degrees. All the academic activities were dominated by the Russian Academy of Sciences, the main coordinator of scientific activities in Russia. Scholars affiliated to academic institutes did not teach. Some of them had a few doctoral students (“aspirants”), three or four at the most.<sup>58</sup> Geographically, Oriental research was concentrated in two cities, Moscow and St. Petersburg (Leningrad). Most academic institutes were and still are situated in these two cities, unlike the USA and Western Europe where scientific activities are distributed among academic centers in various universities in different fields of research. The institutes in these two cities own large collections of Oriental manuscripts, which are usually researched by their own staff. Associates of such institutes were required to publish their results in Russian scholarly journals or in books edited by the Academy’s publisher, Nauka (“Science”).<sup>59</sup>

As to Oriental studies in the USSR, the Moscow Oriental Institute was geared to the modern cultures of countries in the Far East. Notably, the term “oriental” was applied to foreign countries of Asia while research of the history (ancient and modern), linguistics, literature, and ethnography of the oriental republics of the USSR was conducted in the respective national institutes as part of local cultures.

Housed in the palace of the Grand Duke, on the banks of the River Neva, the Leningrad Institute of Oriental Studies was devoted to research of ancient cultures. The Department of the Ancient Near East had two subdivisions, one for historical and one for philological studies. Research in the philological subdivision concentrated on the cultures of Mesopotamia and its northern neighbors, while the Department of Ancient History centered on history of ancient Egypt, Iran, and Palestine, incorporating research in ancient Judaism too. Neither biblical research nor any study related to ancient Judaism was supported or encouraged. In general, research fellows worked in isolation and had little opportunity for contact with colleagues

---

<sup>58</sup> Now the IOS is called the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts (IOM). A history of the Institute may be consulted on its official website: [www.orientalstudies.ru/eng/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=46&Itemid=82](http://www.orientalstudies.ru/eng/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=46&Itemid=82).

<sup>59</sup> The journal *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* (Journal of Ancient History) was founded in 1937 while the *Palestinskij Sbornik*—a periodical intended for studies on the Holy Land and Eastern Christianity—has been published since the end of the 19th century (1886). However, the publication of books was limited: no author was allowed to issue two books in the same year under his or her name.

elsewhere. Fellowships of long periods abroad were very rare, and participation at international conferences was strictly monitored.<sup>60</sup>

*Iosif Davidovich Amussin (1910-1984)*

The career of Iosif Amussin (variants of the name, according to the language of the publication, are Amoussine, Amusin), very different from those of European or American scholars, was fraught with difficulty. Born into a Jewish family in Vitebsk, he received both modern and traditional Jewish education. After graduating from high school he studied medicine, but later Greek and history at St. Petersburg University.<sup>61</sup> As a student he belonged to the literary circle of the famous poetess Anna Ahmatova, bringing Hebrew poetry to the group. However, such intellectual circles were banned under the Stalinist terror so the activity of this group was interrupted, and Amussin was expelled from the university. Some of the following years in his biography are obscure. However, in the 1930s he was able to resume his university studies, and he concluded them in 1941. He spent the following years in military service. His real scholarly career began only in the years following World War II. He was an “aspirant” (Ph.D. candidate) at the Leningrad Institute of Oriental Studies; he wrote a dissertation on Claudius’ letter about the riots in Alexandria in 41 CE (Papyrus London 1912). As he later often told me, he was careful not to mention in his work the name of “that *ethnos*” (meaning the Jews) but used neutral terms instead.<sup>62</sup> He wrote articles on *‘am ha-‘areṣ* and on the terminology of the Septuagint. From the first discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls he was keenly interested in this subject. But in this respect too he was compelled to follow a tortuous course in his scholarly career: political anti-Semitism prevailed in the early 1950s. This was the time of the “Jewish doctors’ trial,” a symbol of official anti-Semitism, which began in 1951. So Amussin was expelled from the Institute. Later on, with the help of Vasilii V. Struve, a member of the Soviet Academy, he managed to get a job as assistant to the academician Aleksandr I. Tiumen’ev. In the 1960s, when the political atmosphere became more lenient under Khrushchev, Amussin was again admitted as

<sup>60</sup> Scholars were usually allowed to participate in conferences as members of a delegation, the trip being organized by the office of the academy. Access to conferences held in the Eastern bloc was easier. Attending those organized in Western countries was quite exceptional.

<sup>61</sup> Until the end of his life he was able to cite by heart the Talmud, as well as classical authors no less than Pushkin, his favorite Russian poet.

<sup>62</sup> The thesis was defended in 1949. It was published as a journal article: “Ad Pap. Lond. 1912,” *JJP* 9-10 (1956): 169-209.

a research fellow to the Institute of Oriental Studies, where he remained until his death.

His first publications on Qumran date from the 1960s, when he published a short guide to the Dead Sea Scrolls (including the findings in Wadi Murabba'at).<sup>63</sup> The success of the book resulted in a second volume on the same theme in 1964.<sup>64</sup> This work of reference was indispensable in the USSR for information on the Scrolls, for no other data were available on the subject. Amussin's articles were strictly historical studies, never addressing theological themes such as messianism or the like.

From that decade onwards he regularly published articles in Russian as well as in French and English. He focused on historical problems in the *pesharim*. Using Flavius Josephus' writings as evidence of Jewish groups during the Second Temple period Amussin was able to identify the historical identity of groups alluded to by sobriquets in these *pesharim*.<sup>65</sup> He paid special attention to the self-designations of the community. The figure of the Teacher of Righteousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls was another focus of his interest. Considering all the texts that mention the Teacher he concluded that this was not a mythical figure but an actual historical personality, although it was impossible to identify him with any known historical individual.<sup>66</sup> These results were presented in a detailed exposition

<sup>63</sup> Iosif D. Amussin, *Rukopisy Mjortvogo moria (The Dead Sea Manuscripts)* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1960; repr. 1961).

<sup>64</sup> Iosif D. Amussin, *Nachodki u Mjortvogo moria (The Discoveries in the Dead Sea Region)* (Moscow: Nauka, 1964; repr. 1965)

<sup>65</sup> Iosif D. Amussin, "Kumranskii kommentarii na Nauma: 4QpNahum (The Qumran Commentary on Nahum)," *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* (82) (1962): 101-10; "Kumranskie kommentarii (The Qumran Commentaries)," *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* (106) (1968): 91-108; "Kumranskii kommentarii na Osiiu (4QpHos<sup>b</sup>). Istoricheskii fon i datirovka (A Qumran Commentary on Hosea [4QpHos<sup>b</sup>]. Historical background and dating)," *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* (109) (1969): 82-88; "K datirovke kumranskogo kommentariia na Osiiu (Concerning the Dating of the Qumran Commentary on Hosea)," in *Pismennye pamiatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov vostoka* 5 (1969): 3-6; "Istoricheskii fon kumranskogo kommentariia na Isaiiu (The Historical Background of the Qumran Commentary on Isaiah)," *Pismennye pamiatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov vostoka* 9 (1973): 51-55; "K istolkovaniiu kumranskogo fragmenta (4Q161): istoricheskij fon i datirovka (The Explanation of the Qumran Fragment 4Q161. Historical Background and Dating)," *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* (149) (1979): 155-63; "Otrazhenie istoricheskikh sobytij I.v. do n.e. kumranskikh kommentarijakh (4Q161; 4Q169; 4Q166) (Reflections of Historical Events of the First Century BC in Qumran Commentaries)," *Oikumene* 3 (1982): 231-53.

<sup>66</sup> Iosif D. Amussin, "'Uchitel' pravednosti' kumranskoj obshchiny (The 'Teacher of Righteousness' of the Qumran Community)," *Ezhegodnik Muzeia Istorii Religii i Ateizma* 7 (1964): 253-77; "Izbrannik boga' v kumranskikh tekstakh (The "Elect of God" in the Qumran Texts)," *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* (92) (1966): 73-79; "Kumranskij uchitel' pravednosti i apokrif 'Zavet Levii' (The Qumran Teacher of Righteousness and the Testament of Levi)," *Pismennye pamiatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov vostoka* 13 (1977): 79-82.



in his *Teksty Kumrana I*, a translation of the texts of the *pesharim* with extensive commentaries.<sup>67</sup> As an addition to this book he published a new Russian translation of the ancient accounts of the Essenes (the translator of this part was Margarita M. Elizarova. Amussin performed meticulous work in his translation and commentaries, taking into consideration all scholarly discussions published by then. As the title of his book suggests, he intended to produce other translations and commentaries of Qumran texts, but he was not destined to complete this work. Among his research themes was the connection of some Qumran texts (11QMelchizedek) to the Pseudepigrapha and Josephus as they survived in Old Slavonic versions.<sup>68</sup> He detected anti-Qumran polemics in the Talmud,<sup>69</sup> and analyzed Jewish tradition on the last Neo-Babylonian king Nabonidus.<sup>70</sup> Amussin was also interested in the nature of the Qumran organization, as well as the relation of Qumran to Christianity.<sup>71</sup> All his important results were first published in

---

See also Lea M. Gluskina, "The Teacher of Righteousness in Joseph Amussin's Studies," in Zdzisław J. Kapera, ed., *Mogilany 1989: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of Jean Carmignac: Part 2, The Teacher of Righteousness, Literary Studies* (Qumranica Mogilanensia 3; Krakow: Enigma Press, 1991), 7-21.

<sup>67</sup> Iosif D. Amussin, *Teksty Kumrana. Vypusk 1. Perevod s drevneevreiskogo i arameiskogo. vvedenie i kommentarii Pamiatniki pismennosti vostoka*, vol. XXXI, 1 (The Qumran Texts. Vol. 1. Translation from Ancient Hebrew and Aramaic, Introduction and Commentary) (Moscow: Nauka, 1971).

<sup>68</sup> Iosif D. Amussin, "Novyi tekst iz Kumrana (11QMelch) i drevnerusskaia apokrificheskaia traditsiia (A New Qumran Text and the Old Russian Apocryphal Tradition)," *Pismennye pamiatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov vostoka* 3 (1967): 37-39; "Novyi eskhatalogicheskii tekst iz Kumrana (11QMelchizedek) (A New Eschatological Text from Qumran [11QMelchizedek])," *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* (101) (1967): 45-62; "K voprosu o zavisimosti soobshcheniia o esseiakh v drevnerusskom perevode Flaviiia ot 'Filosofumeny' (The Question of Dependence of the Account on the Essenes in the Old Russian Translation of Flavius on 'Philosophumena')," Igor M. Diakonov, ed., *Drevnii Vostok i Mirovaia Kul'tura* (Moscow: Nauka, 1981), 392-406.

<sup>69</sup> Josef D. Amussin, "Spuren antiquumrätischer Polemik in der talmudischen Tradition," in Bardtke, *Qumran-Probleme*, 5-27.

<sup>70</sup> Iosif D. Amussin, "Kumranskii fragment 'Molitvy' vavilonskogo tsarja Nabonida (The Qumran Fragment of the 'Prayer' of the Babylonian King Nabunaid)," *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* (63) (1958): 104-17.

<sup>71</sup> Iosif D. Amussin, "Kumranskaja reministsentsiia u Psevdo-Kipriana? (A Qumran Reminiscence in Pseudo-Cyprian?)," *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* (139) (1977): 196-205; "Novye dannye o semeinykh otnosheniakh v kumranskoi obshchine (New Data on Family Relations in the Qumran Community)," *Pismennye pamiatniki i problemy istorii kul'tury narodov vostoka* 14 (1979): 76-79; "Magister unitatis u Psevdo-Kipriana i kumranskii moreh ba-yahad (The magister unitatis in Pseudo-Cyprian and the Qumran moreh ba-yahad)," *Problemy antichnoi istorii i kul'tury. Doklady XIV Mezhdunarodnaia konferentsia antichnikov sotsialisticheskikh stran EIRENE, Erevan 1976* (Erevan: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk Armianskoi SSR, 1979), 1:25-31; "Obshchestvennye i religioznye techeniia v Palestine vo II v. do n.e. – I v. n.e. (Social and Religious Currents in Palestine in the 2nd Century BCE–1st Century CE),"



Russian, but they later appeared in leading international journals in French or English translation.<sup>72</sup>

Publication of Amussin's comprehensive book on Qumran, presenting both archaeological findings and the textual and theological traditions of the place, was long delayed, appearing only in 1984.<sup>73</sup> Unfortunately Amussin was not allowed to make changes in the manuscript before its editing, so he was unable to insert a section on the *Temple Scroll* (first published in 1977) with which he was thoroughly familiar, and which prompted considerable changes in scholarly views of the Qumran Scrolls. This deficiency notwithstanding, Amussin's volume (*Kumranskaja obschchina*) is a first-rate survey, which has been translated into several languages.<sup>74</sup>

#### *Klavdiia B. Starkova (1915-2000)*

Klavdiia Starkova too was a member of the Leningrad Institute of Oriental Studies. She published mainly in Russian in the journals *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* and *Palestinskii Sbornik*. More fortunate than Amussin, she was allowed to publish her work from the 1950s. She chronicled scientific publications on the Qumran texts and wrote reviews on them. She also published in French and English on the tradition of the biblical manuscripts. Her book on the literary texts of the Qumran community appeared as a separate volume of the *Palestinskii Sbornik*.<sup>75</sup> It contains a thorough analysis of the literary Qumran texts (first and foremost the *Hodayot*). Starkova shows the use made by Qumran texts of ideas from the Exodus tradition, chiefly the self-image of the Qumran community as a group entering the Promised Land from the wilderness. Besides these, she contributed a series

---

in Igor M. Diakonov, Valentina D. Neronova, Irina S. Svetsitskaia, eds., *Istoriia drevnego mira* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Nauka, 1982), 2:392-406.

<sup>72</sup> For a bibliography of Amussin's works see Zdzisław D. Kapera, "A Bibliography of J. D. Amussin, Concerning the Dead Sea Scrolls," *RevQ* 14 (1989-1990): 121-6; Lea M. Gluskina, "The Life and Work of Joseph Amussin (1910-1984)," *RevQ* 14 (1989-1990): 109-20.

<sup>73</sup> Isiof D. Amussin, *Kumranskaia obschchina* (The Qumran Community) (Moscow: Nauka, 1984).

<sup>74</sup> Amussin, *Kumranskaia obschchina*. Hungarian translation: *A holt-tengeri tekercsek és a qumráni közösség* (trans. Daniel Bíró and Eva Kalmár; postscript on the author by Ida Fröhlich and Géza Komoróczy; Budapest: Gondolat, 1986). The volume has also been translated into Romanian, Polish, Slovak, and Greek.

<sup>75</sup> Klavdiia B. Starkova, *Literaturnye pomiatniki kumranskoi obschchiny* (The Literary Documents of the Qumran Community) (*Palestinskii Sbornik* 24 [87]; Leningrad: Nauka, 1973).

of communications to the *Palestinskii Sbornik*, with translations of shorter texts.<sup>76</sup>

*Margarita M. Elizarova (1938-1978)*

Margarita Elizarova obtained her university diploma in Classical languages.<sup>77</sup> Having graduated from the University of Gorki (now restored to Nizhnyi Novgorod) she continued her postgraduate work at the Leningrad Institute of Oriental Studies under the direction of Klavdiia B. Starkova.<sup>78</sup> Her dissertation is a remarkable analysis of the Egyptian sect of the Therapeutes, described by Philo, their customs and calendar, and their relation to the Qumran community. Unfortunately the book has not been translated into other languages.<sup>79</sup> Her untimely death ended her career early. Her translation and commentary of the *Genesis Apocryphon* remain unpublished.

Ilja Sh. Shifman was another fellow of the Leningrad Institute of Oriental Studies and a specialist of Phoenician civilization. Besides other studies (on the Semitic peoples mentioned by Classical authors and on Punic history) he published articles on the historical problems of the Second Temple period and on the Nabateans.<sup>80</sup> Joel P. Veinberg (Weinberg), from Daugavpils (Latvia) published on Judean society and its relation to the Temple

<sup>76</sup> Klavdiia B. Starkova, "Ustav dlja vsego obshchestva Izrailia v konechnye dni (Rule for the Whole Community of Israel at the End of Days)," *Palestinskii Sbornik* 4 (67) (1959): 17-72; "Dopol'neniia k 'Ustavu' kumranskoi obshchiny (perevod teksta i primechaniia) (Supplements to the 'Rule' of the Qumran Community [Translation and Remarks])," *Palestinskii Sbornik* 5 (68) (1960): 22-31; "K voprosu o proiskhozhdenii nazvaniia 'Syny Tsadoka' v kumranskikh tekstakh (On the Question of the Origin of the Name 'Sons of Zadok' in the Qumran Texts)," *KSINA* 86 (1965): 67-71; "Kumranskaia obshchina i vnieshnii mir (The Qumran Community and the Inner World)," *Palestinskii Sbornik* 25 (88) (1974): 67-72; "Shifrovannye astrologicheskie dokumenty iz okrestnosti Khirbet-Kumrana (4QCrypt) (Cryptic Astrological Documents from Hirbet Qumran [4QCrypt])," *Palestinskii Sbornik* 26 (89) (1978): 124-32; "Slova svetil'nye (4QDibHam) (The Words of the Luminaries [4QDibHam])," *Palestinskii Sbornik* 29 (92) (1987): 13-21.

<sup>77</sup> At the University of Gorki; she did her postgraduate studies at the IOS, where high-level Qumran studies were (and are) offered.

<sup>78</sup> She studied Syriac and Near Eastern philology with Nina V. Pigulevskaia, an associate at IOS, and a well-known expert in Syriac studies, and with Igor Diakonov, head of the department of Ancient Near Eastern Philology at IOS.

<sup>79</sup> Margarita M. Elizarova, *Obshchina terapevtov. Iz istorii esseiskogo obshchestvennogo-religioznogo dvizhenia I.s do n.e.* (The Community of the Therapeutes. From the History of the Essene Socio-Religious Movement of the 1st Century BCE) (Moscow: Nauka 1972); "Problema kalendaria terapevtov (The Problem of the Therapeutes' Calendar)," *Palestinskii Sbornik* 15 (78) (1966): 107-16.

<sup>80</sup> Ilja Sh. Shifman, *Nabateiskoe gosudarstvo i ego kultura* (The Nabatean State and its Culture) (Moscow: Nauka 1976).

in the Second Temple period, in Russian and English. He advanced a new theory concerning the post-exilic Judean community, positing that it was organized around the Temple.<sup>81</sup>

Contemporary research in Russia features several names. Igor R. Tantlevskii (Ph.D. 1993 from the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts – IOM), a professor at St. Petersburg University (Center for Bible and Judaic Studies at the Faculty of Philosophy), has published three books in Russian on the Qumran community, Enochic literature, and the early Jewish mystical tradition.<sup>82</sup> He regularly publishes in English in the *Qumran Chronicle*. Alexei Sivertzev began his career in Russia; now he works in the USA, and publishes mainly in English.<sup>83</sup> Svetlana Babkina earned her Ph.D. in 2003, defending a dissertation entitled *Sacred and Profane Time and Space in the Qumran Scrolls* under Tantlevskii's supervision. At present she teaches in Moscow, at the Russian State University for the Humanities.<sup>84</sup> Natalia Kireeva graduated from the same university.<sup>85</sup> Dmitrii Iurevich received his

<sup>81</sup> He has published his findings on post-exilic Judean society in Russian journals, but also in German ones such as *Klio*, *ZAW*, *VT*, and *Transeuphratène*. His main thesis is elaborated in his doctoral dissertation *Grazhdansko-khramovaiia obshchina v zapadnykh provintsiakh Akhemenidskoi derzhavy* (The Citizen-Temple Community in the Western Provinces of the Achaemenid Empire) (Tbilisi, 1973). It was published in German, and later on in English. See Joel P. Weinberg, "Die Agrarverhältnisse in der Bürger-Tempel-Gemeinde der Achämenidenzeit," *Acta Antiqua (Hung)* 22 (1974): 473-86; *The Citizen-Temple Community* (trans. Daniel L. Smith-Christopher; JSOTSup 151; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992). Since the 1990s he has pursued his scholarly activity in Israel.

<sup>82</sup> Igor R. Tantlevskii, *Istoriia i ideologiia Kumranskoi obshchiny* (History and Ideology of the Qumran Community) (St. Petersburg: Peterburgskoe Vostokovedenie, 1994); *Knigi Enokha* (The Books of Enoch), (Moscow-Jerusalem: Gesharim, 2000); repr. *Knigi Enokha: Sefer Ietsira. Kniga sozidaniia* (The Books of Enoch. Sepher Yezirah. The Book of Creation) (Moscow-Jerusalem: Gesharim, 2002); *Melkhisedek i Metatron v iudeiskoi mistiko-apokalipticheskoj traditsii* (Melchizedek and Metatron in the Jewish Mystic-Apocalyptic Tradition) (St. Petersburg: SPbGU, 2007).

<sup>83</sup> Alexei Sivertsev, "K voprosu o vzaimnom vlianii bogoslužebnoi i nravouchitel'noi literatury v epokhu Vtorogo Khrama (Some Notes on the Relationship between Liturgical and Wisdom Writings in Qumran and in Second Temple Literature in General)," *Vestnik evreiskogo universiteta Moskve* 21 (2000, 3): 7-24; "Sects and Households: Social Structure of the Proto-Sectarian Movement of Nehemiah 10 and the Dead Sea Sect," *CBQ* 67 (2005): 59-78; *Households, Sects, and the Origins of Rabbinic Judaism* (JSJSup 102; Leiden: Brill, 2005).

<sup>84</sup> Svetlana V. Babkina, "Predstavlenie o vremeni v kumranskoi obshchine (The Concept of Time in the Qumran Community)," *Tirosh. Trudy po iudaïke* 4 (2000): 13-23; "Khram, vozvedennyi v Kumrane (The Temple Erected in Qumran)," *Biblia. Literaturnye i lingvistichekije issledovaniia* 4 (2001): 213-32; "Nesostojavshchiisia eskhaton v Kumrane (The Delayed End of Days in Qumran Scrolls)," *Materiali deviatoi ezhegodnoi mezhdunarodnoi konferentsii po iudaïke* 2 (2002): 8-22.

<sup>85</sup> Natalia M. Kireeva, "Asketizm v ravvinisticheskom iudaizme: tselibat Moshe i praktika Talmud Tory (Ascetism in Rabbinic Judaism: Moses' Celibacy Story)," *Vestnik RGGU* 10 (2007): 62-79.

Th.D. in 2003 from the St. Petersburg Theological Academy, having written on *Messianic Prophecies of the Book of Isaiah and Their Understanding by Jews in the Second Temple Period* (on materials from the Qumran Scrolls). Presently he is pro-rector of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy and head of the Department of Biblical Studies there.<sup>86</sup>

### *Hungary*

From the 1950s onwards, interest in the discoveries of the Scrolls became keen in Hungary. The first news of the findings was reported by Andor Szörényi (1908-1969) in the Catholic journal *Vigilia*.<sup>87</sup> Szörényi was a professor of Old Testament and published a book in German on the Psalms and liturgy.<sup>88</sup> During the 1950s he published in *Vigilia* detailed reviews on the Qumran findings and research.<sup>89</sup> He was also interested in the possible influence of Essenism on Christianity. Following William Brownlee, Szörényi thought that John the Baptist might have been a mediator between the two groups.<sup>90</sup> Very early on he drew attention to the link between the *pesher* genre and the book of Daniel.<sup>91</sup> Beside Szörényi's articles, *Vig-*

---

<sup>86</sup> Dmitrii Iurevich, *Prorochestva o Khriste v rukopisiakh Miorotvogo moria* (Prophecies on Christ in the Dead Sea Scrolls) (St. Petersburg: Axion estin, 2004); "Tipologicheskii metod tolkovaniiia Sviashennogo Pisaniia v rukopisiakh Mertvogo moria i khristianskoi Tserkvy (The Typological Interpreting Method of the Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Christian Church)," in *XIV Ezhgodnaia bogoslovskaia konferentsiia PSTBI: Materialy 2004 g.*, (Moscow: PSTBI, 2005), 146-52.

<sup>87</sup> Andor Szörényi, "A Szentírás és a legújabb felfedezések (The Holy Scripture and the Latest Findings)," *Vigilia* 14 (1949): 856-63.

<sup>88</sup> Andor Szörényi, *Psalmen und Kult im alten Testament* (Budapest: Sankt Stephans Gesellschaft, 1961).

<sup>89</sup> Andor Szörényi, "A barlang kincsei (The Treasures of the Cave)," *Vigilia* 18 (1953): 74-88; "Megszólal Júda sivatagja (The Judean Desert Speaks)," *Vigilia* 21 (1956): 337-47. On research in Hungary from its inception until 1987 see Ida Fröhlich, "Recherches sur Qumrán en Hongrie. Avec une Bibliographie des recherches hongroises sur les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte," *FO* 25 (1988): 75-85.

<sup>90</sup> Andor Szörényi, "Az Úr Jézus szenvedésének története új megvilágításban (Jesus' Passion in New Light)," *Vigilia* 23 (1958): 193-203; "Esszénusok, kereszténység, társadalom (Essenes, Christianity, Society)," *Vigilia* 26 (1961): 257-67; "A holt-tengeri tekercsek és szent János evangéliuma (The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel of John)," *Vigilia* 28 (1963): 641-52. Cf. William H. Brownlee, "John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls," in Krister Stendahl, ed., *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (New York: Harper, 1957), 33-53, 252-6.

<sup>91</sup> Andor Szörényi, "Das Buch Daniel, ein kanonisierte Pescher?" in George W. Anderson, ed., *Volume du Congrès: Genève 1965* (VTSup 15; Leiden: Brill, 1966), 278-94.

*ilia* occasionally published reviews by various authors on diverse Qumran themes.<sup>92</sup>

Alexander (Sándor) Scheiber (1913-1985), an outstanding scholar in several fields and director of the Budapest Rabbinical Seminary, furnished regular reports on the editions of Qumran texts.<sup>93</sup> He kept interest in Qumran alive during the 1950s and 1960s. Although his main field of research was Genizah studies, and he was a passionate hunter of ancient and modern manuscripts, when the Scrolls were discovered he developed a lively interest in the history of the finds in the Dead Sea region.<sup>94</sup>

Another Hungarian scholar who published on problems of Qumran texts in the 1960s was István Hahn, Professor of Ancient History at the Faculty of Humanities of Eötvös Loránd University. Erudite in both Greco-Roman antiquity and biblical and rabbinic studies, he wrote on the *minim* in ancient Jewish sources.<sup>95</sup> Following the discovery of the Qumran Scrolls he returned to this theme in connection with the Qumran community. His longer study on Qumran has remained unpublished.<sup>96</sup> Hahn also launched the Hungarian edition of Millar Burrows's book on the Dead Sea Scrolls, to which he contributed a postscript.<sup>97</sup> The English edition of Burrows's book contains translations of six Qumran texts. In the Hungarian edition these texts were translated by Géza Komoróczy, Hahn's former student. Hahn published several articles on chronological questions of the Second Temple period and Qumran.<sup>98</sup> He attempted to establish the time of the

<sup>92</sup> Béla Görgényi, "A qumráni messiánizmus (Messianism in Qumran)," *Vigilia* 27 (1962): 199-205; László Gyürki, "Az 'igazság tanítója'-nak üldöztetése és az Úr Jézus kereszthalála (The Persecution of the 'Teacher of Righteousness' and the Crucifixion of the Lord Jesus)," *Vigilia* 27 (1962): 492-94; László Horváth, "Jézus, János és Kumrán (Jesus, John, and Qumran)," *Vigilia* 34 (1969): 795-801.

<sup>93</sup> Sándor Scheiber, "Review of Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin, *Megillah hišonit lib' rešit mi-m' gillot midbar-y' budab* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1956)," *Antik Tanulmányok* 4 (1957): 145-6; "Review of Yigael Yadin, *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada* (Jerusalem, 1965)," *Antik Tanulmányok* 13 (1966): 147.

<sup>94</sup> He wrote regular brief reports in Hungarian Jewish journals; see Róbert Dán, "Scheiber Sándor irodalmi munkásságának bibliográfiája (A Bibliography of S. Scheiber)," in Sándor Scheiber, *Folkór és tárgyiörténet* (Budapest: MIOK, 1977), 2:507-79 (nos. 224, 288, 302, 312, 348, 352).

<sup>95</sup> István Hahn, "Sifrē Minim," *Magyar Zsidó Szemle* 54 (1937): 267-75.

<sup>96</sup> The work was mentioned by Hahn in a private conversation. After his death I was unable to locate the manuscript.

<sup>97</sup> Millar Burrows, *A holt-tengeri tekercsek (The Dead Sea Scrolls)* (Budapest: Gondolat, 1961). Heinrich A. Stoll's book *Die Höhle am Toten Meer: Roman der Handschriften von Qumran* (Berlin: Union Verlag, 1961) was also translated: *A holt-tengeri barlangok rejtélye (The Mystery of the Dead Sea Caves)* (Budapest: Gondolat, 1967).

<sup>98</sup> István Hahn, "Zur Chronologie der Qumran-Schriften," *AcOr (Hung)* 11 (1960): 181-9; "Zwei dunkle Stellen in Josephus (Bellum Judaicum V. §311 und §142)," *AcOr* 14 (1962): 131-8.

activity of the Teacher of Righteousness on the basis of data in the *Damascus Document*. Hahn posited that the period of 490 years mentioned by the *Damascus Document* (I, 5-6) implies the chronology of Daniel 9 and of the midrash *Seder Olam Rabba*. On this basis, Hahn thought, the author of the *Damascus Document* reckoned his own time as the final period before the end of days. Hahn's other interest lay in the communality of property practiced by the Qumran community. This theme was regular and mandatory in the communist countries, for it corresponded to the context of Marxist social theory, the official ideology in those countries. Hahn assumed a process at Qumran whereby the community's property and its opposition to the Temple of Jerusalem underwent considerable change in the aftermath of the earthquake in 31 BCE. The author of the *Damascus Document* (which Hahn dated to the end of the 1st century BCE) would have witnessed these changes, when the members of the community began to engage extensively in agriculture. He concluded that it was impossible even for a small community to sustain a structure based on common property within a large surrounding society based on private property. His thesis generated a discussion in Catholic and Protestant circles. Following the 1967 Six-Day War and the break of diplomatic ties between Hungary and Israel, Hahn (formerly a rabbi) abandoned his research on Qumran and focused exclusively on Roman history.

A contemporary of Hahn, László M. Pákozdy from the Calvinist Theological Seminary of Budapest and a former pupil of Otto Eissfeldt, began publishing studies of the Qumran Scrolls. He published an overview of research done during the previous decade.<sup>99</sup> Following a field trip to Israel he issued an article in German on the archaeological finds and questions of the agrarian organization of the settlement, and the function of the nearby Buq'e'a plain and the cisterns in the community's economic life.<sup>100</sup> Another Protestant theologian, Elemér Kocsis, addressed several literary questions regarding the Qumran texts. Kocsis's field was intertestamental literature and early Christianity. He was mainly interested in the relationship between Qumran and Christianity. In his article on this theme he emphasized the disparity of the two movements.<sup>101</sup>

<sup>99</sup> László M. Pákozdy, "Egy évtized Qumrán-kutatás (A Decade of Qumran Studies)," *Theológiai Szemle* 3 (1960): 72-78.

<sup>100</sup> László M. Pákozdy, "Die wirtschaftliche Hintergrund der Gemeinschaft von Qumran," in Bardtke, *Qumran-Probleme*, 269-91.

<sup>101</sup> Elemér Kocsis, "A zsidó messianizmus és a politikai kérdés Jézus életében (Jewish Messianism and Politics in Jesus' Life)," *Theológiai Szemle* 3 (1960): 12-21; "A Jézus-kutatás régi és új útjai. Politikai ellentétek Jézus és a qumrániak között (Old and New Tracks in Jesus



For quite a while only the six Qumran texts that appeared as a supplement to Burrows's book were known in Hungarian translation. Some information on Qumran studies was provided by the Hungarian edition of Amussin's survey on the Qumran community.<sup>102</sup> In 1998 two translations appeared in separate volumes: one by Géza Komoróczy, a retranslation of the six texts of Burrows's volume, together with the translation of a Qumran fragment from the *Damascus Document*. The other was Ida Fröhlich's comprehensive translation of the texts of Qumran, including all the major texts and most of the smaller ones. A revised and extended second edition appeared in 2000.<sup>103</sup> Translations of selected texts were published by Jonatán S. Szénási (4QMMT)<sup>104</sup> and Géza Xeravits (*pesharim*). The latter also published studies on Qumran literature.<sup>105</sup> Ida Fröhlich wrote in Hungarian on the history of the Qumran discoveries;<sup>106</sup> the history,<sup>107</sup> traditions and worldview of the Qumran community;<sup>108</sup> *1 Enoch* and the traditions on

---

Research. Political Controversies between Jesus and Qumran),” *Theológiai Szemle* 5 (1962): 143-8; “Mi történt a “két szövetség” közt? Az Újszövetség történeti problémáiból (What Happened between the Two Covenants? Some Historical Problems in the New Testament),” *Theológiai Szemle* 7 (1964): 146-55.

<sup>102</sup> Amussin, *A holt-tengeri tekercsek és a qumráni közösség*.

<sup>103</sup> Géza Komoróczy, *Kiáltó szó a pusztában: a holt-tengeri tekercsek* (A Voice Cries in the Desert: The Dead Sea Scrolls) (Budapest: Osiris, 1998); Ida Fröhlich, *A qumráni szövegek magyarul* (The Texts of Qumran in Hungarian Translation, with Introduction and Notes) (StudOr 1; Piliscsaba: PPKE, 1998; 2d enl. ed., Piliscsaba-Budapest: PPKE-Szent István Kiadó, 2000).

<sup>104</sup> Jonatán S. Szénási, “Kumráni töredék fordítása (Translation of a Qumran Fragment),” *Múlt és Jövő* 4 (1999): 2-5.

<sup>105</sup> Géza Xeravits, *A qumráni közösség szentíráserőtelmezése: folyamatos peserek: fordítás és kommentár* (Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Community: The Continuous Peshers. Translation and Commentary) (Pápa: PRTA, 2001); *Átalakuló hagyományok* (Altering Traditions) (Budapest: L'Harmattan, 2003).

<sup>106</sup> Ida Fröhlich, “Írányzatok a holt-tengeri tekercsek kutatásában (New Research on the Dead Sea Scrolls),” *Világosság* 28 (1987): 751-54; “Felfedezések és botrányok a holt-tengeri tekercsek körül (The Dead Sea Scrolls – Discoveries and Scandals),” *Múlt és Jövő* 4 (1993): 13-17.

<sup>107</sup> Ida Fröhlich, “Qumrán - egy közösség születése (Qumran - The Birth of a Community),” *Vigília* 56 (1991): 432-9; “A Szentírás Qumránban (Bible and canon in Qumran),” *Egyház és Világ* 5 (1994): 5-8; “Világi hatalom és vallási közösségek a Makkabeus-felkelés után (Secular Power and Religious Communities Following the Maccabean Uprising),” György Benyik, ed., *Világi közösség, vallási közösség: Szegedi Nemzetközi Bibliikus Konferencia, Szeged 2003. augusztus 31 – szeptember 3* (Szeged: JATEPress, 2004), 95-106.

<sup>108</sup> Ida Fröhlich, “Izajás Qumránban (Isaiah in Qumran),” in György Benyik, ed., *A messiási kérdés. Szegedi Bibliikus Konferencia 1995* (Szeged: JATEPress 1997), 15-24; “Pseudepigrafikus irodalom és qumráni ‘szektás’ irodalom (‘Pseudepigraphic’ and ‘Sectarian’ in Qumran),” in József Zsengeller, ed., *Hagyomány és előzmény. Intertestamentális tanulmányok* (Pápa: Pápai Református Teológiai Akadémia, 1999), 65-76; “Történelem - ahogyan Qumránból látták (History from a Qumran Perspective),” in Mihály Ivicz and András Schlett, eds., *Tanulmánykötet Botos Katalin 60. születésnapjának tiszteletére* (Budapest: Books in



the Watchers at Qumran,<sup>109</sup> and on various texts of the Qumran community.<sup>110</sup>

---

Print, 2001), 116-26; "Tisztaság és szentség Qumránban, a narratív szövegek tükrében (Purity and Holiness in Qumran as Reflected in Narrative Texts)," *Proceedings of Szegedi Bibliikus Konferencia 2000* (Szeged: JATEPress, 2001), 82-95; "A szent és a tisztátalan. Ószövetségi és hellénisztikus kori zsidó törvények (From the Holy to the Unclean. Ritual Purity in the Old Testament and in Hellenistic Judaism)," *Iskolakultúra* 12 (2002): 27-39.

<sup>109</sup> Ida Fröhlich, "Bukott angyalok (Fallen angels)," *Protestáns Szemle* 56 (III. új) (1994): 248-66; "Mítosz és logosz az ókori zsidó gondolkodásban ('Mythos' and 'Logos' in Jewish Thought in Antiquity)," in Ferenc L. Lendvai, ed., *Társadalomtudomány és filozófia. Tanulmányok (Tények és Érvek)* (Budapest: Áron Kiadó, 1994), 217-34; "Újraírt szövegek (Rewritten Texts)," in Ida Fröhlich, ed., *Az utókor hatalma. Újraírt szövegek* (Kréné 4; Budapest: Új mandátum, 2005), 7-36.

<sup>110</sup> Ida Fröhlich, "Cion sziklája egy qumráni szövegben: 4Q522 (The Mount of Zion in a Qumran Text: 4Q522)," *Múlt és jövő* 4 (1993): 5-12; "Típológikus nevek és ragadványnevek a qumráni közösség irodalmában (Typological Names and Nicknames in the Literature of the Qumran Community)," *Névtani értesítő* 25 (2003): 109-15; "Igaz Tanító. Egy elnevezés metaforikus hátteréhez (Righteous Teacher. The Metaphoric Background of a Name)," in Sándor Bazsányi and Ferenc Horkay Hörcher, eds., *Útjaidon. Ünnepi kötet Jelenits István 70. Születésnapjára* (Budapest: Magyar Piarista Rendtartomány – PPKÉ BTK – Új Ember Kiadó, 2002), 40-44; "Efráim és Menase. Nevek a qumráni közösség hagyományában (Ephraim and Menashe. Names in the Tradition of the Qumran Community)," in József Szécsi, ed., *Keresztény-zsidó teológiai évkönyv 2002* (Budapest: Keresztény-Zsidó Társaság, 2002), 21-26; "Ábrahám bánata. Érzelmek és törvény egy ókori Genesis-kommentárban (Abraham's Sorrow. Emotions and the Mosaic Law in an Ancient Commentary on Genesis)," in Fodor György, Tarjányi Béla, eds., *Akik az igazságra oktattak sokakat ... A 65 éves Rózsa Huba köszöntése* (Budapest: Szent István Társulat, 2005), 92-97; "Tóbit könyve – qumráni háttérben (Tobit against the Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls)," in Géza Xeravits and József Zsengellér, eds., *Tóbit/Tóbiás könyve: szöveg, hagyomány, teológia* (Deuterocanonica 2; Pápa-Budapest : PRITA-L'Harmattan 2005), 77-100.

## INDICES



## SOURCES

### *Hebrew Bible*

Pentateuch		19:9	357
	5, 10, 27, 60, 63, 95, 108, 137, 139, 144, 214, 241, 252, 257, 263, 264, 269, 275, 290, 295, 305, 335, 343, 348, 400	Deuteronomy	62, 321, 327, 386, 498
– Samaritan	63	2:14	286
		5	309
		6:7	338
		7:9	339
		10:17	339
		11:13-21	338
Genesis		23:15b	350
	163, 316, 382, 383, 386, 427, 437, 445, 446, 447, 482, 555, 627	23:24	356
		29:18	440
		31:19-21	295
1:27	354	Song of Moses	309
2:3	338		
6:1-2	328	Joshua	
6:1-4	328		
6:1-14	328	15:61-62	301, 508 410, 416
17:1	294	Judges	62
34	181		
37-50	185, 605		
Exodus		Samuel	302, 320
	53, 62, 445, 446, 447		
10:21-23	286	1 Samuel	306
20:11	338	11	310
21:1	358	Song of Hannah	310
35-40	65		
Leviticus		2 Samuel	
	61, 301, 386, 400, 445, 446, 447, 498	14-15	60
22:21	264	1-2 Kings	62
Numbers			
	385, 445, 446, 447		
15:37-41	338		
18:21	350		

1 Kings		Malachi	
8:23	339		269, 493
8:35-36	338		
2 Kings		Psalms	
20:1-11	311		10, 57, 59, 317, 318, 383, 386, 490, 498, 593, 638
Later Prophets		25: 4-10	338
	317	37:7	354
Isaiah		41:14	339
	57, 211, 269	55:17-18	336
6:3	340, 341, 342	68:18	341
10:34-11:1	41	72:19	339
29:22-23	342	73:2-12	284
38	311	89:27	440
40:3	252, 269	89:53	339
58:13	338	91	498
– Qumran scrolls of		99:3, 5, 9	340
307		103	339
Jeremiah		106:48	339
	10, 61, 99, 301, 303, 327, 420, 440, 479	122	428
7:29	303	135	446
10	311	139:12	292
12:1-2	284	Job	
29-52	255		169
		28:3	292
Ezekiel		32:13	167
	99, 303, 327, 386	40.32	440
3:12	340, 342	Canticles	
3:12-13	341		61, 301
4:4-5	288	Esther	
11:18-20	338		160, 169, 184, 185, 186, 418, 419
37:1-14	439	3:7	160
Minor Prophets		Daniel	
	53, 61, 62, 385, 405, 411, 488, 493, 587		170, 171, 173, 179, 194, 281, 290, 452, 453, 493, 638
Hosea		2-5	171
	605	2:44	337
6:1-3	338	4	170, 171, 172
Micah		5	171
	493	6:11	336
Habakkuk		7:13	291
	284	7:14	337
1:13	289	9	335, 640
2:2		9:24	287, 288
		9:4	339
		11:41-12:1	242

Ezra		1:5-11	335
	273, 286, 605	9:32	339
9:6-15	335	9:4-37	335
		10	637
Nehemiah			
	605	1-2 Chronicles	
1:5	339		62, 312, 426

*Ancient Bible Versions*

Peshitta		Targum Jonathan	
	169, 508		193, 377
Targum Onqelos			
	193, 376		

*Apocrypha*

Tobit		6:14-15	81
	80, 87, 159, 169,	6:30-31	81
	182-184, 184, 480	35:22-23	337
8:5	339	39-44	386
13:2, 19	339	45:25	82
		50:20	335
1-2 Maccabees		51:13-20, 30	81, 83
	423		
1 Maccabees		– Masada Scroll	369
	173		
8	290		
9:73	397	Letter of Jeremiah	
14:41	291		53
Ben Sira		Baruch	
	81, 111, 269, 371,	1:1-3:8	255
	374, 375, 427, 508,		
	586, 630, 639	Prayer of Azaria	
1:19-20	81	31	341

*New Testament*

New Testament			444, 452, 458, 466,
	14, 36, 42, 66, 155,		472, 474, 480, 499,
	156, 166, 174, 175,		502, 508, 509, 514,
	177, 183, 197, 198,		529, 530, 531, 533,
	199, 201, 202, 204,		534, 535, 539, 541,
	211, 212, 213, 214,		546, 551, 558, 561,
	225, 230, 249, 250,		562, 563, 566, 567,
	359, 412, 420, 422,		569, 571, 572, 611,
	425, 429, 438, 442,		612, 626, 629

Gospels, synoptic	81, 85, 214, 411, 444	Acts	214, 480, 630 441
		1:5-26	
Matthew	230, 427	Paul, Letters of	251, 277, 486
5:3-12	427		
9:35	336	Romans	
11	210	7:23	440
11:2-5	210		
12:11-12	214	1 Corinthians	
12: 6, 41-42	291	11:10	155
13:34	336		
18:15-17	214	2 Corinthians	
27:46	175	4:6	439
Mark		Galatians	
	554		214
1:15a	440		
1:21	336	Hebrews	
6:2	336		214, 251
6:52-53	429, 554	7:1	155
Luke			
	175, 502	1 John	
1:15-21, 31	336	4:6	201
1:32-35	213		
7:22	210	Johanine literature	
11:2	439, 440		201, 202
11:33-36	439		
John		Johanine Letters	
	35, 81, 85, 200, 202, 204, 251, 411, 533, 535, 536, 545, 559, 561, 563		202
1:42	166	Jude	
6:59	336		630
12:36	201	Revelation	
18:20	336	22:16	211, 214 439
		<i>Pseudepigrapha</i>	
Apocalypse of Abraham		2 Baruch (Syriac)	
	438, 439		276
Apocalypse of Moses		1 Enoch	
	75		8, 10, 49, 67, 75, 76, 80, 81, 90, 91, 92, 93, 109, 158, 177- 180, 180, 201, 241, 252, 272, 281, 315,
Ascension of Moses			
	252		



	325, 328, 378, 411, 413, 414, 417, 429, 436, 446, 452, 469, 473, 478, 641	2 Enoch	291 293
1-36	91, 177, 608	4 Ezra	
6-11	91, 328		245, 276, 286
37-71	178, 469	5:44	286
39:10-14	340	13	291
39:12-13	340		
46	291		
58:1-6	293	Joseph and Aseneth	
72-82	93, 328		438, 439
74	339		
81-82	177	Jubilees	
81-108	91		8, 10, 49, 67, 75, 80, 81, 83, 84, 94, 95, 96, 106, 109, 111, 158, 182, 190, 201, 241, 252, 269, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 281, 295, 315, 316, 322, 323, 324, 327, 355, 386, 411, 418, 419, 428, 436, 446, 452
85-90	273, 287		294
89:59-90:7	269	1:15, 23-24	294
90:38	473	1:4	295
91-108	480	1:8-14	295
91:11-17	93	2:31-32	338
93:1-10	93	6	325
93:10	295	6:2	160
100	429	6:2-3	160
103	429	7	325
105	429	7:3-4	160
		10:10	294
– Enochic Literature	184, 637	15:25-32	294
		17-18	324
– Enochic corpus	163	23	274
		30-32	98
– Book of the Watchers		30:17-18	356
1-36	92, 328	32:9	356
– Book of Parables		Lamech, Book of	157
37-71	92, 439		
		Life of Adam and Eve	75, 76
– Astronomic Book			
72-82	92, 93, 269	Martyrdom of Isaiah	436, 438
– Book of Dreams		Paralipomena of Jeremiah	75
83-90	92		
– Animal Apocalypse			
85-90	93, 327		
– Letter of Enoch			
91-105	92, 93		
– Apocalypse of Weeks			
91,93	93		

Psalms, Five Syriac	493	Testament of Levi	8, 80, 97, 181, 252, 272, 417, 429, 446, 633
Psalms of Solomon	452, 542	Testament of Job	438
Pseudo-Jeremianic, works	80	Testament of Moses	441
Sibylline Oracles	452	Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs	80, 97, 98, 109, 180, 201, 241, 424, 438, 452
Testament of Abraham	441		
12-13	291		
Testament of Abraham (Greek)	440		

*Qumran Scrolls and Related Texts*

Damascus Document	II, 14-15	4
2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 14, 17,	II, 14 - VI, 1	424
19, 26, 27, 34, 101,	II, 16 - III, 12	286
102, 103, 104, 105,	III, 14-15	335
106, 107, 108, 109,	IV, 2-3	4
110, 111, 112, 113,	IV, 20-V, 6	108, 120
114, 115, 116, 117,	IV, 21	354
118, 119, 120, 121,	V, 6-11	4
122, 123, 127, 128,	V, 6-7	109
129, 130, 131, 134,	V, 7-11	109, 120
137, 139, 144, 145,	VI, 11-14	424
146, 148, 152, 247,	VI, 2 - VIII, 3	424
253, 257, 259, 260,	VI, 5	4, 252
266, 269, 273, 275,	VII, 9-VIII, 2	424
277, 278, 287, 328,	VIII, 16	270
346, 354, 358, 366,	VIII, 3-19	424
367, 369, 396, 419,	IX, 1	115
420, 424, 437, 452,	IX, 16-23	115
460, 461, 462, 477,	IX, 17-22	127
478, 484, 485, 486,	IX, 8-16	115
491, 540, 583, 586,	X, 10-11	119, 120
598, 611, 615, 616,	X, 14-17	119
627, 640, 641	X, 14-XI, 18	109
I-VIII	X, 20-21	392
I, 11	XI, 21-XII, 1	336
I, 12	XII, 11-15	130
I, 13	XII, 11-18	109
I, 18-19	XII, 13-14	120
I, 5-6	XII, 14-15	354
I, 9	XIII, 4-7	108, 119
II, 11-12	XIII, 7-12	396

XIII, 8	244	123, 125, 139, 148,
XIV, 3, 9	269	152, 200, 203, 240,
XV, 1-3	115	244, 245, 246, 250,
XVI, 2-4	95	266, 319, 351, 396,
XVI, 3-4	276	408, 451, 460, 462,
XVI, 4-6	294	466, 476, 478, 484,
XVI, 6-12	109	486, 489, 524, 533,
XVI, 6-14	115	547, 598, 607, 614
XVI, 6-9	356	
XIX-XX	472, 479	
XIX, 38-XX, 34	424	– manuscripts
XIX, 5-14	424	230
XX, 14	286	
1QIsaiah <sup>a</sup>		1QS(Community Rule)
	50, 51, 52, 79, 190,	2, 3, 6, 13, 17, 27,
	200, 223, 240, 246,	31, 33, 34, 35, 36,
	247, 298, 300, 302,	47, 48, 51, 60, 79,
	304, 311, 366, 367,	122, 123, 125, 139,
	368, 369, 403, 411,	145, 148, 152, 200,
	450, 465, 488, 508,	203, 240, 244, 245,
	514, 555, 604	246, 250, 266, 278,
		281, 282, 319, 345,
		347, 348, 350, 351,
		367, 368, 396, 408,
		424, 451, 455, 460,
		462, 466, 473, 476,
		478, 484, 486, 489,
		502, 506, 524, 533,
		547, 598, 606, 607,
		613, 614, 623, 627
1QpHab(pesherHabakkuk)		I-II
	2, 4, 5, 13, 38, 40,	34
	47, 51, 79, 200, 240,	I, 1-9
	241, 251, 278, 289,	I, 16-II, 25
	290, 316, 317, 367,	I, 7-9
	373, 403, 438, 444,	I, 18
	450, 451, 465, 467,	II, 9
	474, 485, 488, 493,	III-IV
	514, 606, 623, 627	34
I, 13	4	III, 1-4
I, 14	39	III, 9
II, 1	4	III, 13-IV, 14
II, 5-10	290	III, 13-IV, 26
II, 7	294	III, 14-IV, 26
V, 10	4	III, 15-IV, 1
VII, 1-5	289, 290	III, 17-IV, 1
VII, 13-14	283	IV, 15-18
VII, 2, 12	294	IV, 17
VIII, 8-13	290	IV, 18-19
IX, 4-7	4, 290	IV, 18-26
X, 1-5	290	IV, 2-14
XI, 4-8	4	IV, 6-8, 12-14
XI, 4-9	248	5-7
XI, 6	4, 252	V, 1, 21-22
XII, 10-XIII, 4	290	V, 2-3
XII, 7-10	4, 290	V, 7-12
Community Rule		136
	3, 6, 13, 27, 31, 33,	
	34, 35, 36, 47, 48,	

VI, 1-8	36		443, 447, 455, 477,
VI, 11-12	396		489, 496, 501, 533,
VI, 13-23	441		539, 581, 606, 607,
VI, 18-20	394		625, 627
VII, 10-12	350, 451	I, 2, 4	241
VII, 13	350	I, 2	282, 286
VIII, 1	203	I, 3	287
VIII, 1-2, 12-16	282	XII, 16	337
VIII, 11-12	289	XIII, 2-6	293
VIII, 12-16	283	XIV, 12-14	336
VIII, 13-15	252	XIV, 8-10	294
VIII, 13-16	9	XIX, 8	337
VIII, 14-16	269		
IX, 11	291		
IX, 12-14, 19-23	283		
IX, 19-20	269	1QH <sup>a</sup> (Hodayot)	
IX, 3-6	264		1, 6, 31, 43, 44, 47,
IX, 4-5	335		48, 79, 206, 207,
X-XI	34		211, 228, 238, 240,
X, 1-3, 10	336		243, 244, 245, 246,
X, 1-3	336		250, 266, 278, 281,
X, 1-5	411		285, 299, 318, 367,
X, 1-8	335, 336		427, 434, 444, 450,
X, 10	336, 338		455, 502, 506, 540,
X, 13	338		546, 547, 578, 581,
X, 13-14	336		583, 584, 587, 591,
X, 14-17	336		592, 597, 613, 622,
X, 19	283		623, 627, 635
XI 5	439	V, 12-VI, 18	427
XI, 7-8	341	V, 24-27	283
XI, 21-22	451	VII, 27-30	284
		VII, 32-34	284
		VIII, 16-21	338
1QSa (Congregation Rule)		IX	283
	17, 31, 36, 123, 145,	IX, 11-15	283
	146, 213, 244, 278,	IX, 16-22	284
	282, 347, 367, 368,	IX, 18	289
	411, 576, 606, 627	X-XVII	627
I, 11	37	X, 22-32	450
II, 11	576	X, 22-39	284
II, 11-22	36, 427	X, 25-26	284
		XI, 20-33	450
1QSa (Blessings Rule)		XI, 22-24	341
	31, 37, 244, 278,	XIII, 7-17	450
	282, 293, 367, 368,	XIII, 22-XV, 8	450
	591	XIV, 15-16	341
		XV, 37 - XVI, 4	427
1QM (War Scroll)		XVI, 5-XVII, 36	450
	6, 17, 40, 42, 47, 48,	XVIII, 5-9	285
	79, 123, 206, 238,	XIX, 13-17	341
	240, 241, 242, 244,	XX, 27-34	285
	245, 246, 250, 275,	XX, 7-14	335, 336
	278, 281, 289 299,	XXI, 13-16	293
	345, 367, 368, 414,	XXXV, 35-XXXVI, 10	206

1QH <sup>b</sup> (Hodayot)	43, 229, 427	1Q26(Instructions)	89
1Q6(Judg)	428	1Q27(Mysteries)	
1Q7(Samuel)	302	1 i 3-4	292
1Q8(Isaiah <sup>b</sup> )	50, 51, 52, 238, 299, 300, 304, 593	1 i 5-7	337
1Q17(Jubilees <sup>a</sup> )	80, 83, 84	1Q29(Apocryphon of Moses?)	584
1Q19(Noah)	80	New Jerusalem	420, 423, 497, 550
1Q20(Genesis Apocryphon)	58, 75, 77, 79, 156, 157-164, 161, 164, 191, 192, 231, 239, 246, 247, 273, 274, 316, 324, 325, 376, 453, 626, 630, 636	1Q32(New Jerusalem?)	157
0	161	1Q34	446
I	161	1Q34bis	335, 446
II	160	2Q13(Jeremiah)	303
II, XIX-XXII	239, 324	2Q15(Job)	420
V	161	2Q18(Ben Sira)	81
X	160, 325	2Q22,4Q371-4Q373(Narrative and Poetic Composition)	45
X, 14	160	2Q26(Giants)	177
XII	159, 325	3Q15(Copper Scroll)	31, 230, 368, 370, 388, 407, 415, 420, 429, 442, 455, 456, 457, 475, 476, 482, 524, 579, 580, 603, 628
XVI-XVII	164	VI	388
XIX-XXII	160	VIII	628
XX	159	4QPentateuch	333
XXI	161	4QSamuel	333, 577
XXI, 33	160		
1Q21(Aramaic Levi Document)	157, 180, 326, 429		
Giants, Book of	75, 91, 92, 480		
1Q23-24(Giants)	177		
1Q23(Giants <sup>a</sup> )	157		
1Q24(Giants <sup>b</sup> ?)	157		

4Q1(Genesis-Exodus <sup>a</sup> ) 432	4Q88(Psalms <sup>f</sup> ) VII-X 423, 419
4Q11(paleoGenesis-Exodus <sup>l</sup> ) 61	4Q99(Job <sup>a</sup> ) 230
4Q22(paleoExodus <sup>m</sup> ) 57, 61, 63, 65	4Q100(Job <sup>b</sup> ) 230
4Q27(Numbers <sup>b</sup> ) 62	4Q110(Qoheleth <sup>b</sup> ) 428
4Q41(Deuteronomy <sup>n</sup> ) 57	4Q119(LXXLeviticus <sup>a</sup> ) 57
4Q44(Deuteronomy <sup>q</sup> ) 57, 309	4Q121(LXXNumbers) 57
4Q45(paleoDeuteronomy <sup>r</sup> ) 61	4Q128-4Q157 406
4Q47(Joshua <sup>a</sup> ) 310	4Q156-4Q157(Targums) 406
4Q49(Judges <sup>a</sup> ) 310	4Q156(TargumLeviticus) 429
4Q50a(Judges <sup>c</sup> ) 428	4Q157(Targum of Job) 157, 193, 194, 305, 437, 493, 495, 496, 498, 603
4Q51-4Q53(Samuel) 16	4Q158, 4Q364-4Q367(Reworked Penta- teuch) 49, 65, 68, 76, 309
4Q51(Samuel <sup>a</sup> ) 57, 58, 61, 63, 302, 306, 307, 310, 320, 428, 527, 588, 605	4Q158(Reworked Pentateuch <sup>a</sup> ) 68, 317, 319
4Q52(Samuel <sup>b</sup> ) 57, 63, 302	4Q159(Ordinances <sup>a</sup> ) 123
4Q57(Samuel <sup>c</sup> ) 61	4Q160(Visions of Samuel) 333
4Q70(Jeremiah <sup>a</sup> ) 303	4Q161(pesherIsaiah <sup>a</sup> ) 633
4Q71(Jeremiah <sup>b</sup> ) 311	4Q166(pesherHosea <sup>a</sup> ) ii 16 335
4Q72a(Jeremiah <sup>d</sup> ) 311	4Q166-4Q167(pesherHosea) 587, 593

4Q167(pesherHosea <sup>b</sup> )	4Q201-4Q212	
633		177
4Q169(pesherNahum)	4Q201-4Q202	
40, 250, 453, 456,		328
458, 459, 593, 597,		
614, 626, 627, 633	4Q201(Enoch <sup>a</sup> )	
3-4 i 5-8		446
3 1-8		
	4Q203(Giants <sup>a</sup> )	
4Q171(pesherPsalms <sup>a</sup> )		419
39, 354, 548, 597		
626	4Q204-4Q207(Enoch)	
1-10 i 25-27		328
	4Q204(Enoch <sup>c</sup> )	
4Q173(pesherPsalms <sup>b</sup> )		92
39		
4Q173a	4Q205-4Q206(Enoch)	
446		92
4Q174(Florilegium)	4Q205(Enoch <sup>d</sup> )	
39, 474, 547, 587,		92
593, 625	4Q206(Enoch <sup>c</sup> )	
4Q175(Testimonia)		92, 419
19, 20, 40, 155, 626	4Q207(Enoch <sup>f</sup> )	
4Q177(Catena A)		429
547, 587, 593	4Q208-4Q211(Enoch Astronomy)	
4Q180(Pesher on the Periods)		328, 525
275, 287, 317	4Q208-4Q209(Enoch Astronomy)	
4Q181		419
275, 287	4Q212(Enoch <sup>g</sup> )	
4Q184(Wiles of the Wicked Woman)		328
603	4Q213-4Q214(Aramaic Levi Document)	
4Q186(Horoscope)		8, 45, 97, 98, 180-
441, 636		182, 182, 192, 252,
4Q196(Tobit <sup>a</sup> )		269, 272, 274, 326,
87, 419		418, 628
4Q196-4Q199(Tobit)	4Q213-4Q214b(Aramaic Levi Document)	
182		180
4Q196-4Q200(Tobit)	4Q213(Aramaic Levi Document <sup>a</sup> )	
87, 182		181, 326, 429
4Q200(Tobit <sup>c</sup> )	4Q213a(Aramaic Levi Document <sup>b</sup> )	
182		326
	1-2	446



4Q213b-4Q214(Aramaic Levi Document)	429	4Q243(Pseudo-Daniel <sup>a</sup> )	16 4 173
4Q213b(Aramaic Levi Document <sup>e</sup> )	326	4Q245(Pseudo-Daniel <sup>c</sup> )	172, 173
4Q214(Aramaic Levi Document <sup>d</sup> )	326	4Q246(Apocryphon of Daniel)	174, 175-177, 177, 202, 205, 213, 428, 429, 615
4Q214a(Aramaic Levi Document <sup>e</sup> )	326	i 2	176
		i 6	176
4Q214b(Aramaic Levi Document <sup>f</sup> )	326	ii 6	176
		ii	176
4Q215(Hebrew Naphtali Text)	80, 97, 98, 418	4Q248(Historical Text A)	267
4Q215a(Time of Righteousness)	439, 440, 615	4Q249(Midrash Sefer Moshe)	419
4Q216(Jubilees <sup>a</sup> )	94	4Q251(Halakha A)	148, 358
I 10-12	295		
II, 4-17	295	4Q252(Commentary on Genesis A)	474, 615
4Q219(Jubilees <sup>d</sup> )	39	4Q252-4Q254(Commentaries)	418
4Q225-4Q227(Pseudo-Jubilees)	324, 333, 446	4Q253(Commentary on Genesis B)	474
4Q225(Pseudo-Jubilees <sup>a</sup> )	324	4Q253a(Commentary on Malachi)	474
2 i			
4Q238(Judgement)	419	4Q254(Commentary on Genesis C)	474
4Q242(Prayer of Nabonidus)	169-172, 172, 429, 550, 624	4Q254a(Commentary on Genesis D)	474
4Q242-4Q245	418	4Q255-4Q264(Community Rule)	35, 418, 473, 593
4Q242-4Q246	169	4Q256(Community Rule <sup>b</sup> )	35
4Q243-4Q245(Pseudo-Daniel)	172	4Q257(Community Rule <sup>c</sup> )	35
4Q243-4Q244(Pseudo-Daniel)	173	4Q258(Community Rule <sup>d</sup> )	27, 35

4Q259(Community Rule <sup>c</sup> ) 35		4Q286-4Q290 (Berakhor) 341
4Q264a(Halakha B) 148		4Q286(Berakhor <sup>a</sup> ) 2 4 341 7 i 7 341 7ii 293
4Q265(Rules) 148		4Q287(Berakhor <sup>b</sup> ) 2 8 341 3 1 341
4Q266-4Q273(Damascus Document) 146, 147, 262, 345, 356, 418, 584, 591		4Q291 419
4Q266(Damascus Document <sup>a</sup> ) 5 ii 5-7 152 6 i 14-16 356 11 293		4Q292 419
4Q267(Damascus Document <sup>b</sup> ) 160		4Q293 419
4Q269(Damascus Document <sup>d</sup> ) 583 8 ii 5 358		4Q298(Words of the Maskil) 418 3-4 ii 2-10 292 3-4 ii 4-10 295
4Q272(Damascus Document <sup>e</sup> ) 1 ii 3-7 356		4Q299-4Q301(Mysteries) 292, 436
4Q274, 4Q276-4Q278(Tohorot) 148		4Q299(Mysteries <sup>a</sup> ) 418
4Q275(Ceremony) 418		1 03-04 292 3 ii 5 292
4Q277(Tohorot B <sup>b</sup> ) 1 ii 2 358		4Q300(Mysteries <sup>b</sup> ) 418 1 ii 4 292 1 ii 3 292 3 2 292 3 3-4 292 3 4-6 337
4Q279(Four Lots) 418, 441, 446		4Q301(Mysteries <sup>c?</sup> ) 418
4Q280(Curses) 293, 419		4Q302-4Q305 418
4Q284 148		4Q303-4Q305(Meditation on Creation) 229, 482
4Q284a 148		4Q303 1-2 292
4Q285(Sefer ha-Milhamah) 41, 210, 476, 593, 607 8 293		

4Q306(Men who Err)	1, 2, 1-12	440
229, 482		
i 2	4Q370(AdmonFlood)	88
4Q307(Text Mentioning Temple)	4Q371-4Q373(Narrative and Poetic Com- position)	88
229, 482		
4Q318(Zodiology and Brontology)	4Q374(Exodus/Conquest Traditions)	88
186		
4Q331(Historical Text C)	4Q375-4Q376(Apocryphon of Moses)	88, 89
419		
4Q333(Historical Text D)	4Q377(Apocryphal Pentateuch B)	88
419	2	428
4Q334(Ordo)	4Q378-4Q379(Apocryphon of Joshua)	19, 80, 88, 386
582		
4Q341	4Q380-4Q381(Non-Canonical Psalms)	88, 90, 584
458		
4Q342-4Q346a	4Q380(Non-Canonical Psalms A)	228
418		
4Q348	4Q381(Non-Canonical Psalms B)	228
419		
4Q351-4Q354	4Q382	88, 229
419		
4Q356-4Q360a	4Q383(Apocryphon of Jereremiah A)	327
419		
4Q360	4Q383-4Q391(Apocryphon of Jeremiah)	88, 98
4 iii		
248	4Q385-4Q386, 4Q388,4Q391(Pseudo- Ezekiel)	98, 256, 273, 276, 327
4Q363b		
419	4Q385-4Q390(Apocryphon of Jeremiah C)	89, 256, 259, 273, 276, 327
4Q364-4Q367(Reworked Pentateuch)		
68, 256, 319	4Q385(Pseudo-Ezekiel <sup>a</sup> )	327
4Q364(Reworked Pentateuch <sup>b</sup> )	2 9-10	427, 439
88, 320		
4Q365(Reworked Pentateuch <sup>c</sup> )		
320		
4Q368(Apocryphal Pentateuch A)		
88		
4Q369(Prayer of Enosh?)		
88, 89		

4Q385a(Aporcyphon of Jeremiah C <sup>a</sup> )	A-C 8	335
287, 327	B 55-58	142
	B 58-62	439
4Q385b(Pseudo-Ezekiel <sup>c</sup> )	C 13-22	294
327	C 21-22	294
	C 28-32	295
4Q385c (Pseudo-Ezekiel)	D 4	268
327		
	4Q400-4Q407(ShirShabb)	
4Q386(Pseudo-Ezekiel <sup>b</sup> )		46, 47, 242, 335,
327		339, 340, 341, 342,
		387, 437, 464, 499,
		558, 584, 594, 628
4Q387-4Q390(Apocryphon of Jeremiah C)		
287	4Q400(ShirShabb <sup>a</sup> )	498
		342
4Q387(Aporcyphon of Jeremiah C <sup>b</sup> )	1 i 8	342
287, 327	2 6-8	342
4Q387a(Aporcyphon of Jeremiah C <sup>f</sup> )	4Q402(ShirShabb <sup>c</sup> )	
327	4 12-15	295
4Q388(Pseudo-Ezekiel <sup>d</sup> )	4Q403(ShirShabb <sup>d</sup> )	
327	1 i 45	293
	1 i 31	341
4Q388a(Aporcyphon of Jeremiah C <sup>c</sup> )	1 i 28	342
287, 327	1 i 31	342
	1 i 6-7	342
4Q389(Aporcyphon of Jeremiah C <sup>d</sup> )		
327	4Q404(ShirShabb <sup>e</sup> )	
	5 4	293
4Q390(Aporcyphon of Jeremiah C <sup>e</sup> )		
287, 327, 328	4Q405(ShirShabb <sup>f</sup> )	
	20 ii-21-22 7-8	341
4Q392	23 ii 11	342
1 6		
292	4Q408(Apocryphon of Moses?)	
1 5	581, 584	
4Q393(Confession)	4Q410-4Q412	
229, 338		581
4Q394-4Q399(Miqṣat Ma'āše ha-Torah-4QMMT)	4Q410	88
7, 8, 9, 21, 24, 25,		
27, 31, 89, 138, 142,	4Q411	88
144, 145, 148, 149,		
150, 152, 214, 250,	4Q412	88
253, 256, 260, 261,		
262, 265, 267, 269,		
270, 294, 345, 347,		
348, 352, 353, 357,		
360, 370, 447, 591,	4Q414(Purification Ritual)	46
597, 615, 641		

4Q415-4Q418,4Q423(Instruction) 4, 31, 614	4Q432(Hodayot <sup>f</sup> ) 43, 44
4Q415-4Q418(Instruction) 89	4Q433(Hodayot-like A) 43, 228
4Q415-4Q418 <sup>a,c</sup> (Instruction) 88	4Q433,4Q440(Hodayot-like texts) 228
4Q416-4Q418(Instruction) 593	4Q433a(Hodayot-like B) 43, 228
4Q416 (Instruction <sup>b</sup> ) 1 428	4Q440(Hodayot-like C) 43, 228
4Q417-4Q418(Instruction) 428	4Q440a(Hodayot-like D) 582
4Q418 (Instruction <sup>d</sup> ) 69 ii 428 69 ii, 81-81a , 127 428	4Q448(Apocryphal Psalm and Prayer) 267, 428, 442, 443
4Q421(Ways of Righteousness <sup>b</sup> ) 446	4Q459 88
4Q422(Paraphrase of Genesis and Exodus) 88	4Q460 88
4Q423(Instruction <sup>g</sup> ) 89	4Q462 286
4Q425-4Q426(Sapiential-Didactic Work) 581	4Q464(Exposition of the Patriarchs) 88, 190
4Q427-4Q432(Hodayot) 42, 44, 228, 229, 584	4Q468 <sup>f-l,m-bb</sup> 582
4Q427(Hodayot <sup>a</sup> ) 43 7 206 7 i 5-13a 291	4Q470(Text Mentionning Zedekiah) 88, 89
4Q428(Hodayot <sup>b</sup> ) 43, 427 7 1-10 427	4Q471(War Scroll-like Text B) 607
4Q429(Hodayot <sup>c</sup> ) 43	4Q471b(Polemical Text) 206 1 291
4Q431(Hodayot <sup>c</sup> ) 43	4Q474(On Rachel and Joseph) 88
	4Q481a 88
	4Q482-4Q490 421

4Q483	428	4Q506(DibHam <sup>c</sup> )	335
4Q484(Testament of Judah?)	428	4Q507-4Q509(Prayers of Festivals)	335
4Q491(War Scroll <sup>a</sup> )	41, 43, 206, 208, 580, 594	4Q507(Prayers of Festivals <sup>a</sup> )	421
11	206	4Q508(Prayers of Festivals <sup>b</sup> )	421, 446
11 i	581	4Q509(Prayers of Festivals <sup>c</sup> )	421, 446
11 i 12-18	291	4Q510-4Q511(Shir)	294
4Q491-4Q494(War Scroll)	421	4Q510(Shir <sup>a</sup> )	421, 593
4Q491-4Q496(War Scroll)	207, 289, 539, 607	1 6-7	294
4Q493(War Scroll <sup>c</sup> )	289	1 6-8	294
4Q495(War Scroll <sup>c</sup> )	421	4Q511(Shir <sup>b</sup> )	421, 593
4Q496-4Q500	421	1	294
4Q497(War-Scroll like Text A)	607	8 4-5	294
4Q501(Apocryphal Lamentation B)	421	10 3-5	294
4Q502(Marriage Ceremony)	46, 146, 421	10 3-6	294
4Q503(Daily Prayers)	46, 335, 336, 338, 339, 340, 341, 421, 441, 580	35 1-2	294
37	339	35 6-8	294
4Q504-4Q506(DibHam)	339, 636	37	294
4Q505-4Q506(DibHam)	421	52-59	293
4Q504(DibHam <sup>a</sup> )	335, 421	52-59 iii 4-5	294
1-2 ii 11-15	338	4Q512(Ritual Purity)	46, 146, 152, 421, 441
1-2 v 11-17	338	4Q513(Ordinances <sup>b</sup> )	421
		4Q514(Ordinances <sup>c</sup> )	146, 421
		4Q515-4Q520	421
		4Q521-4Q528	257
		4Q521(Messianic Apocalypse)	210, 213, 427, 428, 440

2	615	4Q560(Magical Booklet)	187
4Q522(Apocryphon of Joshua?)	259, 427, 594, 642	4Q569(Aramaic Proverbs)	429
26	428		
4Q523	428	4Q576-4Q579	257
4Q524(Temple <sup>b</sup> )	257, 428	4Q576(Genesis <sup>n</sup> )	427
14 2-4	428		
4Q525(Beatitudes)	214, 427	6Q8(Giants)	177
1-4	427	1-3	429
4Q529(Words of Michael)	607	6Q18(Hymn)	607
4Q530-4Q533(Giants)	177	7Q1	420
4Q532(Giants <sup>d</sup> )		7Q2	420
2 9	193	7Q4	420, 429
4Q534(Elect of God)	155, 423	7Q5	420, 429, 554
1 i 8-11	437		
4Q537(Testament of Jacob?)	429	7QEnoch Greek	429
4Q541(ApocryphonLevi <sup>b</sup> )	439	11QpaleoLeviticus <sup>a</sup>	59
9 i 3			
4Q542(Testament of Kohath)	186, 191	11Q2-11Q18	257, 407
4Q543-4Q549(Visions of Amram)	439	11Q2(Leviticus <sup>b</sup> )	498
4Q550(Jews at the Persian Court)	184	11Q4(Ezekiel)	482
4Q550(Persian Court)	184-186, 185, 186	11Q5(Psalms <sup>a</sup> )	59, 81, 83, 86, 249, 312, 313, 317, 318, 556
4Q554(New Jerusalem <sup>a</sup> )	429	XVIII, 1-16	83
4Q559	187	XIX, 13-15a	338
		XXI-XXII	81
		XXIV, 3-17	83



XXVI, 9	340	11Q13(Melchisedek)	
XXVIII, 3-14	83		39, 202, 288, 291, 427, 436, 447, 499, 626, 627, 634
– Apocryphal Psalms		ii 24	270
	81, 83, 427		
IV-V, 14	427	11Q14(Sefer ha-Milhamah)	
– Plea for Deliverance			293, 499, 593, 607
XIX	498	11Q15(Hymns <sup>a</sup> )	500
– Psalm 154	443	11Q16(Hymns <sup>b</sup> )	500
– Psalm 155	83	11Q17(ShirShabb)	335, 493, 500
– Psalm 151	83, 313, 628	III, 3-4	342
– Psalm 151A	318	11Q18(New Jerusalem)	499, 500, 593
– Psalm 151B	318	11Q19(Temple <sup>a</sup> )	6, 7, 10, 31, 76, 77, 102, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 149, 240, 242, 254, 257, 259, 260, 269, 278, 279, 321, 345, 347, 348, 350, 355, 356, 358, 373, 406, 419, 436, 442, 475, 490, 491, 499, 528, 552, 574, 585, 587, 603, 607, 615, 626, 635
– Psalm 154	83	XXIII, 11ff.	160
11Q6(Psalms <sup>b</sup> )	498	XLV, 11-12	356
11Q6-8	500	LI-LXVI	321
11Q7(Psalms <sup>c</sup> )	499	LX, 6-7	349, 355
11Q10(Targum Job)	165-169, 169, 378, 490	LXIV, 6-13	428
VIIa	168	LXIV, 7-9	259
XXI, 4-5	167	11Q20-11Q31	257, 407
XXIV, 6-7	166	11Q20(Temple <sup>b</sup> )	257, 428, 490, 499, 500, 626
11Q11(Apocryphal Psalms)	427, 428, 490, 498, 499	XQ7	428, 582
IV, 7-9	293		
V, 7-9	293		
11Q12(Jubilees)	499		

XQOffering ar	442	– 7	398
Horoscopes	603	– 8	398
pesharim	6, 19, 27, 31, 32, 39, 153, 266, 303, 329, 330, 331, 345, 454, 486, 555, 597, 614, 626, 633, 634, 641	– 9 – 10	399 399
War Texts	31, 40, 41, 231, 266	– 11	399
KhQ1996/1(Ostracon)	428	– 12	398
MasShirShabb	335	– 13	398, 399
Masada Apocryphal Genesis	386	– 14	399
5/6Hev(Numbers)	385	– 15	398
5/6Hev(Psalms )	384	– 16	399
8HevXII gr(Minor Prophets Greek Scroll)	300, 301, 308	– 16–19	399
XHev/Se 65 (Marriage Contract)	385	papyrus Mish 1	383
Bar Kokhba Letters	195	Papyrus Mur 45 6	416
Jericho Papyri		Psalms Scroll	300, 384
– 1	398		
– 2	399	Se'elim 34 (Numbers)	301
– 2–3	398	– 36	422
– 4–5	398	– 37	384

*New Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*

Acts of Thomas

440

*Philo*

Philo

2, 3, 4, 14, 17, 24,  
81, 245, 269, 359,439, 537, 538, 629,  
636*Josephus*

Josephus Flavius

	– Ant.	
2, 3, 4, 14, 17, 22,	12.414	173
23, 24, 34, 81, 125,	13.209	291
145, 146, 150, 173,	20.159	399
245, 250, 252, 262,	20.237-238	173
265, 269, 271, 291,		
353, 359, 382, 404,	– J.W.	
409, 443, 462, 465,	1.68	291
481, 506, 538, 602,	2.433-440	462
634, 639	V.142	639
	V. 311	639
	7.3	382

*Mishnah, Talmud and Related Literature*

Mishnah

	m. Yad.	
149, 188, 246, 261,		149
359, 624	4:7	261

m. Ber.

2:2	338	m. Yoma	
9:5	350	3:8, 4:2	335

m. Miqw.

7:3	119	m. 'Abod. Zar.	
		1:6	121

m. Para

3:7	261	Tosefta	123, 124
-----	-----	---------	----------

m. Pesah

4:3	121	t. Ber.	
		1.3	336
		1.9	342
		7.6	348

m. Tamid

7:4	335	t. Šabb.	
		13.2	168

t. Soṭa 13.5	291	Sifre, Deuteronomy Deuteronomy 23:15	350
t. Ter. 8.11	348	Sifre, Numbers Numbers 18:21	542 350
y. Ber. 1.1	336	Cant. Rab. 8.11	291
y. Soṭa 9.13	291	Haftarot	218
b. Ber. 3b	336	Mezuzot	406
b. Soṭa 33a	291	phylacteries	242, 300, 305, 309, 351, 383, 406, 417, 419
Seder Olam Rabba	640		
Sifra	107	piyyutim	450
Sifre	357	Shmone Esre, Prayer	337, 338, 340, 342, 544

*Early Christian Literature*

Commodian	441	Constitutiones Apostolorum 7.35.3	341
Diognetus, Letter to	439	8.12.27	341
Claudius' Letter	632	Pseudo-Cyprian	634

*Classical Sources*

– Odyssey	184	– Historia Naturalis V.17, 73	5
Pliny the Elder	3, 5, 14, 24, 394, 404	Virgil, Aeneid 4.9	386

*Varia*

Coran	438, 439	Papyrus Nash	50, 299
Oracles of Hystaspes	439	Tibat Marqe	377
Papyrus Amherst 63	179	Vision of Gabriel	374
Papyrus London 1912	632	Yezirah, Sepher	637
Papyrus Magdalen Greek 17 = P <sup>64</sup>	429		



## NAMES AND SUBJECTS

- Abraham, 161, 164, 294  
Adam, 273, 287  
Adam (Second), 202  
Agrippa II, 399  
Ahiqar, 184, 185  
– Papyri, 578  
Ahmatova, Anna, 632  
‘Ain el-Ghuweir, 388, 389, 410, 431  
‘Ain Feshkha, 16, 396, 404, 407, 430, 432, 467  
Akenaten, 482  
Alcimus, 627  
Alexander Balas, 205  
Alexander Jannaeus, 19, 21, 144, 250, 257, 259, 267, 459, 597  
Alexandria, 632  
Amram, 169, 417  
Angels of Mastemoth, 287  
Antiochus III the Great, 175, 176  
Antiochus IV Epiphanes, 175, 176, 323  
Antiochus VII Sidetes, 19  
apocalyptic, 8, 17, 27, 29, 41, 163, 174, 205, 209, 212, 250, 252, 254, 272, 275, 283, 285, 288, 291, 428, 446, 466, 480  
– Apocalypses, 93, 252  
– Apocalypticism, 556, 559  
– tradition, 201  
Apocrypha, 88, 163, 297, 321, 339, 438  
– apocryphal, 79, 80, 86, 244, 258, 273, 282, 295, 318, 342, 386, 414, 528  
Aqedah, 324  
Aqiba, 441  
Arad, 382  
Aramaic, 8, 125, 155-187, 187, 191-195, 195, 202, 246, 247, 270, 272, 273, 275, 277, 297, 316, 358, 364, 366, 376, 380, 382, 384, 386, 394, 397, 398, 406, 413, 414, 417, 420, 422, 423, 425, 426, 428, 429, 434, 440, 442, 445, 446, 453, 497, 508, 509, 525, 540, 545, 574, 585, 586, 622, 624  
– Arameans, 415, 429  
– Biblical, 375  
– Christian Palestinian, 376  
– Elephantine, 375  
– Galilean, 375, 376  
– Palestinian, 376  
– Qumran, 376, 377, 378, 380  
– Samaritan, 363, 375, 376, 377  
Astrology, 441  
Athanasius Yeshue Samuel, 13, 50, 51, 52, 198, 218, 222, 403, 487, 488  
Azazel, 91  
Babatha, 384, 508  
Babylon, 170, 277, 425, 634  
– Babylonian, 171, 173  
Balakhros, 173  
baptism, 203, 205  
Bar Kokhba, Simon, 415  
– administration, 399  
– Bar Kosiba, 369, 374, 383  
– period, 397, 398  
– Refuge caves, 381  
– revolt, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 397, 398, 399, 400  
Baruch, 273  
Bedouin, 50, 51, 52, 53, 102, 217, 219, 220, 224, 382, 383, 384, 395, 399, 404, 405, 406, 410, 411, 414, 497  
Beirut, 423  
Beitousin, 261, 265, 352  
Belial, 19, 294  
Bible  
– Greek Manuscripts, 60  
– Greek Minor Prophets, 61  
– Hebrew, 56, 60, 204  
– Hebrew scriptures, 213  
– Hebrew text, 60  
– Masoretic canon, 49, 67  
– Masoretic Psalter, 59, 83  
– Masoretic Text, 56, 59, 60, 63, 64, 65, 95, 170, 184, 186, 298, 301, 302, 303, 305, 306, 307, 309, 310, 311, 312, 320, 364, 367, 400, 411, 508, 560, 587  
– Samaritan Pentateuch, 56, 59, 63, 65, 312, 422  
– Septuagint, 56, 57, 60, 63, 64, 65, 83, 269, 302, 304, 306, 308, 310, 311, 318,



- 440, 473, 475, 508, 525, 526, 527, 556,  
560, 562, 587, 606, 632  
– Septuagint Old Greek, 60, 65  
Budapest, 622  
Buqeiah, 410
- calendar, 10, 83, 85, 133, 336, 411, 441,  
556, 571, 636  
– day calendar, 85, 86, 95, 248, 257, 339  
– calendars, 268  
– calendrical, 81, 534, 552  
Canaanite, 204  
Carbon 14, 56  
card concordance, 256, 417  
cemetery, 387, 388, 395  
Christian, 5, 113, 114, 177, 178, 233, 291,  
297, 453, 469, 481, 532, 545, 553, 625  
– Christianity, 1, 3, 8, 29, 65, 81, 112,  
155, 193, 197, 198, 200, 202, 203, 209,  
225, 277, 288, 434, 435, 438, 480, 514,  
537, 553, 612, 627, 629, 634, 638  
– Christians, 226, 253, 355  
– Christology, 563  
– Early, 561, 562, 563  
– early Christianity, 156, 163, 178, 203,  
206, 208, 209, 213, 250, 254, 276, 469,  
530, 531, 535, 536, 538, 552, 561, 571,  
640  
– early Christians, 211  
– early writings, 466  
– Syriac Christianity, 490  
covenant, 27, 197, 514  
– covenantal, 294  
Cyrus' Declaration, 288
- Damascus, 227, 266, 269, 425  
Darius I, 185  
David, 174, 318, 439  
Davidic throne, 205  
Demetrius I Soter, 425  
Dio Chrysostom, 17  
Domitian (Roman Emperor), 399  
Dosithean sect, 109, 110, 111  
Dualism, 18, 246, 250, 251, 258, 538, 550,  
558, 613  
– dualistic, 17, 250
- Ebionites, 200, 203, 465  
Eleazar  
– son of Jair, 461  
– son of Nahmani, 395  
– son of Shmu'el, 384  
Eliezer (son of Hyrcanus), 360  
Elijah, 210  
Elisha, 210  
En Gedi, 3, 5, 381, 382, 384, 399, 411  
Enoch, 169, 173, 341, 417, 609  
– Enochic Judaism, 94  
Ephraim, 19  
Epigraphy, 55  
Epigraphy, Hebrew, 49  
Episkopos, 203  
Eschatology, 212, 213, 283, 547, 613  
– eschatological, 113, 201, 202, 203,  
282, 285, 290  
Essenes, 34, 201, 204, 205  
– Essene, 198, 202, 203, 212
- Falashas, 110  
– Falasha, 105, 136  
First Temple, 288, 370  
Flood, 273, 328  
Flora, 161
- Gabriel (angel), 206  
Gamaliel I/II (Rabban), 168  
Genizah (Cairo), 82, 101, 102, 104, 115,  
122, 146, 180, 181, 247, 253, 276, 277,  
278, 326, 338, 346, 424, 429, 439, 450,  
463, 586, 591, 611  
genizah  
– genizot, 408  
Gerizim (Mount), 60, 65, 387  
Gilgamesh, 443  
Gnosticism, 536  
– Gnostic, 531, 535, 563  
Greek, 394  
Groningen Hypothesis, 267, 268, 494, 504,  
598
- ḥaburah, 125, 126, 127, 461  
Halakhah, 101, 105, 106, 107, 110, 111,  
115, 117, 118, 119, 121, 124, 127, 128,  
129, 130, 131, 134, 135, 136, 137, 153,  
252, 253, 260, 261, 262, 263, 269, 280,  
283, 322, 348, 349, 352, 355, 358, 359,  
360, 361, 446, 479, 598  
– Halakhic, 7, 8, 249, 265, 266, 268,  
276, 351, 461  
Ham, 159  
Hasidim, 201  
Hasmonean, 5, 19, 25, 182, 267, 290, 294,  
393, 396, 435  
– Hasmoneans, 23, 173, 250, 291  
– period, 14, 257  
– Villa, 431

- Haverim, 35
- Hebrew, 125, 175, 183, 188-191, 191, 195, 202, 246, 247, 270, 272, 297, 308, 338, 358, 365, 366, 369, 374, 379, 380, 382, 384, 385, 386, 389, 394, 397, 405, 422, 423, 425, 427, 430, 434, 440, 444, 445, 450, 454, 459, 462, 488, 492, 508, 509, 544, 545, 574, 585, 622, 624, 628, 632
- Babylonian, 364, 375
  - Biblical, 363, 366, 375, 574
  - Classical Biblical, 366, 371
  - Dead Sea Scrolls, 374
  - Late Biblical, 367, 371, 375
  - literary, 370
  - Mishnaic, 246, 247, 363, 366, 370
  - Palestinian, 375
  - rabbinic, 574
  - Samaritan, 246, 363, 364, 375
  - square, 498
  - Tannaitic, 364, 366, 371, 375
  - Tiberian, 364, 375
- Hebrew texts, 210, 407, 415
- Hellenism, 563
- Hellenistic, 16, 160, 175, 202, 241, 268, 277, 290, 323, 388, 405, 438, 440, 441, 445, 531, 535, 558, 563, 624
  - Hellenistic context, 202
  - Hellenistic kingdoms, 242
- Herod, 26, 382
- Herodian, 389, 393
- High Priest, 5, 173, 261, 267, 268, 269, 335, 425, 435, 548, 598
- High Priests, 173
- Hillel, School of, 350, 360
- Hippolytus, 17
- Honi, 394, 395
- Huntington Museum, 209
- Hussein, King of Jordan, 457
- Hyrchanus II (Hasmonean ruler), 28, 40
- ‘Îr ham-Mélaḥ, 410
- Iran, 277
- Iranian, 438
- Iron Age, 391
- Iron Age II, 389, 410, 416
  - Iron Age II B, 405
- Jabesh Gilead, 310
- Jacob, 96
- Jakim-Alkimos, 548
- James (brother of Jesus), 26, 209, 553
- Japhet, 159
- Jericho, 19, 270, 397, 398, 428
- Jerusalem, 60
- Jesus, 175, 197, 199, 200, 202, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 276, 336, 435, 452, 453, 455, 458, 465, 469, 471, 472, 473, 480, 534, 535, 537, 545, 546, 549, 553, 559, 561, 638
- Jewish
- mysticism, 208
  - sectarianism, 469
  - sects, 125
- Jewish War, Second, 462
- Joezer, 397
- John Hyrcanus I (Hasmonean ruler), 15, 19, 144, 291, 461
- John the Baptist, 534, 200, 203, 204, 205, 212, 213, 251, 277, 453, 469, 514, 537, 549, 561, 638
- Jonathan (Hasmonean ruler), 23, 40, 173, 266, 267, 397, 416, 427, 443, 548, 597, 598
- Judah, 19
- Judah (the Prince), 342
- Judah Maccabeus, 26, 173
- Judaism, 199, 200, 201, 202, 208, 225, 226, 508
- ancient, 631
  - early, 193, 503
  - Judean, 637
  - Palestinian, 169
  - rabbinic, 65, 123
- Judea, 290, 480
- Judean Desert, 3, 56, 80, 86, 245, 255, 270, 280, 297, 298, 308, 315, 336, 368, 374, 381, 382, 383, 385, 388, 390, 394, 397, 398, 400, 420, 425, 426
- Judenfrage, 541, 543, 544
- Karaism, 119, 123, 128, 130, 445, 466
- Karaites, 124, 130, 131, 137, 450
  - Karaite, 105, 106, 109, 110, 124, 129, 130, 131, 132, 136, 154, 277, 321
- Ketuvim, 49
- Khalil Iskander Shahin (Kando), 382, 406
- Khirbet Mird, 420
- Kittim, 210, 241
- of Assyria, 241
  - of Egypt, 241
- Kurth (collection), 596
- Lactantius, 439
- Lamech, 161
- Levi, 98, 169, 182, 326, 446
- Lion of Wrath, 597

- liturgy, 283, 340  
 – liturgical, 7, 8, 276, 339, 343  
 Logos, 202  
 Luke, 206
- Maccabean crisis, 194, 241, 266, 452, 641  
 Man of Lies, 597  
 Manichaeans, 92  
 Mary, 206  
 Masada, 81, 82, 242, 243, 298, 301, 369, 374, 381, 382, 385, 386, 387, 499, 605  
 Mattathias Antigonus, 396  
 Melchizedek, 499, 637  
 – Melki Sedeq, 447  
 Menahem, 462  
 Menahem (son of Judah), 461  
 Menelaus, 452  
 meorave shemesh, 357  
 Messiah, 41, 174, 197, 202, 205, 210, 211, 288, 427  
 – Davidic, 38, 206, 210  
 – First, 211  
 – messianic, 139, 176, 287, 291, 423, 456, 558, 609, 638  
 – messianism, 82, 478, 558, 626  
 – Two, 36  
 Metatron, 637  
 Michael (angel), 42, 207  
 Michmas, 397  
 middot (of Rabbi Ishmael), 38  
 miqvaot, 351, 391  
 Mishna  
 – Mishnaic, 392  
 Moses, 27, 95, 144, 294, 295, 327, 428  
 mutzakot, 357
- Nabataeans, 636  
 – Nabataean, 239, 384, 385, 389, 422, 423  
 – Nabataean Papyri, 426  
 Nablus, 417  
 Nabonidus, 170, 172, 443, 634  
 Naḥal Arugot, 383, 399, 400  
 Naḥal David (Wadi Sdeir), 382, 383, 384  
 Naḥal Harduf, 383  
 Naḥal Ḥever, 53, 224, 298, 300, 301, 308, 369, 376, 379, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 405, 411, 420, 606  
 Naḥal Michmas, 397  
 Naḥal Mishmar, 383, 384, 388  
 Naḥal Še'elim, 308, 379, 606  
 Nahash, 310  
 Nebuchadnezzar, 170, 173
- Necropolis, 431  
 Nero (Roman Emperor), 399  
 Noah, 92, 160, 161, 164, 173, 180, 276, 286, 287, 325
- Onias III (High Priest), 428, 452  
 Orion Center, 313, 504  
 ostraca, 386, 390, 412  
 Ostraca  
 – Aramaic, 386  
 – Greek, 386  
 – Hebrew, 386, 394  
 – Lachish, 407  
 – Latin, 386  
 Overseer, 107, 203, 244
- Paleo-Hebrew, 57, 61, 387, 428, 473  
 Paleography, 55, 430  
 – paleographic, 14, 379, 465  
 Palmyra, 422  
 – Palmyrean, 423  
 papyri, 384, 385, 386, 387, 398, 412, 429  
 Papyri  
 – Greek, 386, 399  
 – Latin, 386  
 Patriarchs, 273  
 Paul, 227, 535, 536, 553, 559, 561, 563  
 Persia, 193  
 – Persian, 18, 165, 185  
 Petersburg, 622  
 Petra, 423  
 Pharisees, 18, 24, 108, 109, 113, 114, 116, 120, 137, 141, 250, 259, 261, 265, 268, 269, 277, 355, 358  
 – Pharisaic, 2, 28, 85, 106, 107, 109, 111, 113, 115, 127, 128, 134, 253, 263, 265, 352, 353, 354, 360, 536, 538  
 – Rabbinic, 95  
 – Pharisaism, 460, 461  
 Paleography  
 – paleographic, 368  
 prayer, 343  
 Predestination, 251, 258, 441, 476  
 Predetermination, 246  
 Procurators (Roman), 393  
 Pseudepigrapha, 88, 180, 273, 275, 321, 509, 634  
 – pseudepigraphic, 79, 80, 81, 90, 98, 109, 163, 241, 244, 258, 274, 282, 286, 327, 438, 440  
 – pseudepigraphic writings, 276  
 Ptolemies, 176  
 – Ptolemaic, 242, 269

- Prolemy (son of Abubos), 19  
 Pushkin, Alexander Sergeevich, 632
- Qedushah, 340, 341, 342  
 Qohat, 169  
 Qumranforschungsstelle, 424, 532, 541, 544, 545, 549, 550, 559, 565, 566, 568, 569, 571, 573, 574, 578, 579, 584, 589, 594, 597, 598
- rabbim, 35  
 Rabbis, 14, 35, 64, 106, 107, 130, 136, 137, 142, 153, 353, 355, 360  
 – law, 460  
 – literature, 461, 471  
 – Methodology, 133  
 – prayers, 337, 340, 343  
 – rabbinic, 24, 75, 81, 96, 103, 104, 105, 107, 108, 113, 116, 118, 119, 121, 124, 130, 132, 134, 151, 154, 262, 265, 276, 321, 322, 330, 336, 340, 351, 352, 357, 358, 360, 486, 525, 528, 535, 536, 538, 542, 562, 637  
 – texts, 128, 146, 261
- Reconstrucion  
 – material, 546-549, 549, 578, 590-592, 592
- Refuge Caves, 397  
 Resurrection, 428, 472  
 Rewritten Bible, 159, 163
- Sa'ad, Y., 220  
 Sabbath, 214, 336  
 – law, 96
- Sadducees, 18, 21, 24, 106, 141, 142, 149, 150, 250, 261, 265, 352, 354, 355, 357, 360  
 – High Priest, 266  
 – Sadducean, 2, 25, 95, 96, 105, 120, 144, 145, 150, 253, 260, 263, 268, 598
- Sahl b. Mas'iah, 130  
 Salome Alexandra (Hasmonean ruler), 28  
 Salome Komaise, 384, 385, 508  
 Samaria, 419  
 Samaritan, 57, 64, 105, 109, 136, 181, 377, 417, 467  
 – Samaritans, 64, 109, 365, 387, 422  
 – Samaritan sect, 312  
 – Samaritan Temple, 387
- Sarai, 159, 160  
 Sassanian, 131  
 Second Temple, 9, 29, 47, 135, 286, 335, 340, 381, 480, 607  
 – compositions, 315  
 – era, 238  
 – Jewish sects, 608  
 – Jewish writings, 75, 143  
 – Judaism, 31, 78, 93, 101, 106, 111, 136, 139, 152, 163, 265, 280, 288, 295, 322, 339, 447, 481, 495, 561, 564, 602  
 – literature, 105, 118, 152, 158, 159, 163, 164, 249  
 – Palestinian Judaism, 478  
 – period, 4, 14, 55, 56, 65, 77, 80, 94, 106, 108, 110, 124, 133, 134, 141, 145, 151, 164, 167, 195, 252, 261, 263, 270, 271, 285, 289, 290, 291, 316, 327, 330, 335, 336, 337, 343, 359, 360, 361, 370, 388, 390, 391, 392, 395, 396, 452, 474, 562, 633, 636, 638, 639  
 – sources, 50, 146, 173, 245
- sect, 609  
 Seleucids, 176, 242, 269  
 Shammai, School of, 106, 350, 360  
 Shapira, 403  
 Shema', 336, 338  
 Shemihazah, 429, 446  
 shemitah, 336  
 Simon (Hasmonean ruler), 19, 40, 173, 291, 416  
 Simon III (High Priest), 428  
 Sin (god), 170, 172  
 Sodom, 382  
 Son of God, 202, 205, 206, 209, 210  
 Son of Man, 202  
 Syriac, 636
- Talmud, 116, 123, 349, 632, 634  
 – Talmudic, 351  
 Tannaitic, 263, 265, 349  
 – period, 461  
 Targums, 169, 359, 471, 481, 508, 528  
 Teacher (Hymns of), 546  
 Teacher of Righteousness, 2, 5, 9, 14, 15, 19, 21, 23, 24, 28, 145, 197, 202, 207, 209, 248, 250, 261, 266, 268, 269, 289, 396, 425, 428, 435, 443, 452, 453, 455, 456, 459, 461, 465, 534, 545, 548, 597, 598, 607, 626, 628, 633
- Telemachus, 184  
 Tell el-Far'ah, 407  
 Temple, 5, 10, 133, 149, 150, 241, 248, 257, 261, 268, 335, 350, 390, 441, 548, 579, 637, 640  
 Tetragrammaton, 124  
 tevil yom, 357

Therapeutes, 537, 608, 636  
trefa, 357

Wadi

- Daliyeh, 625
- Hammamat, 386
- Murabba'at, 53, 224, 308, 369, 389, 404, 405, 407, 412, 413, 420, 605, 628, 633
- Qumran, 406, 413
- Sdeir, 308, 606
- Seiyal, 382, 383, 385, 386, 419, 420
- Suweinit, 397

Warsaw Ghetto, 544

Wicked Priest, 5, 15, 19, 20, 21, 23, 28, 40, 248, 416, 427, 452, 462, 493  
women, 37, 96, 226

yaḥad, 27, 29, 36, 126, 127, 203, 394, 548, 624

Yaqūb al-Qirqisānī, 110

Yoşer, 340

Zadokite, 95, 96

Zealots, 26, 461, 462, 630

Zion, 288

Zoroastrianism, 538

- Zoroastrian, 536

## MODERN SCHOLARS\*

- Abegg, M. G., 32, 38, 40, 41, 44, 67, 99, 189, 207, 215, 230, 231, 232, 507, 572, 573, 576
- Ackerman, S., 172
- Aharoni, Y., 383, 384, 385
- Albani, M., 426, 556, 582, 583
- Albeck, C., 246, 322
- Albright, W. F., 14, 33, 34, 50, 51, 56, 58, 63, 64, 80, 155, 170, 197, 201, 202, 204, 219, 469
- Alexander, P. S., 35, 208, 470, 472, 475-476, 485
- Allegro, J. M., 39, 55, 199, 203, 225, 317, 319, 407, 414, 450, 451, 453-458, 459, 463, 473, 475, 482, 512, 515, 580
- Allison, D. C., 35
- Alon, G., 346, 359
- Amit, D., 382
- Amit, Y., 243
- Amussin, J. D., 632-635, 641
- Anderson, A., 455
- Arendzen, J., 180
- Arnaldich, L., 514
- Arnold, R., 47
- Ashton, J., 472
- Attridge, H. W., 214
- Aune, D., 214
- Avi-Yonah, M., 382
- Avigad, N., 50, 56, 157, 239, 243, 281, 316, 318, 325, 368, 373, 375, 376, 383, 384, 639
- Baasten, M., 508
- Babkina, S. V., 637
- Baigent, M., 453, 482, 552, 570
- Baillet, M., 41, 51, 53, 138, 206, 207, 407, 420-422, 423, 425, 433, 436, 516, 517, 539
- Baker, H. W., 456
- Baneth, D. H., 364, 370
- Bar-Adon, P., 383, 384, 388, 389, 410
- Bar-Asher, M., 280, 308, 331, 371-372, 374
- Barag, D., 239
- Barclay, J., 481
- Bardtke, H., 516, 534, 549, 551, 622, 623, 625
- Barth, K., 543
- Barthélemy, D., 51, 53, 54, 55, 84, 405, 408, 411-412
- Basser, H., 231
- Batsch, C., 447
- Baumbach, G., 550
- Baumgarten, A., 268
- Baumgarten, J. M., 37, 42, 82, 85, 86, 96, 123, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 138, 141, 142, 145, 146, 147, 148, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 259, 348, 349, 591
- Baumgartner, W., 495, 575
- Beall, T. S., 34
- Becker, J., 545
- Beek, M., 498, 501
- Bell, C., 47
- Ben-Dov, J., 248, 311
- Ben-Hayyim, Z., 246, 363, 364, 367, 370, 371, 372, 375, 377
- Ben-Shammai, H., 278
- Bendavid, A., 367
- Bengtsson, H., 614, 616
- Benoit, P., 51, 61, 254, 412, 413, 420, 421, 426, 517
- Bentwich, N., 111
- Berardi, G., 606
- Bergmeier, R., 546
- Bernhard, W., 550
- Bernstein, M., 37, 40, 68, 75, 76, 153, 162, 169, 230
- Berthelot, K., 32, 445, 447
- Betz, O., 532, 550
- Beyer, K., 183, 540, 585, 586, 589
- Bič, M., 624
- Bieberkraut, J., 50

\* Page numbers in italics refer to passages that contain biographic material.

- Birks, J. H., 221, 223, 224  
 Birnbaum, S., 219, 465  
 Black, M., 177, 468-469, 471, 477  
 Blau, J., 370  
 Bloch, R., 485  
 Boccaccini, G., 93, 94, 609  
 Boccaccio, P., 606  
 Bockmuehl, M., 472, 473  
 Boismard, M.-É., 420, 421  
 Boogaard, L. van der, 499  
 Borbone, P. G., 604, 605  
 Bousset, W., 206  
 Bowley, J. E., 67, 99  
 Bowman, J., 467  
 Boyarin, D., 192, 193  
 Boyd, D., 227  
 Brady, M., 99  
 Braun, H., 531, 532, 534  
 Brin, G., 321  
 Brock, S., 412  
 Brongers, H. A., 501, 502  
 Brooke, G. J., 39, 66, 67, 426, 473, 474-475, 476, 484, 485  
 Broschi, M., 237, 253, 267, 279, 391, 392, 393, 523  
 Brown, R. E., 58, 200, 201, 202, 204, 226, 469  
 Brownlee, W. H., 13, 14, 15, 32, 33, 38, 39, 51, 79, 80, 83, 198, 200, 202, 203, 211, 212, 218, 411, 474, 475, 485, 612, 638  
 Bruce, F. F., 458-459, 469, 473, 485  
 Büchler, A., 111, 128, 129, 137, 346  
 Buitkamp, J., 501  
 Bultmann, R., 202, 531, 535, 536  
 Burchhardt, C., 574  
 Burrows, M., 13, 14, 32, 34, 36, 51, 79, 200, 212, 213, 214, 219, 223, 371, 512, 535, 550, 639, 641  
 Burton, D., 467  
  
 Cabet Iturbe, J., 513  
 Cachampdor, A., 515  
 Callaway, P. R., 476  
 Campbell, J., 472, 479, 486  
 Cantera Ortíz de Urbina, J., 514  
 Capper, B., 480  
 Caquot, A., 425, 433, 435, 436-437  
 Carmignac, J., 425, 426, 427, 433, 443-444, 503  
 Cassuto, U., 601  
 Catastini, A., 605  
 Cazelles, H., 425  
  
 Chalcraft, D., 480  
 Chambon, A., 431  
 Chandler, E., 164  
 Charles, R. H., 180  
 Charlesworth, J. A., 32, 35, 37, 40, 66, 86, 90, 212, 214, 426, 588, 607, 613  
 Chazon, E., 276, 279, 338, 339, 341  
 Chiesa, B., 604, 605  
 Chmiel, J., 627  
 Chrostowski, W., 627  
 Ciecielag, J., 627  
 Cinal, S., 628  
 Clines, D. J. A., 185, 484  
 Cohen, S., 160  
 Collin, J. J., 22, 23, 26, 27, 36, 41, 171, 172, 174, 175, 179, 185, 186, 211, 484, 506  
 Collins, A. Y., 214  
 Collins, J. J., 93, 205, 207, 210, 230  
 Contenson, H. de, 405  
 Conzelmann, H., 569  
 Cook, E. M., 32, 40, 67, 99, 167, 174, 175, 176, 183, 186, 187, 191, 193, 194  
 Cothenet, E., 519  
 Couâsnon, C., 408  
 Courroyer, B., 408  
 Cowley, A., 180  
 Cross, F. M., xi, 3, 4, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 33, 34, 36, 40, 49, 52, 54, 55-56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 76, 77, 80, 170-171, 174, 176, 187, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 213, 222, 226, 239, 251, 255, 394, 407, 410, 414, 416, 426, 470, 502, 527, 535  
 Crowfoot, G., 466  
 Cullmann, O., 532  
  
 Dahmen, U., 556, 575  
 Danby, H. H., 460  
 Daniel, C., 629  
 Daniélou, J., 425, 444, 515  
 Davenport, G. L., 96  
 David, M., 498  
 Davies, P. R., 476-478, 480, 485  
 Davila, J. R., 62, 426, 481, 482  
 Del Medico, H. E., 515  
 Delcor, M., 444-445, 504, 516, 518  
 Dhorme, É., 444  
 Di Lella, A., 81, 86  
 Díez Macho, A., 514, 525, 526  
 Dimant, D., 31, 89, 98, 99, 206, 254, 256, 258-259, 261, 264, 269, 271, 272, 273,

- 275, 276, 280, 285, 286, 287, 308, 323,  
324, 327, 328, 331, 353, 555
- Dion, P.-E., 189
- DiTommaso, L., 231
- Doering, L., 351, 479, 481
- Donceel, R., 430
- Dorman, A., 505
- Doudna, G. L., 40, 614
- Douglas, M., 45
- Drawnel, H., 628
- Dreyer, A., 502
- Driver, G. R., 451, 453, 454, 460, 461,  
462-463, 464, 465, 613
- Drori, A., 255, 390
- Duhaime, J., 32, 35, 40, 41, 226, 228, 230,  
231, 232
- Duncan, J., 62, 426
- Dunn, J., 214, 215
- Dupont-Sommer, A., 1, 3, 15, 197, 198,  
199, 202, 203, 211, 225, 252, 425, 433-  
436, 438, 441, 442, 444, 468, 495, 535,  
580
- Dušek, J., 625
- Edelkoort, A., 502
- Ego, B., 560
- Eichhorn, J., 312
- Eisenman, R. H., 22, 26, 41, 168, 174, 208,  
209, 210, 213, 260, 389, 453, 482, 553,  
570
- Ejrnæs, B., 616
- Elgvin, T., 426, 614, 616, 617, 618
- Elior, R., 265
- Elitsur, B., 374
- Elizarova, M. M., 634, 636
- Emerton, J. A., 451, 454, 463
- Endres, J., 96
- Enzenauer, R., 594
- Erder, Y., 129, 277
- Eshel, E., 98, 241, 267, 273-274, 276, 301,  
305, 312, 326, 378, 394
- Eshel, H., 241, 266, 267, 268, 276, 301,  
312, 381, 389, 391, 392, 393
- Evans, C., 66, 99, 159, 214, 230
- Fabry, H.-J., 555, 557, 575, 588, 595
- Falk, D. K., 46, 68, 77, 163, 164, 229, 232,  
233, 426
- Fassberg, S. E., 194, 279, 370, 371, 372,  
378, 379
- Feather, R., 482
- Feldman, A., 325
- Feliks, Y., 389
- Fernández Marcos, N., 523
- Fields, W. W., 218, 219, 237, 596
- Finkel, J., 40, 160
- Fisher, L., 474
- Fitzmyer, J. A., 34, 39, 58, 66, 86, 87, 92,  
155-157, 158, 165, 174, 175, 182, 183,  
191, 192, 193, 195, 200, 203, 204, 205,  
226, 239, 316, 376, 612
- Fleischer, E., 337, 340, 342
- Flint, P. W., 22, 25, 67, 86, 99, 171, 172,  
213, 214, 215, 229, 230, 231, 426, 507
- Flusser, D., 249-251, 252, 267, 288, 289,  
290, 291
- Flusser, D., 175, 242, 247, 258, 273, 276,  
288, 325, 337
- Fox, M. V., 185
- Fraade, S. D., 40, 153
- Fraenkel, Z., 346
- Freedman, D. N., 33, 54, 59, 170
- Frennsson, B., 614
- Frey, J., 558
- Friedmann, M., 103, 105
- Fritsch, C. T., 502
- Frizzell, L., 227
- Fröhlich, I., 641
- Frost, S., 224
- Fuller, R., 62, 426
- Gallego, E., 522
- García Cordero, M., 514
- García Martínez, F., xii, 32, 52, 59, 94, 99,  
171, 178, 206, 224, 230, 259, 299, 426,  
449, 487, 491, 494, 495, 499, 500, 502-  
504, 505, 506, 507, 512, 518, 519, 520,  
521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528,  
603, 610
- Garnet, P., 35, 227
- Garr, R., 193
- Gärtner, B., 612
- Gaster, T., 32, 37
- Gathercole, S. J., 215, 480
- Geiger, A., 105, 106, 114, 115, 119, 135,  
346, 359
- Geller, M., 480
- Gesenius, W., 575
- Gevirtz, L., 161
- Gilat, Y., 346, 359
- Ginsberg, H. L., 219
- Ginzberg, 113, 118, 119, 121, 125, 127,  
131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 148, 154
- Ginzberg, L., 103, 116-117, 277, 346, 461
- Ginzburg, L., 253
- Gleßmer, U., 426, 556, 582, 583, 596



- Gluskina, L. M., 634  
 Golb, N., 22, 26, 129, 130, 131, 168, 169, 226  
 Goldberg, A., 347, 348  
 Goldenberg, G., 372  
 Goldman, L., 275  
 Goldsmid Montefiore, Claude, 104  
 Golebiewski, M., 627  
 González Lamadrid, A., 512, 515  
 Goodblatt, D. M., 195  
 Goodman, M., 471, 472  
 Goren, S., 347  
 Goshen-Gottstein, M. H., 59, 247, 249, 318, 364, 365  
 Gottlieb, L., 306  
 Grabbe, L. L., 479  
 Green, D. A., 185, 186  
 Greenberg, M., 329  
 Greenfield, J. C., 92, 97, 98, 159, 180, 194, 255, 273, 326, 371, 373, 377, 378, 379, 384  
 Greenhut, Z., 389  
 Grelot, P., 425  
 Grossman, M., 29, 47  
 Grossouw, W., 498  
 Gruenwald, I., 340  
 Gusella, L., 608  
 Gutfeld, O., 397  
 Gzella, H., 509  
  
 Haapa, E., 612  
 Habermann, A. M., 32, 251, 367  
 Habermann, B., 572  
 Hahn, I., 639, 640  
 Hahn, O., 578  
 Halpern-Amaru, B., 95, 97  
 Hamidović, D., 446  
 Hann, S., 218  
 Hanson, P. D., 91  
 Harkins, A. K., 45  
 Harrelson, W., 90  
 Harrington, D. J., 31, 75, 92  
 Harrington, H., 151, 153  
 Harrison, R. K., 469  
 Hayes, C., 152  
 Hayward, R., 481, 486  
 Heger, P., 231  
 Heidegger, M., 535  
 Hempel, C., 479, 485  
 Hengel, M., 557, 558  
 Henshke, D., 349, 350, 355  
 Henze, M., 171, 172  
 Herbert, E. D., 59, 67, 479, 482  
  
 Herrero, P., 515  
 Hillhorst, T., 506  
 Himmelfarb, M., 152, 153, 356  
 Hirschfeld, Y., 271, 396, 595  
 Hoenig, S., 128, 129  
 Hogeterp, A., 505  
 Holm-Nielsen, S., 613  
 Hölscher, G., 586  
 Holst, S., 615  
 Horgan, M., 39  
 Horst, P. van der, 508  
 Hoppers, J. H., 501  
 Huebsch, R., 228  
 Hughes, J. A., 474  
 Hugo, P., 577, 587  
 Humbert, J.-B., 431, 583  
 Hunzinger, C.-H., 54, 407, 414, 421, 539, 540, 580, 581, 596  
 Hurvitz, A., 368, 369, 370, 371, 373  
 Hvidberg, F. F., 611  
 Hyatt, J. P., 80, 81  
  
 Ibba, G., 93, 607  
 Isaac, E., 179  
 Isaksson, B., 618  
 Iurevich, D., 637  
 Ivany, E. L., 227  
 Iwry, S., 33  
  
 Jain, E., 593  
 James, F. C., 221  
 Janowski, B., 557  
 Jastram, N., 62, 426  
 Jauber, A., 84  
 Jaubert, A., 85, 86, 411  
 Jellinek, A., 103  
 Jeremias, G., 45, 545, 548, 597  
 Jiménez Bedman, F., 524  
 Johns, L., 214  
 Jokiranta, J., 615  
 Jones, V., 388, 390  
 Jonge, M. de, 495  
 Jongeling, B., 495, 496, 499, 501, 504, 506  
 Joosten, J., 440  
 Justnes, Å., 615  
  
 Kaddari, M. Z., 368, 375  
 Kahle, P., 124, 219, 468  
 Kalman, J., 217, 225  
 Kalman, Y., 397  
 Kampen, J., 230, 232  
 Kapelrud, A., 612  
 Kapera, Z., 627, 628

- Kaufman, S. A., 165, 184, 186, 191, 193, 194  
 Kenyon, K., 407  
 Kireeva, N., 637  
 Kister, M., 259, 262, 264, 265, 273, 274, 275, 276, 279, 280, 292, 293, 294, 324, 329, 353, 357, 371, 372  
 Kittel, B., 44  
 Kittel, G., 542, 543  
 Klausner, J., 538  
 Klawans, J., 151, 152  
 Klinzing, G., 546  
 Knibb, M. A., 177, 180, 478, 479, 485, 614  
 Knohl, I., 360  
 Kobelski, P. J., 39  
 Koch, K., 556  
 Kocsis, E., 640  
 Koehler, L., 575  
 Kohler, K., 114, 115  
 Kohn, L. L., 233  
 Komoróczy, G., 639, 641  
 Kooij, A. van der, 508  
 Kottsieper, I., xii, 44, 576, 577, 578, 587, 589-590  
 Koymman, S., 153  
 Kraft, R. A., 51, 53, 90, 304  
 Kratz, R. G., xii, 545, 555, 568, 569, 574-575, 588, 592  
 Kugel, J. L., 96, 181, 182, 188, 275, 322, 323, 326, 330  
 Kugler, R. A., 45, 47, 97, 98, 180, 181  
 Kuhn, H.-W., 545, 557, 559, 560  
 Kuhn, K. G., 424, 495, 531, 536, 538, 540, 541-545, 546, 550, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 571, 572, 574, 579, 580, 586, 597, 612  
 Kuiper, G., 158  
 Kutscher, E. Y., 223, 247, 316, 363, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 375, 376, 378, 506  
 Labuschagne, C., 495  
 Lambdin, T. O., 155, 371  
 Lange, A., 540, 557, 558, 560, 567, 577, 579, 582  
 Lange, F., 514  
 Langhe, R. de, 406  
 Langlois, M., 445, 446  
 Lankester Harding, G., 54, 84, 220, 221, 222, 223, 404, 408, 451, 454, 457, 463, 464  
 Laperrousaz, E.-M., 436, 441-442  
 Larson, E., 92, 148, 179, 426  
 Leaney, R., 466, 484  
 Legrand, T., 32, 445  
 Lehmann, M. R., 82, 148, 158  
 Leigh, R., 453, 482, 552, 570  
 Lemaire, A., 426, 431, 442-443  
 Levine, B., 127, 139-140, 179, 257  
 Lewis, N., 384  
 Licht, J., 38, 239, 240, 243-244, 245, 246, 249, 252, 276, 278, 280, 281-283, 284, 285, 289, 290, 293, 318, 329, 347, 367, 373  
 Lichtenberger, H., 546, 557, 558, 560  
 Lieberman, S., 34, 123, 124, 125, 137, 142, 154, 347, 358  
 Lifshitz, B., 300  
 Lim, T. H., 229, 426, 472, 475, 481, 484, 486  
 Lindars, B., 473  
 Littmann, E., 84, 542  
 Livneh, A., 324  
 Lohse, E., 32, 551, 571, 585  
 López Melús, F. M., 514, 515  
 Lurya, B.-T., 368  
 Machiela, D. A., 164, 231, 239  
 Magen, Y., 271, 390, 391  
 Magness, J., 29  
 Maier, J., 520, 525, 551, 552, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 574, 586, 587  
 Mann, C. S., 469  
 Manoog, C., 222, 223  
 Manson, T. W., 453, 458  
 Mansoor, M., 42, 66, 506  
 Margoliouth, G., 112  
 Marmardji, S., 403, 487  
 Marmorstein, A., 346  
 Martone, C., 504, 603, 605, 606  
 Mathews, K., 59  
 Maurer, A., 593  
 Mayerhofer, K., 574  
 Mazar, B., 365  
 Mazor, L., 310  
 McCready, W., 228  
 Medala, S., 627  
 Meer, M. N. van der, 508  
 Mendelson, A., 228  
 Metso, S., 35, 36, 229, 230, 233, 426, 547, 593, 614  
 Meyer, R., 550, 624  
 Meyers, B., 228  
 Micallef, F., 227  
 Miletto, G., 604  
 Milgrom, J., 139, 140, 141, 151, 153

- Milik, J. T., xi, 2, 3, 4, 20, 34, 36, 38, 43, 49, 51, 53, 54, 80, 81, 82, 84, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 94, 97, 142, 146, 171, 172, 174, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 184, 185, 205, 222, 248, 251, 405, 407, 408, 410, 413-419, 421, 422, 423, 424, 427, 429, 433, 436, 457, 469, 490, 495, 512, 515, 579, 580, 582, 584, 591, 601, 606, 622
- Millar, F., 471
- Miller, J. E., 159
- Mizrahi, N., 373
- Molin, G., 534
- Monti, L., 609
- Moore, C. A., 87, 183
- Moore, G. F., 112, 113, 114, 115
- Mor, U., 374
- Morag, S., 365, 366, 370, 375
- Moraldi, L., 602, 603, 604, 607
- Morgenstern, J., 85
- Morgenstern, M., 239, 301, 372-373, 378
- Mosbech, H., 611
- Moscato, S., 601, 602
- Muchowski, P., 628
- Muilenburg, J., 502
- Müller, H.-P., 557
- Muraoka, T., 165, 188, 191, 508
- Najman, H., 78, 95, 231, 233, 506
- Nakhman, D., 305, 339
- Navarro Peiró, Á., 526
- Naveh, J., 373, 379
- Nebe, W., 589
- Neusner, J., 126, 127, 128, 142, 520
- Newmann, J., 231
- Newsom, C., 29, 31, 44, 45, 46, 47, 242, 426, 500, 590
- Newton, M., 228
- Nickelsburg, 24, 93, 163, 184
- Nickelsburg, G., 22, 23, 47, 49, 75, 90, 91, 92, 163, 177, 179, 237
- Nielsen, E., 612
- Nims, C., 179
- Nitzan, B., 278, 284, 290, 292, 293, 329, 336, 339, 342, 373
- Noam, V., 263, 265, 349, 350, 357, 359
- Nöldeke, T., 116
- Norin, S., 618
- Norton, J., 593
- Núñez, G., 514
- Obermann, J., 85
- Olmos, A., 518
- Olyan, S., 229, 426
- Oppenheimer, A., 519
- Orlinsky, H., 52, 223
- Osborne, R. E., 227
- Osten-Sacken, P. von der, 585
- Österreicher, J., 228
- Otzen, B., 612
- Oudshoorn, J., 508
- Oxtoby, W., 58, 226
- O'Callaghan, J., 513, 516, 554
- O'Connor, J. M., 424-425, 495
- O'Connor, M., 189
- Pákozdy, L. M., 640
- Parry, D. W., 32, 63, 195, 299, 504, 582
- Parsons, P. J., 473
- Pasquali, G., 604
- Pass, H. L., 180
- Patrich, J., 388, 389, 391, 393, 397
- Patterson, D., 461
- Paul, A., 32, 445
- Peláez, J., 519
- Peleg, Y., 271, 390, 391
- Penna, A., 608
- Penner, J., 231
- Penner, K., 231
- Penney, D. L., 187
- Pérez Castro, F., 513
- Pérez Fernández, M., 523
- Peters, D. M., 180, 231, 474
- Peursen, W. van, 508
- Pfann, S. J., 381
- Pfeiffer, R., 84
- Philonenko, M., 436, 438-439, 445
- Philonenko-Sayar, B., 438, 439
- Pigulevskaia, N. V., 636
- Pike, D., 89
- Pixner, B., 553
- Plenderleith, H. J., 455, 466, 483
- Ploeg, J. van der, 50, 403, 487, 488-491, 497, 498, 499, 500, 506, 516
- Poirier, J., 169, 195
- Polak, F. H., 243, 305
- Polotsky, H. J., 364
- Poole, J. B., 467, 483
- Popović, M., 504, 505
- Porzig, P., 555
- Poznanski, S., 106
- Price, R., 396
- Pryke, J., 469
- Przybylski, B., 228

- Puech, É., 49, 174, 186, 205, 243, 424,  
 425-430, 431, 503, 523, 525, 528, 547,  
 586, 591, 592, 610
- Qimron, E., 82, 149, 159, 189, 256, 260,  
 267, 278, 280, 321, 347, 348, 369, 370,  
 371, 373, 374, 375, 377, 378, 379, 508,  
 591
- Rabin, C., 4, 122, 133, 134, 190, 246, 247,  
 308, 346, 364-365, 366, 460-461, 463,  
 464, 485
- Rabinowitz, I., 188
- Ranta, E., 614
- Reed, R., 466, 483
- Reed, W., 219
- Reeves, J. C., 91, 180
- Regev, E., 265, 267, 269, 355
- Reicke, B., 612
- Renan, E., 3, 434, 537
- Rendsburg, G. A., 191
- Rengstorf, K.-H., 595
- Revell, J., 227, 228
- Richardson, H. N., 37
- Richter, H.-P., 572
- Riesner, R., 553
- Rinaldi, G., 601
- Ringgren, H., 612, 613
- Riska, M., 615
- Roberts, B., 466
- Robinson, J. M., 261
- Roß, A., 269, 306, 308, 309, 310, 311,  
 320, 610
- Röhler-Ertl, O., 596
- Roitman, A., 279, 522, 523, 525
- Rost, L., 34
- Roth, C., 461-462, 464, 468
- Rousée, J.-M., 408
- Rowley, H. H., 224, 451-453, 454, 455,  
 456, 471, 485, 613
- Rubinstein, A., 450
- Ruiten, J. v., 506
- Sabugal, S., 518
- Sacchi, P., 604, 607, 609
- Sáenz Badillos, A., 523, 526
- Safai, S., 359
- Safrai, S., 346, 347
- Saley, R., 63
- Samely, A., 486
- Sander, R., 574
- Sanders, E. P., 179, 228
- Sanders, J. A., 51, 59, 81, 83, 86, 317
- Sanderson, J. E., 52, 61, 426
- Sandmel, S., 226
- Sarfatti, G. B.-A., 368
- Saukkonen, J., 615, 618
- Savignac, R., 407
- Schattner-Rieser, U., 445
- Schechter, S., 4, 102, 103-104, 105, 106,  
 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 116,  
 117, 118, 120, 121, 125, 127, 131, 133,  
 135, 136, 137, 148, 154, 253, 277, 346
- Scheiber, A., 639
- Schick, A., 596
- Schiffman, L. H., 22, 24, 25, 28, 36, 37, 38,  
 66, 68, 95, 96, 99, 123, 135, 136, 137,  
 138, 139, 142, 143, 145, 148, 149, 154,  
 212, 213, 237, 238, 257, 261, 265, 269,  
 308, 348
- Schippers, R., 498
- Schmidt, F., 436, 440-441
- Schneider, C., 624
- Schniedewind, W., 188, 190
- Schofield, A., 29, 36
- Schubert, K., 32, 515, 534, 551, 565-566,  
 567, 568, 570
- Schuller, E. M., 37, 42, 43, 44, 46, 86, 90,  
 217, 226, 228, 229, 232, 233, 426, 540,  
 547, 584, 587, 592
- Schultz, B., 41, 241
- Schürer, E., 470, 471, 472
- Schwartz, D. R., 262, 263, 268, 277, 354
- Schwartz, S., 195
- Schwarz, O., 491
- Scobie, C. H. H., 469
- Scott, J. M., 96
- Scott, R., 79, 217, 218, 220, 221, 222, 223,  
 224, 225, 226, 227, 232
- Seeligmann, I., 304
- Segal, M. (Michael), 68, 274, 276, 301,  
 306, 308, 309, 320, 324
- Segal, M. (Moses), 195, 241, 302
- Segert, S., 166-167, 179, 190, 624-625
- Selms, A. van, 502
- Sen Montero, E., 522
- Sen, F., 513
- Shaked, S., 277, 377
- Shalit, A., 365
- Shatzman, I., 241
- Shavit, Y., 519
- Shemesh, A., 107, 262, 263, 264, 350, 352,  
 353, 358
- Shifman, I. S., 636
- Shinan, A., 331
- Silberman, L. H., 40

- Silman, Y., 354  
 Sivertzev, A., 637  
 Skehan, P. W., 49, 52, 54, 56-57, 58, 59,  
     60, 61, 63, 85, 86, 407, 414, 455  
 Skinner, A. C., 89  
 Slingerland, H. D., 98  
 Slomovic, E., 40  
 Smith, M., 41, 206, 207  
 Smith, M. S., 99, 188, 189, 426  
 Smith, W. C., 222  
 Smyth, P., 227  
 Soggin, J. A., 602  
 Sokoloff, M., 166, 179, 194, 377, 378  
 Solé, S., 514  
 Sollamo, R., 614, 616  
 Spijkerman, A., 409  
 Starcky, J., 385, 407, 414, 417, 419, 421,  
     422-424, 425, 427, 429, 430, 433, 436,  
     495  
 Starkova, K. B., 635, 636  
 Steck, O. H., 554  
 Steckoll, S., 387  
 Stegemann, H., 44, 173, 227, 228, 229,  
     243, 268, 426, 519, 540, 545, 546-549,  
     550, 555, 557, 559, 560, 568-569, 570,  
     571, 572, 574, 578, 583, 584, 587, 589,  
     590, 591, 592, 595, 597, 614  
 Steiner, R., 161, 179  
 Steinman, A., 171  
 Stemberger, G., 567  
 Stendahl, K., 66, 199, 213, 612  
 Stern, S. (Sacha), 265, 480  
 Stern, S. (Samuel), 613  
 Steudel, A., xii, 426, 540, 545, 547, 555,  
     571, 574, 577, 581, 582, 585, 587, 593  
 Stevenson, W. B., 468  
 Stökl Ben Ezra, D., 447  
 Stoll, D., 593  
 Stoll, H. A., 639  
 Stone, M. E., 92, 97, 98, 180, 269, 273,  
     274, 276, 279, 326, 377, 378  
 Strange, J. F., 394  
 Strawn, B. A., 35  
 Strugnell, J., 15, 16, 20, 21, 22, 29, 31, 34,  
     39, 43, 44, 47, 54, 62, 76, 77, 82, 83,  
     87-90, 93, 98, 149, 254, 256, 260, 267,  
     327, 348, 407, 413, 414, 416, 421, 426,  
     454, 455, 463-464, 470, 495, 527, 572,  
     581, 591, 592  
 Stuckenbruck, L. T., 37, 91, 93, 426, 479,  
     480, 481  
 Sukenik, E. L., 1, 33, 40, 42, 44, 49, 84,  
     237, 238, 239, 240, 243, 244, 252, 280,  
     281, 297, 299, 300, 318, 363, 365, 404,  
     450, 547  
 Sussmann, A., 255, 347  
 Sussmann, Y., 260, 261, 262, 263, 265,  
     348, 352, 353, 359, 372  
 Sutcliffe, E. F., 516  
 Swanson, D. D., 474  
 Szénási, J. S., 641  
 Szörényi, A., 638  
 Tabor, J. D., 210  
 Tal, A., 377  
 Talmon, S., 10, 59, 64, 247-249, 252, 255,  
     286, 287, 301, 304, 306, 308, 310, 312,  
     318, 335, 336, 337, 373, 387, 582  
 Talshir, D., 311, 371, 372, 378  
 Tanner, S., 484  
 Tantlevskii, I. R., 637  
 Tanzer, S., 44  
 Taylor, J., 479, 482  
 Taylor, W., 232  
 Teeter, D. A., 67, 78  
 Teicher, J. L., 465  
 Teixidor, J., 226  
 Thiede, C. P., 554  
 Thomas, D. W., 465, 466  
 Thorion, Y., 589  
 Thorion-Varda, T., 589  
 Thorion-Varda, T., 589  
 Thyen, H., 546  
 Tigchelaar, E. J. C., 52, 59, 94, 426, 500,  
     504, 505, 506, 507, 524, 525  
 Tiller, P., 93  
 Tocci, F. M., 602  
 Toit, J. du, 217, 225  
 Torrey, C. C., 84, 183  
 Tournay, R., 408  
 Tov, E., 32, 49, 51, 53, 61, 64, 67, 68, 76,  
     89, 99, 229, 237, 255-256, 279, 280,  
     300, 301, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309,  
     310, 311, 312, 319, 320, 321, 327, 373,  
     412, 507, 525, 540, 582, 604, 614  
 Trebelle Barrera, J., 62, 426, 449, 504, 512,  
     521, 522, 523, 525, 526-527, 528  
 Trever, J. C., 13, 32, 33, 38, 49, 50-51, 79,  
     157, 218, 219, 403  
 Tritton, A. S., 364  
 Tromp, J., 508  
 Tronina, A., 628  
 Troyer, K. de, 185, 560  
 Tso, M. K. M., 474  
 Tur-Sinai, N. H., 363, 364, 365  
 Tushingham, D., 219, 220, 225, 226

- Tyloch, W., 625-627
- Ulfgard, H., 616
- Ullendorff, E., 180
- Ullmann-Margalit, E., 266, 272
- Ulrich, E., 49, 52, 55, 56, 58, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 229, 230, 426, 525, 604
- Unnik, W. van, 497, 498
- Urbach, E. E., 346, 347
- Urbán, A., 517
- Valchanov, S., 630
- VanderKam, J. C., xi, 22, 23, 25, 49, 66, 67, 68, 86, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 99, 158, 159, 177, 212, 213, 214, 215, 308, 426, 582
- Vaux, R. de, 9, 15, 20, 51, 53, 54, 80, 81, 83, 220, 223, 232, 253, 254, 270, 271, 387, 391, 392, 393, 395, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407-410, 411, 412, 415, 416, 419, 420, 421, 422, 430, 431, 432, 433, 435, 436, 442, 456, 457, 463, 477, 489, 491, 497, 512, 580, 596
- Vázquez Allegue, J., 523, 524
- Vegas Montaner, L., 512, 518, 521
- Vermes, G., xi, 20, 32, 35, 37, 75, 76, 159, 228, 464, 467-468, 469-472, 473, 475, 485
- Vermes, P., 471
- Vidal Manzanares, C., 522
- Vielhauer, P., 569
- Vielhauer, R., 555, 587, 593, 599
- Vilar Hueso, V., 511
- Vincent, A. L., 515
- Virolleaud, C., 444
- Vivian, A., 607
- Vriezen, T., 497, 498, 500, 501, 502
- Waard, J. de, 502
- Wacholder, B.-Z., 139, 168, 171, 194, 573
- Wagner, S., 550
- Wallenstein, M., 449, 450
- Walther, J. A., 86
- Ward, W. H., 461
- Wassen, C., 37, 231, 232, 615
- Wechsler, M. G., 168, 169, 186
- Wechsler, T., 218
- Weeks, S., 480
- Weigold, M., 579
- Weinberg, J. P., 636
- Weinfeld, M., 268, 321, 337, 338, 340, 614
- Weiss, P. R., 450, 452, 613
- Weiss, I. H., 103, 105
- Weiss, R., 305
- Weissenberg, H. von, 615
- Weitzman, S., 190
- Werber, E. W., 629
- Werman, C., 263, 264, 274, 287, 295, 323, 324, 325, 349, 352
- Wernberg-Møller, P. C. H., 450, 451, 454, 463, 484, 506, 613
- Wevers, J., 228, 232
- White Crawford, S., 49, 62, 68, 76, 163, 164, 184, 319, 426
- Wieder, N., 465
- Wilcox, M., 469
- Wilson, E., 15, 198, 199, 225, 515
- Winnett, F., 217, 218, 220
- Winter, P., 471
- Wise, M. O., 28, 32, 40, 87, 161, 168, 169, 173, 174, 183, 186, 187, 194, 206, 208-209, 210, 211, 213, 553, 570
- Witaszek, G., 627
- Wolters, A., 230
- Wood, W. R., 227
- Woude, A. S. van der, 52, 59, 94, 487, 489, 492-495, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 504, 505, 506, 507, 518, 525, 526
- Wright, B., 506
- Wright, N. T., 215
- Xeravits, G., 505, 641
- Yadin, Y., 6, 40, 50, 52, 59, 81, 82, 102, 138, 139, 157, 223, 240, 240-243, 244, 246, 252, 257, 276, 280, 299, 300, 316, 321, 325, 347, 365, 368, 369, 373, 374, 375, 376, 383, 384, 406, 490, 499, 590, 639
- Yalon, H., 33, 246, 363, 364, 367
- Yardeni, A., 56, 239, 267, 373, 374, 379
- Yeivin, I., 371
- Yishai, R., 241, 276
- Yizhar, 299
- York, A., 167
- York, A. D., 167
- Yuditsky, A. (E.), 372, 373, 374
- Zahn, M., 68, 77
- Zakovitch, Y., 310, 331
- Zangenberg, J., 508, 509, 595
- Zdun, P., 628
- Zeitlin, S., 14, 15, 85, 122, 128, 346
- Zewi, T., 372
- Zias, J., 271

Zimmermann, J., 558

Zuckerman, B., 161, 167, 168

Zulay, M., 373