Keter Shem Tov

Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures and its Contexts

20

This series contains volumes dealing with the study of the Hebrew Bible, ancient Israelite society and related ancient societies, biblical Hebrew and cognate languages, the reception of biblical texts through the centuries, and the history of the discipline. The series includes monographs, edited collections, and the printed version of the Journal of Hebrew Scriptures, which is also available online.

Keter Shem Tov

**Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of
Alan Crown**

**Edited by
Shani Tzoref
Ian Young**

gorgias press

2013

Gorgias Press LLC, 954 River Road, Piscataway, NJ, 08854, USA

www.gorgiaspress.com

Copyright © 2013 by Gorgias Press LLC

All rights reserved under International and Pan-American Copyright Conventions. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning or otherwise without the prior written permission of Gorgias Press LLC.

2013

,

ISBN 978-1-61143-866-6

ISSN 1935-6897

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

International Conference on the Dead Sea scrolls (2011 :
Mandelbaum House, University of Sydney)

Keter shem tov : collected essays on the Dead Sea scrolls
in memory of Alan Crown / edited by Shani Tzoref, Ian Young.
pages cm. -- (Perspectives on Hebrew scriptures and
its contexts, ISSN 1935-6897 ; 20)

"This volume contains the proceedings of a conference on
the Dead Sea scrolls held in memory of the late emeritus
professor Alan Crown in late 2011 at the University of
Sydney, Mandelbaum House. This eclectic collection contains
16 articles on a variety of topics within Qumran studies from
established scholars in the field such as Emanuel Tov, Albert
Baumgarten, William Loader and Shani Tzoref as well as
exciting new voices in the field. Topics cover the full range
of scholarly study of the scrolls, from the impact of the
Qumran discoveries on the study of the Hebrew Bible and the
New Testament to the study of the scrolls themselves and the
community organizations presupposed in them, focusing as well
on topics as diverse as sexuality, scribal practice and the
attitude to the Temple in the scrolls."--Summary.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-61143-866-6 (alk. paper)

1. Dead Sea scrolls--Congresses. I. Crown, Alan David.
II. Tzoref, Shani. III. Young, Ian. IV. Title.

BM487.I545 2013

296.1'55--dc23

2013034674

Printed in the United States of America

KETER SHEM TOV:
ESSAYS ON THE
DEAD SEA SCROLLS
IN MEMORY OF ALAN CROWN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	v
Abbreviations	vii
Introduction	1
Shani Tzoref and Ian Young	
Eulogy for Alan Crown	9
David Freedman	
Part 1. Qumran Scholarship: Now and Then	15
Qumran Communities—Past and Present	17
Shani Tzoref	
Part 2. Textual Transmission of the Hebrew Bible	57
The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The	
Proximity of the Pre-Samaritan Qumran Scrolls to the SP	59
Emanuel Tov	
“Loose” Language in 1QIsa ^a	89
Ian Young	
The Contrast Between the Qumran and Masada Biblical	
Scrolls in the Light of New Data.	113
Ian Young	
Part 3. Reception of Scripture in the Dead Sea Scrolls	121
A Case for Two <i>Vorlagen</i> Behind the Habakkuk	
Commentary (1QpHab)	123
Stephen Llewelyn, Stephanie Ng, Gareth Wearne and	
Alexandra Wrathall	
“Holy Ones” and “(Holy) People” in Daniel and 1QM	151
Anne Gardner	
What has Qohelet to do with Qumran?	185
Martin A. Shields	
4QTestimonia (4Q175) and the Epistle of Jude	203
John A. Davies	

Plant Symbolism and the Dreams of Noah and Abram in the Genesis Apocryphon.....	217
Marianne Dacy	
Part 4. Community and the Dead Sea Scrolls	233
What Did the “Teacher” Know?: Owls and Roosters in the Qumran Barnyard	235
Albert I. Baumgarten	
Exclusion and Ethics: Contrasting Covenant Communities in 1QS 5:1–7:25 and 1 Cor 5:1–6:11	259
Bradley J. Bitner	
Eschatology and Sexuality in the So-Called Sectarian Documents from Qumran	305
William Loader	
Part 5. The Temple and the Dead Sea Scrolls	317
A Temple Built of Words: Exploring Concepts of the Divine in the Damascus Document	319
Dionysia A. van Beek	
4Q174 and the Epistle to the Hebrews.....	333
Philip Church	
The <i>Temple Scroll</i> : “The Day of Blessing” or “The Day of Creation”? Insights on <i>Shekinah</i> and Sabbath	361
Antoinette Collins	
List of Contributors	375
Index of Authors	377
Index of Ancient Sources.....	385

QUMRAN COMMUNITIES— PAST AND PRESENT*

Shani Tzoref

The history of the publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls has attracted almost as much public interest as the contents of the Scrolls themselves. Today, the Scrolls are again making headlines, as the Israel Antiquities Authority (my home institution) and the Israel Museum have partnered with Google Inc. to upload digitized images of the manuscripts.¹ For most of the twentieth century, the extensive media fanfare focused on dramatic controversies, conspiracy theories, exclusion, lawsuits, divisions and divisiveness. In the current study, to honor the memory of Alan Crown, I call attention to a phenomenon that has received less attention but is of more lasting significance: the evolution of Qumran studies into a field that is a model of interfaith collegiality and cooperation. I will outline the three phases that have been perceived in this evolutionary process, and demonstrate how these phases correlate with developments in the scholarly consensus about the

* For Prof. Alan Crown, in warm appreciation and gratitude, and with particularly fond memories of our committee sessions for setting the NSW Higher School Certificate; his personal interest in and support of students, colleagues, and anybody who crossed his path; and his contagious sense of humor and smile.

¹ The Israel Antiquities Authority site, <http://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/>, contains new spectral images of Scrolls fragments and scanned images of infrared photographs of the Rockefeller Museum corpus taken in the 1950s and 1960s. The Israel Museum site, <http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/project>, contains images of the relatively complete scrolls housed at the Shrine of the Book.

identification of the community of the scrolls. Finally, I will suggest that the modern progression towards global cooperation may be seen as a mirror image of a move towards insularity that characterized the people of the scrolls in antiquity.

1. THREE PHASES OF QUMRAN SCHOLARSHIP: ACCESS AND PUBLICATION (LINEAR MODEL)

The model of three stages of Qumran studies, or three generations of Dead Sea Scrolls scholars, has been portrayed by some as a linear progression. The linear model is relevant with respect to access and publication:

- 1) The first generation was a period of *Acquisition and Allocation*, when access to the texts was limited to a closed circle of official scholars.
- 2) The second phase, a time of *Breaking Barriers*, was about opening the field, especially physically, in terms of access to unpublished texts; it was also an era of rejection of established interpretations and analyses.
- 3) Finally, we reach today's phase of *Cooperation and Collaboration*, and complexity in analysis.

Phases 1 and 2 have been discussed at great length, especially by Lawrence H. Schiffman,² Neil Asher Silberman,³ and, most recently, by Weston Fields.⁴ Some highlights are summarized here.

² 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), esp. pp. xxi–xxiv and Part 1, “Discovery and Disclosure: Liberating the Scrolls,” 1–61 (ch. 1 is entitled “Shepherds and Scholars: Secrets of the Caves” [3–19]; ch. 2 is “Scholars, Scrolls, and Scandals” [21–31]); idem, “Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Significance of the Scrolls for Judaism and Christianity” and “The Many ‘Battles of the Scrolls,’” in *Archaeology and Society in the 21st Century: the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Case Studies* (ed. Neil A. Silberman and Ernest S. Frerichs; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2001), 160–68; 188–210.

³ Neil Asher Silberman, *The Hidden Scrolls: Christianity, Judaism, and the War for the Dead Sea Scrolls* (NY: Putnam’s, 1994).

1.1. Phase 1: Acquisition and Allocation, a Closed Circle

In concrete physical terms, the restriction and separateness of the first generation of Qumran scholarship is evidenced by the fact that three of the first seven scrolls found in Cave 1 were acquired by Prof. Eliezer Sukenik of the Hebrew University, for the University, and were published in west Jerusalem in Israel, while the remaining four were published by the American Schools of Oriental Research (ASOR) based in east Jerusalem, then part of Jordan. The timing and location of the discovery of the first Dead Sea Scrolls in Cave 1 near Qumran in 1947 placed the scrolls squarely in the center of the Arab-Israeli conflict associated with the UN partition vote of that year and the establishment of the State of Israel. The coincidence of the partition vote and the Scrolls discovery was romanticized and dramatized by Sukenik's son Yigael Yadin, the Israeli statesman and archaeologist who is most well-known for his excavation of Masada, in his book *Message of the Scrolls*.⁵ Among the uglier aspects of the modern historical context of the discovery was the politically motivated ostracism of Israeli and Jewish scholars from the large-scale publication process. With the discovery of Cave 4, and its many thousands of fragments, an “international” team was established at the Palestine Archaeological Museum (later the Rockefeller Museum) in East Jerusalem, to produce the official

⁴ Weston W. Fields, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Full History*, Vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2009). This very comprehensive account, the first of an anticipated two-volume work, covers events of the first phase, from 1947–1960. Fields conducted extensive personal interviews with individuals involved in the discovery, acquisition, and publication of the scrolls, and tracked down many unpublished records. Fields also refers to the numerous (and frequently conflicting) first-person accounts and memoirs that have been published by early scrolls scholars, which are important sources for the initial phase.

⁵ Yigael Yadin, *The Message of the Scrolls* (London: Simon and Schuster, 1957). The excerpts that Yadin quotes from his father's diary are especially dramatic and moving. See also, idem, “A Biography of E.L. Sukenik,” (Hebrew) *Erlsr* 8 (1967): 12–20.

publication of the scrolls corpus.⁶ There is some uncertainty as to whether there was a conscious effort to include a balance of Protestants and Catholics on the original team,⁷ but it is clear that ecumenical sensitivity did not extend to Jews. Israeli and Jewish scholars were deliberately excluded from this enterprise, in part due to expedience—it was considered a given that Jordan would not grant entry to east Jerusalem to a Jew or Israeli—and in part due to the anti-Israel sentiments of the original publication team.⁸

Another illustration of the policy of exclusion, also outlined in Yadin's book, is Yadin's complicated clandestine operation to acquire the four Dead Sea Scrolls of the original lot of seven from Cave 1 that had been photographed and published by ASOR, but kept in the possession of the Syriac Archbishop Athanasius Samuel who had purchased them from the Bedouin discoverers. The premise of this classic tale of intrigue and *chutzpah* is that the seller, and even large segments of the international community, would not have tolerated the sale of the scrolls to Israel.⁹

⁶ The official excavation of Cave 4 and the initial publication of the texts took place under the auspices of G. Lankester Harding, the British director of the Jordanian Antiquities Authority along with the Dominican priest Roland de Vaux of the French École Biblique.

⁷ The nationalities and denominational affiliations of the original team are listed in James C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 229 (in ch. 7 "Controversies About the Dead Sea Scrolls," 227–41). Fields (*Full History*, 192) dismisses claims that denomination played a role in the selection of scholars for the international team.

⁸ See Fields, *Full History*, 437–38; Schiffman, "Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls," 162; Silberman, *The Hidden Scrolls*, 84–85. Evidence of anti-Zionism and antisemitism on the part of the original team members appears throughout Fields' book, though he generally attempts to mute it. The most well-known declaration from a member of the team comes from a later period, John Strugnell's infamous 1990 interview in the Israeli newspaper *Ha'aretz*. See below, n. 25.

⁹ See the explicit remark by the early Scrolls scholar, William H. Brownlee, "One severe limitation upon any prospective buyer was that he must not be a Jew... Even if the metropolitan himself had been willing to

An unusual comment upon the segregated scholarship is found in correspondence between two members of the original team, a personal letter written by John Strugnell to John M. Allegro on 15 October, 1955 (somewhat prefiguring his later removal from editorship of the team due, in part, to antisemitic statements):

Apparently the Jew who is preparing the full-scale commentary on the Hodayot has signed a contract with the Mosad Bialiq which means not only that it will appear in Hebrew, but also that he promises *not to allow* a translation into any other language. That sort of parochial obscurantism makes me sick.¹⁰

The letter contains a post-script: “Did you notice that in the photograph in the London News there was an awful lot of unpublished Pesher clearly legible? I wonder what fool will try to produce a first edition.”¹¹ To my knowledge, no attempt was made to publish the text that was pictured in the 1955 *Illustrated London News*. In 1961, however, Jacob Licht, the author of the Hebrew commentary on Hodayot condemned by Strugnell in the above quote, published three columns of Pesher Nahum on the basis of a poor-quality photograph that he found in a brochure for the Rockefeller Museum, put out by the Department of Antiquities of Jordan in that year.¹²

Licht’s maverick publication is the exception that proves the rule. The small official team retained exclusive publication rights for the Qumran texts through the 1950s and 1960s and into the

sell to a Jew, he would have been ostracized by his own people” (in an unpublished manuscript, *Phenomenal Discoveries*, cited by Fields, *Full History*, 241).

¹⁰ From the Allegro Archive, cited in Fields, *Full History*, 259–60.

¹¹ The reference is to a photo of a pesher on Psalms, now known as 4Q171 Pesher Psalms A, that appeared in G. Lankester Harding, “Where Christ Himself may Have Studied: An Essene Monastery at Khirbet Qumran,” *Illustrated London News* 227 (September 3, 1955): 379–81.

¹² Jacob Licht, “Additional Pages of Pesher Nahum,” *Molad* 19 (1961): 454–56.

1970s and 1980s.¹³ As time wore on, publication slowed and funding began to evaporate. Scholars who had written about the scrolls in the first two decades of Qumran studies began to pursue other avenues of research.¹⁴ When Israel annexed East Jerusalem, including the Rockefeller Museum, following the 1967 Six-Day War, some perceived an opportunity for change. Instead, the government of Israel left the management of the Scrolls publication to the existing team of scholars, choosing to maintain the status quo in this matter as in so many others.¹⁵ Edmund

¹³ During the 1950s and 1960s, Israeli archaeologists uncovered additional texts in the Judean desert. This material, mostly documentary papyri from Masada and from Bar Kokhba caves, was published by Jewish and Israeli scholars. See, inter alia, Hanan Eshel, "Excavations in the Judean Desert and at Qumran under Israeli Jurisdiction," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective: A History of Research* (ed. Devorah Dimant; STDJ 99; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 381–400, at 382–87. The official publication team also published separate lots of Bar Kokhba era texts that the Rockefeller Museum had purchased from Bedouin. For the most part, these texts were of less interest to Christian scholars than the earlier sectarian material from Qumran.

¹⁴ Despite the frustrations and limitations, scholars outside the official publication team made significant contributions in the early decades of the field. Comprehensive overviews, according to geographic and national categories, are provided in the articles in Dimant, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective*. On early Israeli Scrolls scholarship in particular, see esp. eadem, "Israeli Scholarship on the Qumran Community," 237–80, and Emanuel Tov, "Israeli Scholarship on the Biblical Texts From the Judean Desert," 297–313. See also, Emanuel Tov, "Israeli Scholarship on the Texts from the Judean Desert," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings* (ed. Robert A. Kugler and Eileen Schuller; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 123–27.

¹⁵ On the Israeli policy of maintaining "status quo" in matters of conflict, see, inter alia, Daphne Barak Erez, "Law and Religion Under the Status Quo Model: Between Past Compromises and Constant Change," *Cardozo Law Review* 30 (2009): 2495–2507. Marlen Eordegian, "British and Israeli maintenance of the status quo in the holy places of Christendom," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 35/2 (2003): 307–28. The

Wilson, the noted American literary figure who captured popular attention and imagination with his accounts of the Scrolls, wrote in the aftermath of the 1967 war of his expectation that “both Israeli and Gentile scholars are, one hopes, for the first time, at last, in a position to examine the whole mass of the scrolls, to confer about them, and to pool their findings.”¹⁶ His assessment was premature, but developments in the 1970s and 1980s did ultimately lead to such broader access.

1.2. Phase 2: Breaking the Barriers, Broadening the Field

One of the factors that have been credited with infusing the new spirit of the second generation into Qumran studies is actually associated with the first generation figure Yigael Yadin. Yadin’s acquisition of the *Temple Scroll* in 1967, and his publication of this monumental work along with a Hebrew commentary in 1977, simultaneously mitigated and reinforced the marginalization of Jewish scholars within Qumran studies. Scholars with fluency in

adoption of the “status quo” approach was itself an implementation of status quo, following a policy first introduced by the Ottoman Sultan Abdul Mejid in 1852 with respect to Christian holy sites in Palestine.

¹⁶ Edmund Wilson, *The Dead Sea Scrolls 1947–1969* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1969), 259. Wilson also noted (*ibid.*) that before he left Jordan on the eve of the war in 1967, de Vaux had asked him to “give his regards to Yadin and to say to him how much he regretted ‘the barrier’ that had prevented them from meeting anywhere except in Paris or London.” [That last qualification is tantalizing. Geza Vermes reports that when he met Yadin for the first time at a conference in Cambridge in 1954, he agreed to Yadin’s request that he [Vermes] “act as his letter box for his correspondence with Father de Vaux and other Qumran scholars in Jordan.” Geza Vermes, *Providential Accidents: An Autobiography* (Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1998), 108. Schuller similarly notes that Yadin and another member of the team, Pierre Benoit, communicated by means of a postal box, and that Weston Fields has confirmed that he has records of some of their correspondence. Eileen Schuller, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and Jewish-Christian Dialogue,” in *From Judaism to Christianity: Tradition and Transition: a Festschrift for Thomas H. Tobin* (ed. Patricia Walters; Leiden: Brill, 2010) 45–58, at p. 56].

modern Hebrew—almost exclusively Jews, in that era¹⁷—were given access to a wealth of new material, but it was specifically *halakhic* material.¹⁸ During this time, Qumran *halakha* became a specialty niche for Jewish scholars, though they continued to function under the handicap of being barred access to unpublished material.¹⁹

Even more significantly, an active campaign began in the 1980s to “free the scrolls” from the monopoly of the “international team.” Two of the most active agents in this campaign have written lively accounts of their perspectives and roles in this second phase of access and publication.²⁰ Beginning in 1980, Emanuel Tov, Elisha Qimron, and Devorah Dimant became the first Israeli scholars to join the authorized publication team.²¹ The first two

¹⁷ One non-Jewish scholar of the first generation who was in fact conversant in Modern Hebrew was not a member of the international team—William Foxwell Albright, who described the Hebrew he learned as a student in Jerusalem the 1920s as “archaic Modern Hebrew.” See the description of his opening address to the 1965 World Congress of Jewish Studies, in Moshe Bar-Asher, “Linguistic Activism,” in *Studies in Modern Hebrew* (Jerusalem: Keter, 2012), 93–120, at 116 n. 105. I thank Jonathan Howard for this reference.

¹⁸ Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977). See Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 26; idem., “Many ‘Battles,’” 192–93; Wilson, “The June War and the Temple Scroll,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 263–72; Silberman, *Hidden Scrolls*, 162–72.

¹⁹ See Alex P. Jassen, “American Scholarship on Jewish Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in Dimant, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective*, 101–54; Aharon Shemesh, “Israeli Research of the Halakhah in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *ibid.*, 345–61. Shemesh states (349) that “almost all scholars engaged in study of Qumran halakhah have been educated at traditional Yeshivot with academic training in Talmudic studies.”

²⁰ Geza Vermes, “The Battle Over the Scrolls: A Personal Account,” ch. 16 in *Providential Accidents* 188–209; Hershel Shanks, *Freeing the Dead Sea Scrolls: And Other Adventures of an Archaeology Outsider* (NY: Continuum, 2010), 125–60. See also, Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 26–31.

²¹ James C. VanderKam and Peter Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity* (San Francisco, Calif.: HarperSanFrancisco, 2002), 388; Schiffman

project directors, Roland de Vaux and Pierre Benoit, each retained their positions until their deaths. When John Strugnell formally succeeded Benoit in 1987, there was some opposition to his appointment, and a good deal of pressure to broaden the field of scholars involved in the project. Both Geza Vermes of Oxford University and Hershel Shanks, editor of *Biblical Archaeology Review*, prominent figures in this campaign, identified antisemitism as one of the factors in the unfairness of the then-status quo.²² It is perhaps a “providential accident,” to borrow the title of Vermes’s memoirs, that a key figure in opening access to the Scrolls was a scholar who was born a Jew, converted to Catholicism, survived the Holocaust as a young priest, and later came to re-identify as a Jew.²³ In his memoirs, Vermes describes the role played by Alan Crown during this transitional period in the late 1980s.²⁴

(“Many Battles,” 193) names these three scholars as members of an expanded team of twenty recruited by Strugnell in 1984. Besides the copies of the PAM photographs held in the Rockefeller Museum in Jerusalem, additional copies were deposited in the Huntington Library as well as at the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center in Claremont, the Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies, and Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati (VanderKam and Flint, *ibid.*, 393).

²² See Vermes, “The Battle Over the Scrolls,” Shanks, *Freeing the Dead Sea Scrolls*.

²³ Vermes, *Providential Accidents*. His parents perished in Auschwitz. Besides his work on the Scrolls, Vermes is best-known for his contribution to the study of the historical figure of Jesus, particularly the Jewish background of his life, thought, and ministry. See, *inter alia*, Geza Vermes, *Jesus the Jew: a Historian's Reading of the Gospels* (London: Collins, 1973).

²⁴ Vermes, *ibid.* He notes in particular (197–98) his consternation that after Alan Crown had been involved in negotiations to arrange for the storage of copies of photographs of the Scrolls at Oxford, in 1989, Crown held the key to the room with the photographs, while resident Oxford scholars were denied entry and access to the material.

In 1990, Strugnell was removed from his position²⁵ and Emanuel Tov became the director of the international committee and the editor-in-chief of the project. In 1991, the Huntington Library in California decided to grant access to all “qualified scholars” to a complete set of negatives that had been entrusted to the Library.²⁶ In that same year, Shanks published the first volume of an edition that was produced with the assistance of computer technology from an “unauthorized” copy of a concordance that had been provided to official editors.²⁷ Also in 1991, Shanks

²⁵ Strugnell’s dismissal, on medical grounds, followed upon an interview for the Israeli newspaper *Ha’aretz* (November 9, 1990) in which he made a number of anti-Jewish and anti-Israeli statements. See Avi Katzman, “Chief Dead Sea Scroll Editor Denounces Judaism, Israel; Claims He’s Seen Four More Scrolls Found by Bedouin,” *B’AR* 17/1 (1990): 64–72; Hershel Shanks, “An Interview with John Strugnell: Ousted Chief Scroll Editor Makes His Case,” *B’AR* 20/4 (1994): 40. It would be too facile, however, to point to Strugnell as an obstacle to Jewish participation in Scrolls research. He was the first to invite an Israeli scholar to work with the unpublished material, and he had close collaborative relationships with a number of Jewish and Israeli colleagues, including some younger scholars whom he mentored. A substantial number of Jewish scholars were among the dozens of “friends and colleagues” who signed a letter of support that was published as “No evidence of Anti-Judaism in Strugnell’s Work,” *B’AR* 17/2 (1991): 15. In fact, the topic of this conference paper was suggested to me by the late Prof. Hanan Eshel, whose relationship with Strugnell was elemental to his appreciation of the interfaith collegiality in the field of Qumran studies. Following Prof. Strugnell’s death in 2009, the Strugnell family entrusted Prof. Eshel with the responsibility and honor of transporting his cremated remains from Boston to Israel for interment in the École Biblique in Jerusalem.

²⁶ Vermes, “The Battle Over the Scrolls,” 203.

²⁷ This was the first of four volumes produced from the index-card concordance by Martin Abegg, using then-cutting-edge computer analysis tools: Ben Zion Wacholder and Martin G. Abegg, eds., *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: the Hebrew and Aramaic texts from Cave Four* (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991–1996). The volumes were carefully labeled as preliminary editions “reconstructed

published a two-volume facsimile edition of a selection of Qumran texts, on the basis of photographs from a source that was not divulged.²⁸ This last publication led to one of the most dramatic episodes in the “battle for the scrolls.” In the “Publisher’s Forward” that appeared in the introduction to the facsimile edition, Shanks had published an unauthorized copy of a transcription of a text known as 4QMMT (*Miqṣat Ma’ase haTorah*, or the *Halakhic Letter*).²⁹ One of the official editors of this text, Elisha Qimron, sued Shanks for this infringement upon his intellectual property in a landmark case that ultimately was decided in favor of Qimron by the Israeli Supreme Court.³⁰ Despite the personal setback for Shanks, the major breakthroughs in 1991 ushered in a new era for Qumran studies. The “monopoly” was broken and the playing field was leveled.

1.3. Phase 3: Cooperation and Collaboration

By 2001, all but two of the total forty volumes of the official *Discoveries in the Judean Desert* series (DJD) were published. Eight of

and edited” by Abegg and his PhD supervisor Wacholder, since copies of the concordance had been printed privately “for use by the editors.” (*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]).

²⁸ Robert H. Eisenman and James M. Robinson, eds., *A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991). Shanks himself says he does not know where or how Eisenman acquired the photographs (*Freeing the Scrolls*, 155).

²⁹ The official edition was published in 1994, Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, in consultation with Yaakov Sussmann and with contributions by Yaakov Sussmann and Ada Yardeni. *Miqṣat Ma’ase HaTorah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994).

³⁰ Israel Supreme Court of Appeals case 54(3) P.D. 817. See Raphael Israeli, *Piracy in Qumran: The Battle Over the Scrolls of the Pre-Christ Era* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2008); Shanks, “Losing in Court,” in *Freeing the Scrolls*, 161–75; VanderKam and Flint, *Meaning*, 388–94.

these volumes were published during the four decades following the initial discovery; twenty-eight were completed by the expanded, truly international team, in the following decade.³¹ It is perhaps ironic that 4QMMT, the manuscript at the heart of the lawsuit concerning the breaking of the monopoly, was the first work to have been edited jointly by a baton-passing interfaith team, Strugnell and Qimron.³² Collaboration among individuals has been an important indicator and generator of interfaith dialog in Qumran studies. Prior to the 1990's, joint publication by Jewish and Christian Dead Sea Scrolls scholars was extremely rare. In the twenty-first century, this is the norm. The conversations and

³¹ See John Noble Wilford, "Team Is Ready to Publish Full Set of Dead Sea Scrolls," *New York Times*, Nov. 15, 2001. Despite the relatively slower pace of the original team, there is no basis to conspiracy theories that posit deliberate delays. Thus, for example the sensationalist claims that the Vatican was blocking publication because the Scrolls posed a challenge to Christian faith, popularized in Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception* (London: Corgi, 1991). The members of the original team were remarkably efficient in their identifications of the thousands of Scrolls fragments. The initial publication rate has been compared favorably to that of other major manuscript finds, such as the Oxyrhynchus papyri. See, inter alia, Michael E. Stone, "The Scrolls and the Literary Landscape of Second Temple Judaism," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Text and Context* (ed. Charlotte Hempel; STDJ 90; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 15–30, at 15. Vermes, however, ridiculed Strugnell's appeal to that collection as a benchmark (*Providential Accidents*, 195). In any case, the faster pace of the final decade may be attributed to the increase in the number of scholars and collaborative methods, Tov's skills in managing the large team, and the technological advances of the computer age.

³² Strugnell (DJD X:vii) states that it was Qimron's impressive linguistic skills that prompted the invitation to collaborate; the halakhic content of the letter was also relevant, and eventually led to the inclusion of Talmud specialist, Yaakov Sussman to contribute a section, "The Halakha," *ibid.*, 123–200.

partnerships that began to emerge in “Phase 2” were both cause and effect for a transformation to swift collaborative publication.³³

Beginning in the 1980’s, “international” conferences devoted to the Dead Sea Scrolls began to be truly international, self-consciously inclusive at first, and then naturally so. A pioneering 1985 conference at New York University (“Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin”)³⁴ was followed by a number of commemorative conferences marking the fortieth anniversary of the discovery of the scrolls, initiating a trend that has become commonplace.³⁵ The fiftieth anniversary of the

³³ The relationship between Qumran scholarship and formal interfaith dialogue is less clear. See Eileen Schuller, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and Jewish-Christian Dialogue.”

³⁴ The conference papers were published in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: the New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman; JSPSS 8; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990).

³⁵ See, inter alia, the volumes of proceedings from conferences in Haifa, Madrid, and Mogilany: Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill; Jerusalem: Magnes, Yad Yizhaq Ben-Zvi, 1992); Julio C. Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner, eds., *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March, 1991* (2 vols.; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992); Zdzisław J. Kapera, *Mogilany 1989: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Jean Carmignac: International Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Qumranica Mogilanensia 2–3; Krakow: Enigma Press, 1991, 1993). See also the review of the Mogilany volume, and of the 1987 and 1989 conferences, by Lawrence H. Schiffman in *BAR* 20/1 (1994).

Schiffman (“Many Battles, 198–99) places these transitional conferences in the second phase of scholarship, when “scholars of the second (and even third) generation undertook the study of the particularly Jewish issues in the scrolls—Jewish history, law, theology, and messianism.” The Mogilany conference was in fact consciously anti-establishment, but, like the others, it also contributed to laying the foundations for a new broader professional community. Schiffman notes that John Strugnell, unlike most of the first generation scholars, was an active participant in these conferences (*ibid.*, 199). An especially

Qumran discoveries was celebrated in an atmosphere of the pursuit of unity, most palpably at the Israel Museum's extravagant 1997 congress, "The Dead Sea Scrolls—Fifty Years After Their Discovery, Major Issues and New Approaches."³⁶ The editors' preface to the volume of the congress proceedings proudly declares that the "conference was organized in order to guarantee the highest level of international and interconfessional participation."³⁷ The Hebrew University's Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature was established at that time, with Australian support, and instituted a series of annual international symposia that continues until today. One more recent example of institutional cooperation that I would like to mention is the Notre Dame/New York University program, "Jewish and Christian Scholars on the Origins of Rabbinic Judaism and Christianity," which was constructed as an opportunity for student interaction.³⁸

noteworthy conference was sponsored by the New York Academy of Sciences and the University of Chicago, held at the Blood Center in New York City on 14–17 December 1992. The conference successfully met one of its goals, which was to bring together "scholars of diverse—even radically diverse—views." The volume of proceedings includes transcripts of the discussions following the presentations, preserving some of the heated debates: Michael O. Wise, Norman Golb, John J. Collins, and Dennis G. Pardee, *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; NY: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 1–38.

³⁶ See Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, James C. VanderKam, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–35, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000). In Emanuel Tov's opening address, "Five Decades of Discoveries, Editions, and Research," he noted that there had been twenty-two international scrolls conferences from the 1985 NYU conference to the 50 years celebration in 1997 (ibid., 951–60, at 954–55).

³⁷ Ibid., xix.

³⁸ Held in 2005–2007; coordinated by Lawrence Schiffman, James VanderKam, Alex Jassen, and Todd Russel Hanneken.

Another landmark conference, primarily in terms of scope, location, and the sponsoring institutions was the 2008 “The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context” held in Vienna, and organized jointly by the University of Vienna and the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.³⁹

There is an increasing expectation for specialists in Qumran studies to develop expertise in both rabbinic Judaism and early Christianity. At a time when some scholars detect signs of a decline in proficiency in Modern Hebrew among scholars of Jewish Studies programs outside of Israel,⁴⁰ a significant number of non-Jewish Qumran scholars stay abreast of relevant literature published in modern Hebrew, and also present and publish academic papers in Modern Hebrew.⁴¹ The Community of scholars working together on discovering and constructing the meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls is achieving a level of understanding that could not have been attainable when segments of the Community were working apart from each other and against each other.

I will conclude this survey of the cooperative phase of Qumran studies with one particularly noteworthy venture, the Enoch Seminar, founded by Prof. Gabrielle Boccaccini in 2001.⁴² This is actually a closed group, but membership is not determined by arbitrary criteria or those related to ethnicity or nationality; it is rather subject to demonstration of academic credentials, with special care to incorporate student researchers. As stated on the group’s website, “the Enoch Seminar is an academic group of

³⁹ 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* (2 vols.; VTSup 140; Leiden: Brill, 2011).

⁴⁰ A recent newspaper article refers to such concerns among Israeli academics, Revital Hovel, “Professors Fume Over Dominance of English Language in Israeli Academia,” *Haaretz*, 12 Oct. 2012. I am grateful to Dr. Hillel Cohen, Co-ordinator of Israel Studies, M.A. Program at Hebrew University, for this reference.

⁴¹ See especially the journal *Meghillot*, which contains the proceedings of the annual Dead Sea Scrolls conference held at Haifa University: <http://meghillot.haifa.ac.il/index.php/en/meghillot-journal>.

⁴² <http://www.enochseminar.org/drupal/>.

international specialists in Second Temple Judaism and Christian Origins, who share the results of their research in the field and meet to discuss topics of common interest.... It is a shared commitment by the members of the Enoch Seminar that the study of this crucial period offers an important contribution to the understanding of the common roots of Judaism, Christianity and Islam and therefore to better relations among them.”⁴³

Further advancement in this latest phase of openness and cooperation is anticipated with the IAA-Google website, which offers global public access to spectral-images of the corpus of scrolls fragments and scans of all the PAM negatives in the IAA archives.⁴⁴

⁴³ Ibid., accessed 11 December, 2012.

⁴⁴ See above, n. 1. The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library is emblematic of Schiffman’s observations regarding important contributing factors affecting the second and third phases described in this paper. At the turn of the millennium he correctly anticipated further rapid progress due to “a world growing increasingly democratic” and “new technological advances” (“Reclaiming,” 163). As far as democratization, one full volume of the professional journal *Dead Sea Discoveries* was devoted to the Scrolls and popular culture (*DSD* 12/1 [2005]). See also *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)* (ed. Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref; STDJ 93; Leiden: Brill, 2011). As for technology, Schiffman (ibid.) mentioned generally the fields of archaeology, photographic techniques, carbon-14, genetic testing of materials, optical research. To note some specific examples, in addition to Abegg’s computer reconstruction for the concordance edition (above, n. 27), key information resources have included the microfiche publication of the scrolls in 1992 (*The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judean Desert* [ed. Emanuel Tov with the collaboration of Stephen J. Pfann; Leiden: Brill, 1992]); CD-ROM editions (*The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library* [3 vols.; ed. Timothy H. Lim in consultation with Philip S. Alexander, vol. 1; Emanuel Tov, vols. 2–3; Leiden: Brill, 1997, 1999, 2006]); the use of photoshop tools for deciphering text (see the anecdotal report of one of the first demonstrations of this use of technology for the scrolls at a 1991 conference in Oxford—with Australian funding arranged by Alan Crown, in Timothy

2. TRIADIC DEVELOPMENT MODEL:

IDENTIFYING THE COMMUNITY OF THE SCROLLS

We turn now to examine the history of the identification of the people of the scrolls through the lens of our 3-phase model. Here, I think that a “Hegelian” model of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis is more effective than a supposition of linear progression:⁴⁵

- 1) Phase 1 was dominated by a “thesis:” the **Essene hypothesis**.
- 2) In Phase 2, the consensus view was subjected to a barrage of opposition and the formation of alternative proposals that I would term **anti-“Essene hypothesis” hypotheses**.
- 3) One of my claims in this paper is that there is currently a broad consensus in Qumran studies that I would identify as Phase 3, a synthesis of the first two phases. This is more difficult to name but may perhaps best be described as

H. Lim, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Very Short Introduction* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005], 4; and most recently, a session at the August 2012 conference “University of Agder: New Discoveries in the Judean Desert I,” devoted to “Use of Photoshop in Reconstruction of Qumran ‘Biblical’ Texts” with a presentation by Michael Langlois and response by Søren Holst); and a searchable digital edition of the non-biblical Qumran texts developed by Martin Abegg, and available as a module for Accordance Bible Software and Logos Bible Software. On the innovative use of multimedia technology, see also, Stephen Pfann Jr. and Stephen J. Pfann, “The Second Temple Period Multimedia Educational Suite with an Appendix on the Ceramic and Numismatic Evidence for Qumran’s Period 1a,” in Roitman et al., eds., *Contemporary Culture*, 683–717.

⁴⁵ I use the terms “Hegelian” and “thesis, antithesis, synthesis” following common parlance, for their heuristic effectiveness, although I recognize that philosophers today commonly maintain that the “Marxist” use of this dialectic triad of terms, which does not appear in Hegel’s writings, is not representative of Hegel’s thought. See, inter alia, Gustav E. Mueller, “The Hegel Legend of Thesis-Antithesis-Synthesis,” in *The Hegel Myths and Legends* (ed. Jon Stewart; Evanston, Ill: Northwestern, 1996), 301–5.

general agreement concerning attributes shared by “the [Essene?] Communities of the Scrolls.”

2.1. Phase 1: Thesis—Essene Hypothesis

I have described phase 1 of the discovery and publication of the scrolls as a time of separateness and distrust and divisiveness. In terms of methodological approaches to identifying the people of the scrolls, however, there was a large degree of unity, and a general acceptance of what has come to be known as the Qumran Consensus: the “Essene Hypothesis.” I do not want to misrepresent this phase as one of harmony. For one thing, the Essene “consensus” existed in two polarized versions in the early stages of Qumran scholarship. The “international” literature was dominated by a picture of monastic ascetic Essenes, often said to have been created in the image of the Catholic priest Père Roland de Vaux, the director of the excavations of the Qumran site and the nearby caves and of the publication of the scrolls.⁴⁶ In contrast, Yadin’s publications and his Shrine of the Book exhibit at the Israel Museum focused upon the Jewish identity of the Essenes—an identification first put forth by his father Sukenik in the 1940s—and emphasized Jewish continuity.⁴⁷ An influential figure in early scholarship who shaped popular views about the Scrolls in Israel was the brilliant, original, and often iconoclastic scholar David Flusser. Flusser emphasized similarities between the scrolls and early Christianity, but tended to do so in a way that highlighted the Jewish milieu and origins of Christianity, rather than

⁴⁶ See Roland de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1959* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973); Frank Moore Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies: The Haskell Lectures, 1956–1957* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1958); Józef T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea* (trans. John Strugnell; SBT 26; London: SCM, 1959).

⁴⁷ See Yadin, *Message*, 176; Eliezer L. Sukenik, *Megillot Genuzot: Scrolls that Were Stored Away from an Ancient Genizah Found in the Judean Desert, First Survey* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1948) 1:16–17 (Hebrew).

overshadowing them.⁴⁸ Moreover, the first “battles of the scrolls” emerged during this period, and some of the more blatant and public controversies of phase 1 related to this question of identification.⁴⁹

⁴⁸ See, *inter alia*, the recently translated volume of select articles from his oeuvre: David Flusser, *Judaism of the Second Temple Period* (trans. Azzan Yadin; 2 vols; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007–2009). See also the portrait of Flusser in Wilson, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 78–84, 247–55, and *passim*. Flusser’s influence in highlighting the Christian significance of the Scrolls in Israeli society is noted in Schuller, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and Jewish-Christian Dialogue,” 50.

⁴⁹ Early battles were fought over the authenticity and antiquity of the manuscripts, and then about their significance, and the identification of their authors. Thus, Schiffman (“Many ‘Battles,’” 187): “in the early 1950s, it was customary to speak of ‘the battle of the scrolls.’ This phrase referred to the heated public debates that raged over the importance of the scrolls and the identity and dating of their authors. Later on, in the 70s and 80s we again witnessed a battle of the scrolls, this time over the publication of the texts and access to them for scholarly research.” Solomon Zeitlin insisted that the manuscripts dated to the medieval period (e.g., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Modern Scholarship* [JQRMS 3; Philadelphia: Dropsie, 1956]). Godfrey Rolles Driver (*The Judean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution* [Oxford: Blackwell, 1965]) and Cecil Roth (*The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Oxford: Blackwell, 1958]) identified the authors of the scrolls as Zealots. Most troubling to the establishment were the theories put forth by the maverick insider John Marco Allegro (in popular interviews and articles; he eventually published *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Myth* [Newton Abbot: Westbridge, 1979]) and also by André Dupont-Sommer (*The Essene Writings from Qumran* [transl. G. Vermes; Oxford: Blackwell, 1961]) who portrayed the Dead Sea Scrolls as anticipating Christianity. Focusing upon elements in the Scrolls that resonated with the New Testament, they each argued that the Community was the source of early Christian beliefs and practices, and they viewed the founder of the Community, the Teacher of Righteousness, as a Jesus figure, even making claims about references to an anticipated resurrection of the Teacher, and to his crucifixion. Allegro further antagonized the other members of the official team by publishing an edition of the Copper Scroll (*The Treasure of the Copper Scrolls* [London:

For our purposes, the point I would like to emphasize here is that during the early years of Qumran studies, despite controversy about the specific nature of the authors of the scrolls, there was general agreement about the triangular relationship that Albert Baumgarten succinctly describes in this volume as “Scrolls/Site/Sect:”⁵⁰ that the texts found in the 11 caves near Qumran belonged to a single community, which was associated with the archaeological site of Qumran, and that this Community was to be identified with the Essenes, as described in Josephus and other classical stories. Or, in the formulation of Frank Moore Cross, there was broad agreement about identifying the “Ancient Essene Library of Qumran.”⁵¹

Of course, one of the problems with this “triangular” relationship between the scrolls, the site, and the sect, is that it is in

Routledge, 1960]) before the official editor produced his edition, and by setting off on treasure hunts in pursuit of the enormous riches listed in that scroll. His later books included as well *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1970) in which he proposed that the origins of Christianity lay in the use of hallucinogens. See the interview he gave on Dutch television, 1976, to Kees Van Kooten and Wim De Bie (a popular comedy team, though Allegro was apparently unaware of this): <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mOu9tV6uy2E>. Edmund Wilson’s *The Dead Sea Scrolls* is a useful and entertaining source for more information about Allegro (see esp. *ibid.*, 154–59) and Dupont-Sommer (esp. 85–103) and the reception of their theories. A recent work that sheds new light upon factionalism among Christian scholars in the first generation of Qumran scholarship is the biography of Allegro published by his daughter, Judith Brown’s *John Marco Allegro: The Maverick Of The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005).

⁵⁰ Albert I. Baumgarten, “What Did the ‘Teacher’ Know?: Owls and Roosters in the Qumran Barnyard,” 235–57.

⁵¹ See above, n. 45. See also Jaqueline S. du Toit and Jason Kalman, “Albright’s Legacy? Homogeneity in the Introduction of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Public,” *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 36/2 (2010), 23–48, at 23. They cite Silberman’s memorable formulation (*Hidden Scrolls*, 98): “Even though there were minor divergences in the details of their stories ... [the authors] were all singing from the same hymnal.”

fact circular.⁵² And so at some time during our second phase, the barriers-breaking phase, some scholars began to question the assumptions in this circular reasoning, raising objections to interpretations of each of the sources and to claims of the relationships between each of the sources.

2.2. Phase 2: Antithesis: Non-Essene Hypothesis

At the same time that pressure was mounting in the public sphere to “free the scrolls” from the monopoly of the “international team,” counter-proposals to the Essene consensus were being put forth in the academic arena.⁵³ Phase 2 was simply made to order for Alan Crown. As was noted numerous times in the course of this memorial conference, Prof. Crown would always ask “how do you know that?,” urging students and colleagues to question our assumptions, and our reasoning, and to re-evaluate the givens. In this spirit, Alan published a seminal article with Lena Cansdale,⁵⁴ containing a detailed point-by-point critique of the Essene

⁵² For a recent defense of the logical argument, see Edna Ullmann-Margalit, “Interpretive Circles: the Case of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in Roitman et al, eds., *Contemporary Culture*, 649–64; *ibid.*, *Out of the Cave: A Philosophical Inquiry into the Dead Sea Scrolls Research* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 2006).

⁵³ Robert Eisenman is a figure associated with both aspects of the second phase, due to his publication of the Facsimile Edition of the Scrolls (above, n. 28) and his unorthodox interpretations of the scrolls as reflecting a messianic Palestinian community that he associates with James the brother of Jesus. See Robert H. Eisenman, *Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians, and Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 1983); *idem*, *James the Brother of Jesus: the Key to Unlocking the Secrets of Early Christianity and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (NY: Viking, 1996). In the context of maverick interpretations that associate the Qumran corpus with Christianity, I would be remiss if I did not mention the Australian scholar Barbara Thiering who was also active during the second phase of Qumran studies, beginning with Barbara E. Thiering, *Redating the Teacher of Righteousness* (Sydney: Theological Explorations, 1979).

⁵⁴ Alan D. Crown and Lena Cansdale, “Qumran: Was It an Essene Settlement?” *BAR* 20/5 (1994): 24–35, 73–78.

hypothesis, which was later expanded upon by Cansdale in her full-length book.⁵⁵

Crown and Cansdale and other scholars questioned the assumptions about the **sect**, challenging Josephus's credibility, and the extent of the similarity between the community of the scrolls and Josephus's Essenes. Most notably, Lawrence Schiffman pointed to similarities between halakhic rulings in 4QMMT and positions attributed to the Sadducees in rabbinic literature, to argue a Sadducean identity for the authors of the sectarian scrolls.⁵⁶ Second-phase scholars questioned the nature of the **scrolls**: was this really a sectarian corpus, or was it a diverse collection of ancient Jewish writings of multiple origins? One key text that influenced this debate was the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.⁵⁷ This text had been known from the Qumran caves, and was identified as a "sectarian" text especially on the basis of its presumption of a 52-week solar calendar. When a copy of the work was discovered at Masada, scholars initially suggested that a Qumran Essene had brought the scroll to Masada, but then began to question its "sectarian" classification.⁵⁸ They also questioned the

⁵⁵ Lena Cansdale, *Qumran and the Essenes: a Re-evaluation of the Evidence* (TSAJ 60; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1997). The preface (ibid., v) includes a beautiful expression of gratitude to Alan Crown.

⁵⁶ See, inter alia, Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect," *BA* 53/2 (1990): 64–73; "The Sadducean Origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls Sect," *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Hershel Shanks; NY: Random House, 1992), 35–49; "The Place of 4QMMT in the Corpus of the Qumran Manuscripts," in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (ed. John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996), 81–98; "Origins and Early History," in idem, *Reclaiming*, 83–95.

⁵⁷ For the official edition of the eight copies from Qumran (Caves 4 and 11) and the Masada manuscripts, see Carol Newsom, "Shirot 'Olat HaShabbat," in *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (ed. Esther Eshel et al.; DJD 11; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 173–401.

⁵⁸ Carol Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: a Critical Edition* (HSS 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), but, later, "'Sectually' Explicit Literature from Qumran," in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters* (ed. William Henry

site:⁵⁹ was it a religious center, or might it have been a fortress,⁶⁰ a luxury villa,⁶¹ an agricultural-industrial complex,⁶² or a way-station for travellers to Jerusalem?⁶³ One of the most vocal challengers of the Essene Hypothesis was Norman Golb, who argued that the site of Khirbet Qumran was a Hasmonean fortress, with no connection to the scrolls found in the nearby caves. He argued that the scrolls were a collection or collections of texts from Jerusalem, moved to the caves for safe-keeping on the eve of the Judean Revolt against Rome.⁶⁴

To some extent, Qumran scholars today are still challenging assumptions. So I can appreciate Lena Cansdale's suggestion to identify a paradigm shift in the questioning of the Essene theory.⁶⁵

Propp, Baruch Halpern, and David Noel Freedman; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167–87.

⁵⁹ See the survey of alternative interpretations of the site by Magen Broshi and Hanan Eshel, "Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls: the Contention of Twelve Theories," in *Religion and Society in Roman Palestine: Old Questions, New Approaches* (ed. Douglas R. Edwards; London: Routledge, 2004), 162–69.

⁶⁰ See especially, Norman Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls: the Search for the Secret of Qumran* (NY: Scribner, 1995). In the 2012 edition of this work, Golb added an Afterword in which he presents a rather different portrait of the phases of scholarship and current state of the modern community of Qumran scholars from the one presented here.

⁶¹ See, e.g., Robert Donceel and Pauline Donceel-Voute, "The Archeology of Qumran," in Michael O. Wise et al., eds., *Methods of Investigation*, 1–38.

⁶² See Yizhar Hirschfield, *Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004).

⁶³ See Crown and Cansdale, "Qumran;" Alan D. Crown, "An Alternative View of Qumran," in *Samaritan, Hebrew and Aramaic Studies Presented To Professor Abraham Tal* (ed. Moshe Bar-Asher and Moshe Florentin; Jerusalem: Bialik, 2005): 1*–24*.

⁶⁴ Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls*.

⁶⁵ Cansdale (*Qumran and the Essenes*, 1) cites Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), on the transformation of a "rebel" thesis to a new standard model when it answers questions better than the originally accepted theory.

But I think a dialectical model is more relevant. Today's scholars are less reactive than those of the second generation who sought to challenge the Essene hypothesis. They are less partisan in their attitudes, and more flexible, taking into account elements from various theories, including the Essene identification, in constructing new models for interpreting the scrolls. During phase two, even "mainstream" scholars who dismissed many of the anti-establishment alternative proposals, were slowly being affected by the critiques put forth to challenge the dominant theory. Initial manifestations of some of this maturation, modulation, and attenuation, are evident in some of the retrospective summaries of scholarship that were published around the turn of the millennium, in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the discovery of the scrolls.⁶⁶

2.3. Phase 3: Synthesis: Essene-Related(?) Communities

As scholarship moves beyond the "non-Essene" orientation of Phase 2, I perceive the emergence of a broad synthesis that recognizes pluralism and variation within the corpus. One sphere in which the "synthesis" of the third phase is especially clear is the study of the texts that were once universally called "biblical scrolls." As discussed elsewhere in this volume, first generation scholars viewed texts like 1QIsa^a as variants to the Masoretic versions of biblical scrolls.⁶⁷ Often, the scrolls were viewed as a

Similarly, Schiffman wrote of "the Second Generation" that "a new "non-consensus" was emerging ("Many Battles," 199).

⁶⁶ In addition to the Israel Museum conference and volume discussed above (n. 36), see Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam with the assistance of Andrea E. Alvarez, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999); Robert A. Kugler and Eileen Schuller, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999); Philip R. Davies, George J. Brooke, and Philip R. Callaway, *The Complete World of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2002).

⁶⁷ Ian Young, "Loose' Language in 1QIsa^a," 89–112.

tool for pursuing the biblical *Urtext*.⁶⁸ The publication of “The Psalms Scroll” (11Q5 Ps^a) confounded early Qumran scholars.⁶⁹ They did not know what to make of this nearly complete scroll, containing only 48 psalms, of which only 39 appear in MT Psalms, and even these occur in the Qumran scroll in a different order than in MT. Was this a very variant biblical scroll, or was it something else entirely, a prayerbook perhaps? Today, while there is still no consensus about the nature of the Psalms Scroll, there is universal recognition of the multiplicity of textual traditions and the complexity of transmission history.⁷⁰ The current stage is also characterized by full awareness of the significance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for illuminating the shared foundations of rabbinic Judaism and Christianity.

On our specific topic of the origins of the scrolls, most scholars tend to retain some conception of a central *Yahad* Community, usually associated with the site of Qumran, but they also allow for diversity and development.⁷¹ Scholars are also

⁶⁸ Thus, Schiffman (“Many ‘Battles,’” 198) indicates that biblical specialists of the first generation of Qumran scholars had hoped that the scrolls would lead them to the *Urtext* of the Hebrew Bible and to the roots of Christianity.

⁶⁹ James A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QP^s^a)* (DJD 4; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965).

⁷⁰ See Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3d ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012). For surveys of Qumran scholarship and the Hebrew Bible, see the following contributions in Dimant, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective*: Eugene Ulrich, “Biblical Scrolls Scholarship in North America,” 49–74; Emanuel Tov, “Israeli Scholarship on the Biblical texts from the Judean Desert,” 297–313; Jörg Frey, “Qumran Research and Biblical Scholarship in Germany,” 529–64.

⁷¹ The following surveys in Dimant, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective* are especially informative on the coalescence of a broad new consensus: Sidnie White Crawford, “The Qumran Community in American Scholarship,” 13–29; John J. Collins, “The Scrolls and Christianity in American Scholarship,” 197–215; Devorah Dimant, “Israeli Scholarship on the Qumran Community,” 237–80. It is interesting to compare White Crawford’s description of John Collins’s scholarship

introducing innovative approaches for thinking about the scrolls, suggesting new questions to ask as well as new ways to go about seeking answers. As observed by Sidnie White Crawford,⁷² and championed in particular by Maxine Grossman,⁷³ scholars continue to employ the traditional “historical critical” method, with increasing sophistication, but also have begun to borrow methodologies from such fields as sociology and anthropology, socio-rhetorical and discourse analysis, and literary criticism. On the site/scrolls/“sect” association, the current broad consensus can be summarized as follows:

2.3.1. Complexity, Diversity, and Development

The Site: Most scholars today accept the association between the site of Qumran and the scrolls corpus, but the archaeological analysis has become more open in its consideration of data that does not conform to the rigid original Essene hypothesis, such as

about the authors of the Scrolls in the sections she designates as “The Next Generation: 1970s–1990s” (22–26) as compared to the section labeled “The Present” (26–29). Apparently, editorial decisions called for the use of the present tense in her account. So that on p. 23, we read that Collins “states” that the evidence makes “overwhelmingly probable the identification of Qumran... as ‘Essene’” (from John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other Ancient Literature* [NY: Doubleday, 1995], 7), whereas on pp. 26–27, we read that he “has thoroughly critiqued the Qumran-Essene hypothesis” and now supports a construct that involves multiple inter-related communities. Thus, in John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010).

⁷² Sidnie White Crawford, “The Qumran Community in American Scholarship,” 29. She mentions Carol Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden, Brill, 2004); Maxine Grossman, *Reading for History in the Damascus Document: A Methodological Study* (STDJ 45; Leiden: Brill, 2002); Alison Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad* (STDJ 77; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

⁷³ Maxine L. Grossman, ed., *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), 2010.

the presence of women in the cemetery, evidence of economic prosperity, or the dating of the different stratigraphic layers.⁷⁴ Some scholars trained in the consensus tradition sometimes erroneously describe Qumran as “inhabited” by Essenes, but most understand that this unusual site served religious and economic communal functions, rather than residential purposes.⁷⁵ This supports the conceptualization of the site as a center for diverse related groups, as described below.

The Scrolls: The dominant view today retains the concept of a corpus of scrolls from the caves of Qumran, but recognizes diversity within this collection. Devorah Dimant has worked to re-define the early paradigm of a tri-partite division of the corpus into “biblical,” “non-biblical,” and “sectarian” scrolls, all associated with the Qumran Essenes. She has suggested new criteria for evaluating the texts within a context of multiple religious circles, rather than as a “homogenous sectarian-apocalyptic” library.⁷⁶ An important contribution to this discussion was Carol Newsom’s memorably titled, “‘Sectually’ Explicit Literature from Qumran.”⁷⁷ More

⁷⁴ The standard work in the field is Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).

⁷⁵ Roland de Vaux himself, and his colleagues, recognized that Khirbet Qumran was not suited for residential purposes. He generally spoke of periods of “occupation” of the site, not habitation, suggesting only that the “administrators and guardians of the group” might have had lodgings in the buildings at Khirbet Qumran. The “Essenes” of his hypothesis dwelled in caves or tents or similar structures near the site. See de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 56–57, 86. See, however, the proposal of second-story residential accommodations, e.g., in Hartmut Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 48–51.

⁷⁶ Devorah Dimant, “Introduction” in *ibid.*, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective*, 1–10. The quoted expression is from p. 6. See *ibid.*, “Israeli Scholarship on the Qumran Community,” in the same volume, esp. 258–59.

⁷⁷ See above, n. 58.

recently, some scholars have sought to identify distinctive attributes for the different collections discovered in the different caves.⁷⁸

The Sect: It is common today to speak of the “communities of the scrolls,” in the plural, by analogy with Neusner’s terminology of “ancient Judaisms.”⁷⁹ This is true even among those who associate the scrolls with the Essenes. This new consensus is in keeping with Schiffman’s assessment that “the dominant Essene hypothesis, if it is to be maintained at all, requires radical reorientation.”⁸⁰ Joan Taylor has recently produced a thorough updated formulation of the Essene association of Qumran and the scrolls corpus.⁸¹ Other scholars prefer to use more neutral terms such as *Yahad* or Community to indicate a central group that produced core “sectarian” texts, and some refrain from using any umbrella term.

The most significant texts that fostered awareness of fluidity within and among the groups that authored and transmitted the Scrolls corpus are the Community Rule (*Serekh Hayahad*) and the Damascus Document.⁸² The similarities and differences between

⁷⁸ See Stephen J. Pfann, “Reassessing the Judean Desert Caves: Libraries, Archives, ‘Genizas’ and Hiding Places,” *Bulletin of the Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society* 25 (2007): 147–70; Florentino García Martínez, “Cave 11 in Context,” in Hempel ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context* (199–210), and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, “Further Reflections on Caves 1 and 11: A Response to Florentino García Martínez,” in Hempel, *ibid.*, 211–24.

⁷⁹ E.g., Jacob Neusner, William Scott Green, and Ernest S. Frerich, *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

⁸⁰ “Many ‘Battles,’” 202. He stated that in light of the Sadducean halakhic elements he had isolated in the scrolls corpus, proponents of the Essene identification would either have to posit a group with Sadducean origins, which radicalized to become a distinct sect, or to presume the existence of a “wide variety of similar groups.”

⁸¹ Joan E. Taylor, *The Essenes, the Scrolls, and the Dead Sea* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

⁸² See Dimant, “Introduction,” 2–4. Among the influential paths of investigating diachronic development, see discussions of the “Groningen Hypothesis” (most recently, Florentino García Martínez, “The Groningen Hypothesis Re-visited,” in Roitman et al., eds., *Contemporary Culture*, 17–

these foundational texts, as well as the circumstances of their discovery and publication,⁸³ naturally led even early scholars to recognize, and attempt to account for, some degree of synchronic variation. Eyal Regev has written extensively on the distinction between the *Yabad* of the Community Rule and the community reflected in the Damascus Document.⁸⁴ John Collins is at the forefront of those arguing for an even more pluralistic model.⁸⁵

These same compositions were also important for diachronic analysis, especially in the redaction-critical studies of Sarianna Metso⁸⁶ and Charlotte Hempel.⁸⁷ Serious redaction criticism only

29) and the distinctions made between “older” and “younger” caves in the work of Pfann and Stökl Ben Ezra (above, n. 78).

⁸³ 1QS, a well-preserved copy of the Community Rule, was among the first seven scrolls discovered in Cave 1. The Qumran copies of the Damascus Document, preserved in fragmentary condition in Cave 4, were anticipated by the discovery of two medieval copies of this work in the Cairo Genizah in 1898. Dimant (“Introduction,” 4) echoes the question asked by Moshe Bernstein, and quoted in Stephen Llewelyn, Stephanie Ng, Gareth Wearne and Alexandra Wrathall, “A Case for Two *Vorlagen* Behind the Habakkuk Commentary (1QpHab),” 123–50, at 123 in this volume—what would Scrolls scholarship look like if other compositions had been found first instead?

⁸⁴ E.g., Eyal Regev, “Between Two Sects: Differentiating the Yahad and the Damascus Covenant,” in Hempel, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*, 431–49.

⁸⁵ Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*.

⁸⁶ Metso’s analysis is most fully presented in Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997). Until the 1990s, little attention had been given to the earlier work on redaction criticism undertaken by Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, who had briefly served as one of the original members of the editorial team. See Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, “Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milhamā aus Höhle 4 von Qumran,” *ZAW* 69 (1957): 131–51; and the discussion in Jörg Frey, “Qumran Research and Biblical Scholarship in Germany,” in Dimant, ed., *Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective*, 528–64, at 539, and Annette Steudel, “Basic Research, Methods and Approaches to the Qumran Scrolls in German-Speaking Countries,” in Dimant, *ibid.* 565–99, at 581, esp. n. 67.

became feasible with the complete publication of the corpus in the 1990's. Isolating variations among the various recensions of the Damascus Document and the Community Rule enabled scholars to discern clues to modifications in organizational structure, and to construct more sophisticated models for tracing the development of the *Yabad* and associated groups. An important contribution made by Metso was her observation that the physical date of a manuscript did not necessarily indicate the age of the recorded recension; a manuscript that is determined (generally, paleographically) to have been written at a relatively late date may preserve a version of the text that had been composed at an early time, which remained in circulation among copyists and readers. By inverting the previously accepted dating of the Serekh manuscripts, Metso argued that a high-status group known as "Zadokites," previously understood to be among the founders of the community, were in fact introduced later in the history of the *Yabad*. The limitation of Metso's argument must be noted, however. Her significant observation that an older manuscript *need* not preserve an older recension, does not justify the conclusion that it *cannot* be older.⁸⁸ Evaluation of the evolution of the *Serekh* Community remains in progress, most recently, with Alison Schofield's proposal to consider a "radial-dialogic" model of interactive development rather than isolated linear change.⁸⁹

Charlotte Hempel has recently taken a broader view of the data demonstrating textual development within the transmission

⁸⁷ Hempel's most comprehensive treatment of the Damascus Document recensions is found in Charlotte Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Tradition, and Redaction* (STDJ 29; Leiden: Brill, 1998), but, as discussed here, her approach has developed significantly. See also, Menahem Kister, "The Development of the Early Recensions of the Damascus Document," *DSD* 14/1 (2007): 61–76.

⁸⁸ See the survey and evaluations of proposals concerning the direction of development attested in the Serekh recensions, in Joseph Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 86; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 11–14.

⁸⁹ Alison Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yabad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for the Community Rule* (STDJ 77; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

history of the Serekh traditions and the Damascus Document (the diachronic analysis of manuscript recensions and redactional layers), and organizational and theological variations between and within the two compositions (the synchronic analysis of diverse levels and types of sub-groups within the umbrella community) to form a more synthetic perspective. Thus, for example, in her discussion of the question, “1QS 6:2c–4a: Satellites or Precursors of the Yahad?” Hempel argues that this passage preserves evidence of both diversity and development, employing the term “sprouting fossil.”⁹⁰ Elsewhere, she employs similarly effective and vivid imagery, using the term “cross-fertilization,” and adapting Karel van der Toorn’s description of the evolution of ancient texts in terms of “pearls on a string,” to describe the multiple strands identified in the Serekh and Damascus texts as reflecting “shared pearls as well as shared types of string between both corpora.”⁹¹

3. PROPOSAL: INVERSE CORRELATION BETWEEN DEVELOPMENT OF QUMRAN COMMUNITY AND TRAJECTORY OF ACADEMIC *COMMUNIS OPINIO*

In the previous two sections of this essay, I presented interconnected models of development in Qumran studies, attempting to show a trajectory towards open access and cooperation alongside progress towards increasingly sophisticated theories about the nature of the ancient groups associated with the manuscript corpus. In this final section, I observe that this positive move towards increased access and complexity is the opposite of

⁹⁰ Charlotte Hempel, “1QS 6:2c–4a: Satellites or Precursors of the Yahad?” in Roitman et al., eds., *Contemporary Culture*, 31–40.

⁹¹ Charlotte Hempel, “Shared Traditions: Points of Contact Between S and D,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts* (ed. Sariana Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen Schuller; STDJ 92; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 115–31. The pearls imagery appears on p. 129, adapted from Karel van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007); the reference to cross-fertilization occurs on p. 131. See also, Charlotte Hempel, “Sources and Redaction in the Dead Sea Scrolls: the Growth of Ancient Texts,” in Maxine L. Grossman, ed., *Rediscovering*, 162–81.

the direction of development that many scholars have discerned with respect to the ancient community(ies) of Qumran, which seem to have moved towards increasing insularity, xenophobia, and rejectionism.

For over two decades, many scholars cautiously avoided the use of the term “sect” to describe the Qumran community, since this term implied a departure from a “normative” standard, and such a perspective was inconsistent with the pluralistic model of ancient Judaism accepted by scholarship.⁹² There is now a renewed interest in exploring the Community as a “sect” from a sociological perspective, particularly with respect to exclusivist “boundary-setting.” Thus, for example, Eyal Regev has conducted comparative analysis with American separatist communities, characterizing the Scrolls’ community as “introversionist.”⁹³ Albert Baumgarten has demonstrated the tendency of the community to move towards an increasingly sectarian character.⁹⁴ Alex Jassen has begun a project dedicated to analyzing violence, including violent rhetoric, in the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁹⁵ Gabrielle Boccaccini’s hypothesis of “Enochic Judaism” highlights universalist tendencies in early Qumranic literature and its precursors, which contrast with the more narrow

⁹² See, e.g., Shemaryahu Talmon, “Qumran studies: Past, Present, and Future,” *JQR* 85 (1994): 1–31; idem, “The ‘Dead Sea Scrolls’ or ‘The Community of the Renewed Covenant,’” in *The Echoes of Many Texts: Reflections on Jewish and Christian Traditions. Essays in Honor of Lou H. Silberman* (ed. William G. Dever and J. Edward Wright; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 115–45.

⁹³ Eyal Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-cultural Perspective* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007).

⁹⁴ Albert I. Baumgarten, “Four Stages in the Life of a Millennial Movement,” in *War in Heaven/Heaven on Earth: Theories of the Apocalyptic* (ed. Stephen D. O’Leary and Glen S. McGhee; London: Equinox, 2005), 61–75; and, more generally, idem, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (JSJSup 55; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

⁹⁵ See Alex P. Jassen, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and Violence: Sectarian Formation and Eschatological Imagination,” in *Violence, Scripture, and Textual Practice in Early Judaism and Christianity* (ed. Raanan Boustan, Alex P. Jassen, and Calvin Roetze; Leiden: Brill, 2010).

perspectives of later compositions in the corpus.⁹⁶ His analysis supports the suggestion that the Community underwent development towards an increasingly dualistic, fatalistic, and rejectionist worldview. A particularly synthetic presentation of a trajectory towards insularity is put forth in George Brooke's "From Jesus to the Early Christian Communities: Modes of Sectarianism in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls."⁹⁷ Brooke attempts a comparison between the communities of the Qumran scrolls and early Christianity, in which he departs from the more conventional focus on specific theological or sociological parallels and instead constructs a model of similarities with regard to developmental stages. He traces the evolution from (1) an incipient "pre-sectarian" phase (for the Scrolls corpus, Brooke remarks that this pre-Qumran group may perhaps be identified as an Essene group) to (2) nascent sectarianism to (3) full-blown sectarianism and finally (4) rejuvenated sectarianism.⁹⁸ In a separate study, Brooke traces developmental stages in modern Qumran scholarship, which he correlates with the archaeological periods identified at the site of Khirbet Qumran.⁹⁹ This model, which is discussed in detail by Brad Bitner in this volume, presents an illuminating parallel to the phases outlined in this study.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁶ See esp., Gabrielle Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), 1988. See also Collins's evaluation and critique: John J. Collins, "Enochic Judaism: An Assessment," in Roitman et al., eds., *Contemporary Culture*, 219–34.

⁹⁷ George J. Brooke, "From Jesus to the Early Christian Communities: Modes of Sectarianism in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls" in Roitman et al., eds., *Contemporary Culture*, 413–34.

⁹⁸ Brooke notes, however, that these stages are not necessarily linear (ibid., 433).

⁹⁹ George J. Brooke, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Study of the New Testament," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. George J. Brooke; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 3–18.

¹⁰⁰ Bradley J. Bitner, "Exclusion and Ethics: Contrasting Covenant Communities in 1QS 5:1–7:25 and 1 Cor 5:1–6:11," 259–304.

4. CONCLUSION

I have argued that current research supports the hypothesis that the ancient community/ies of the Qumran scrolls became increasingly insular, suspicious, and separatist over time. Nothing is known of these group(s) subsequent to the destruction of Qumran (68 CE), and of the Jerusalem Temple (70 CE) during the Great Judean Revolt against Rome. In contrast, the modern Community of Qumran scrolls scholars is currently flourishing in an era of global synergy. I have aimed in this study to document the transformation of the discipline of Qumran studies from a contentious battleground to a productive cooperative global enterprise. I hope thereby to replace the image of controversy that persists as a dominant popular perception of Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship, so as to reflect the current state of the field, and to allow the contemporary situation to serve effectively as a model and inspiration for interfaith cooperation.

APPENDIX: MILLAR BURROWS, AN OUTLIER

While I was preparing the oral form of this paper for presentation at the memorial conference in November 2011, I was dismayed to come across some evidence that seemed to undermine my thesis correlating the trajectory from closed circles and simplistic theories to open cooperation and sophisticated academic models. I had been aware that Millar Burrows, a prominent figure in the first generation of scrolls scholarship, was an American Christian scholar who, like many of the scholars on the original editorial team, was a vocal opponent of the then-newly founded state of Israel. I also knew that he was a proponent of the Essene hypothesis, the standard position at the time. So far, this suited the correlation I was claiming—insularity in current socio-political matters and adherence to the consensus identification. However, re-reading Burrows' comments about the Essene identification, I was struck by his nuanced sensitivity to diversity and development, as is more typical of current scholarship. He wrote:

Since we are dealing not with one text but with many, we cannot of course take it for granted that all the texts come from the same sect or party. All the writings contained in the scrolls and fragments found in the Qumran caves were no doubt accepted and used, but they were not all necessarily

produced by the sect. Even if they represent *branches* or *successive phases* of the same general movement <italics added-ST>, one such branch or movement may prove identical with a particular group in Jewish history, while those represented by other documents cannot be so identified.¹⁰¹

Of the group that produced the scrolls, he wrote:

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... For the present, however, in order not to prejudge the case, it seems better to reserve that name for the group described by Philo and Josephus, which, if their reports are accurate, was not exactly identical or coextensive with the Qumran community. As a matter of convenience, we may still designate the latter by the term "covenanters," which implies neither acceptance nor rejection of their identification with the 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.¹⁰²

Reading Burrows's words, I was impressed by his far-sightedness. But I was also disappointed. For one thing, the anomalous sophistication of this first-generation analysis presented itself as a deviation from the neat model I have proposed in this study.¹⁰³

¹⁰¹ Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (NY: Viking, 1955), 273. And again, similarly (ibid., 293), "The term Essene does not necessarily indicate a single organization with a sharply definable set of beliefs and practices; it may designate rather a number of groups that were similar but not identical. Together with variations between different groups of the same period, we must reckon with changes from one period to another." And even (ibid., 294), "for the present it seems to me best not to speak of the Qumran sect as Essenes, but rather to say that the Essenes and the covenanters, with other groups of which we know little or nothing, represented the same general type."

¹⁰² Ibid., 298.

¹⁰³ Of course my neat model, like Brooke's (above, n. 99), is primarily intended for heuristic purposes. Some other deviations from my

Moreover, I found it troubling that a scholar who was so admirably and exceptionally attuned to pluralism in antiquity would have been so conformist in his insensitivity to “Others” in his own time as to have produced an anti-Zionist tract called *Palestine is Our Business*.¹⁰⁴ In preparing the current study for publication, I steered

schematic presentation are also instructive. On continued unsophisticated use of the Scrolls in popular media, see Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Inverting Reality: the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Popular Media,” *DSD* 12/1 (2005): 24–37. He describes (*ibid.*, 37) the “public culture of the Dead Sea Scrolls” as being characterized by “conflict, invective, secrecy, and the inversion of reality,” and notes that they thereby “mirror” the drama, hostility, and turmoil of the ancient sectarians’ worldview. Naïve tendentious use of the corpus can also be found in political rhetoric. Timothy Lim (*A Very Short Introduction*, 9–10) offers his reminiscence of the opening night of the Israel Museum’s International Fifty Years’ Scrolls conference (see above, n. 36). He recalls an awkward moment during that gala event, when a “disapproving titter ripple[d] through the audience” in response to an attempt by then-(and current) Prime Minister of Israel Benjamin Netanyahu to make the case that the Scrolls were “vital for Jerusalem.” This remark entirely missed a central feature of the sectarian Scrolls—opposition to the corrupt leadership of Jerusalem. My own memory of that night includes Netanyahu’s further attempt to describe the archaeological and academic community as “Sons of Light” who were honorably committed not to be deterred in their pursuit of truth by Ultra-Orthodox groups who posed obstacles to research, for example by attempting to block excavations of ancient burial sites. This entirely missed the point of the great interest, one might even say obsession, with purity on the part of the Sons of Light in the Scrolls corpus, and their general extreme scrupulousness in ritual matters and polemic opposition to those who were more lenient.

¹⁰⁴ Millar Burrows, *Palestine is Our Business* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1949). There is another scholar, of the current era, who is in fact very attuned to nuance, complexity, and diversity in ancient Judaism, and also in most ways in his understanding of modern Scrolls scholarship, and yet has exhibited glaring insensitivity to the Jewish and Israeli Scrolls scholars of the first generation. In a generally perspicacious account, Philip Davies writes the following: “No Jews, let alone Israelis, were (regrettably, but understandably) allowed to work on these scrolls [the scrolls in East

myself to read Burrows's political monograph. Anticipating simplistic antisemitic diatribe, I was surprised to find a nuanced and sensitive assessment of the issues, and awareness of the complexity of the origins of the Arab-Israeli conflict and its manifestations. Burrows recognized the significance of antisemitic persecution, and especially the Holocaust, as a key factor in the migration of Zionists to Palestine and the establishment of the State of Israel, even as he expressed his concern for Palestinian rights and the plight of Palestinian refugees. His specific criticism about the founding of the State of Israel notwithstanding, Burrows was clearly favorably disposed to Judaism and he was an active proponent of, and participant in, interfaith dialogue.¹⁰⁵ In a paper

Jerusalem, and those that came to be discovered in the Qumran caves, which were "in territory annexed by Jordan"]... It is broadly true that the Scrolls were studied largely by Christians and thus, inevitably, in terms of Christian agendas. For this no apology is needed...The exclusion of a major Jewish interest was certainly due in large measure to political circumstances. But, ironically, it had been the Jews who pressed for partition of Palestine, and so the blame for the state of affairs that excluded them from the initial research cannot be directed elsewhere (this is usually over-looked in discussion of such matters.)" Philip R. Davies, "Qumran and the Quest for the Historical Judaism," in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans; JSPSup 26, Roehampton Institute London Papers 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 24–42, at 28–29. It is disappointing, if not troubling, to see this significant contemporary scholar blaming the victim, and I find it disingenuous of him to blame not only "the Jews" in general, but also specifically the physical partition, rather than the intolerant policies and predilections to exclusion attested in sources from the time.

¹⁰⁵ Some similarities may be drawn between Burrows and the Israeli Jewish scholar Shemaryahu Talmon, who was a first generation scholar who remained active in the field well into the 21st century until shortly before his death in 2010 at the age of 90. As described by Dimant, "Israeli Scholarship," 248, Talmon accepted the Essene theory at first, but later came to question attempts to force the evidence of the texts to conform to pre-determined models of sectarianism, and was an early advocate for avoiding the term "sect" altogether to describe the authors of the Scrolls.

from a 1940 conference on religion and democracy, he presented the case for looking to the Bible as a source for respecting human rights, and against discrimination. He emphasized the Bible's "fundamental conception of the nature of man and of his relation to his Maker and to his fellow-man" and maintained that "in the presence of the living God of Israel right always outweighs might. Tyranny can never tolerate the cultivation of the Hebrew-Christian tradition."¹⁰⁶ I would suggest that Millar Burrows was simply ahead of his time.¹⁰⁷

Like Burrows, Talmon preferred the term "Covenanters." Also like Burrows, Talmon was an active participant in interfaith dialogue, having been among the founders of the "Jerusalem Rainbow Group" and the "Israel Interfaith Committee." A footnote in one of Talmon's works preserves a reaction to the experience of exclusion, or in this case erasure, as an Israeli-Jewish scholar of the first phase of Qumran studies. In writing about his proposal that the "Qumran Covenanters" reckoned days as beginning in the morning, rather than at sunset, as is the case in the rabbinic calendar, he notes, "It appears that my suggestion became the basis of the 'Additional Note No. 5' in Strugnell's translation of Józef T. Milik, *Dix ans de découvertes dans le Désert de Juda* (Paris: Cerf, 1957): 'There also seems to be no doubt that they reckoned the day as starting with sunrise, not sunset.' John Strugnell, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea* (London: SCM Press, 1959), 152, for which no documentary evidence is adduced." (Shemaryahu Talmon, "Calendar Controversy in Ancient Judaism: the Case of the 'Community of the Renewed Covenant,'" in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls; Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 379–95.

¹⁰⁶ Millar Burrows, "Democracy in the Hebrew-Christian Tradition, Old and New Testaments," in *Science, Philosophy and Religion: A Symposium* (NY: Conference on Religion, Philosophy, and Science in Relation to the Democratic Way of Life, 1941), 412. This is the proceedings of the first of a series of annual conferences, held on 9–11 September, 1940.

¹⁰⁷ In the modern legend of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Burrows is most frequently mentioned in the context of poor timing. Director of ASOR at 1948, he happened to have been away in Baghdad when the first Scrolls were brought to the School in 1947 for authentication and examination. The young John C. Trever, who was the

Working to complete this study in Jerusalem on 29th November, 2012—on the day that the UN voted to approve Palestine’s appeal for recognition as a state, 65 years after Sukenik’s initial deciphering of the first scrolls against the backdrop of the UN partition vote in 1947—I came to reflect that just as Burrows was ahead of his time with respect to recognition of diversity and complexity, so too was he ahead of his time politically. I pray that just as Scrolls scholarship has moved from its initial contentiousness to the state of exemplary collegiality outlined above, so too may we merit to bring peace, co-existence, and co-operation to this sacred and turbulent land.

acting director in Burrows’s absence, became the first American scholar to see the Dead Sea Scrolls. Trever is best known for his work photographing the Scrolls. See John C. Trever, *The Untold Story of Qumran* (Westwood, N.J.: F. H. Revell); idem, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Personal Account* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977).