

Some Recent Developments in the Study of Discoveries near the Dead Sea

R. A. MARTIN

The discovery of a considerable number of ancient manuscripts and fragments in the Dead Sea area, beginning in 1947, came as a great surprise, since up to that time there seemed to be little hope, if any, for such extensive MS finds in Palestine. Most of the interest has centred on the material from the caves in and around Khirbet Qumram, which contained, generally speaking, the oldest MSS and fragments. There have, however, been other finds in the region of the Dead Sea, which date from the first and second Christian centuries. The present survey will deal primarily with the material found from 1957 onwards, since the books by Cross,¹ Burrows,² and Milik³ published in 1958 provide an excellent survey of the developments up to that time. Burchard's⁴ and LaSor's⁵ bibliographies also cover the same period very thoroughly.

Naturally in the space available, nothing like a complete study of all the aspects of this field can be undertaken. It is hoped, however, that these few remarks will be found helpful to those who wish to pursue specific topics hereafter. Appended to this article is a bibliography of the most important literature published about Qumram and related areas since 1957. Most of the entries in that bibliography have listed after them some of the more accessible reviews.

The second list which is appended is a classified bibliography of printed editions of various MSS and fragments not included in

¹ F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumram and Modern Biblical Studies* (New York, 1958).

² M. Burrows, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York, 1958).

³ J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea* (London, 1958).

⁴ C. Burchard, *Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer* (1957).

⁵ W. S. LaSor, *Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 1948-1957* (Pasadena, California, 1958).

the series, *Discoveries in the Judean Desert*.⁶ Neither of these lists is exhaustive and I shall personally be grateful to receive notice of important titles which may have been inadvertently omitted.

This paper will have two main sections. The first will consist of a survey of the archaeological exploration of the Dead Sea area in the last eight or ten years. The second will treat in greater or less detail specific developments in certain aspects of the study of the Dead Sea scrolls. Much of this material has been gleaned from a number of excellent and more detailed surveys, written in the last few years.⁷

I. SURVEY OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXPLORATION OF THE DEAD SEA AREA

In 1958 the extensive archaeological survey of the Qumram area, led by R. de Vaux, was concluded. His definitive statement of the series of excavations from 1951-1958 formed the Schweich Lectures for 1959.⁸ G. Lancaster Harding has presented a summary of these findings in the *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* for 1958, pp. 7-18, in which he indicates that this thorough survey by de Vaux has in general confirmed the picture of the archaeological history of Khirbet Qumram as it had been unfolding since the initial discoveries.

⁶ With the publication of Vol. III of *Discoveries in the Judean Desert* (*Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumram*), edited by M. Baillet, J. T. Milik and R. de Vaux, all MSS and fragments except those from Caves 4 and 11 have been published. The following detailed surveys of extant MSS remains in Caves 4 and 11 and the work being done on them may be noted: P. Benoît, 'Editing the Manuscript Fragments from Qumram', *Biblical Archaeologist*, XIX (1956), pp. 75-96; F. M. Cross, *Ancient Library of Qumram*, pp. 31-36; K. G. Kuhn, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 85 (1960), cols. 649-651.

⁷ The following may be mentioned here:

O. Betz, 'Dead Sea Scrolls', *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (New York, 1962), Vol. 1, pp. 790-802.

W. S. LaSor, 'Historical Framework. The Present Status of Dead Sea Scrolls Study', *Interpretation*, XVI, 3 (July, 1962), pp. 259-279.

H. Bardtke, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 85 (1960), cols. 263-274; 87 (1962), cols. 818-826.

_____, *Theologische Rundschau*, 29 (1963), pp. 261-292.

H. Braun, 'Qumram und das Neue Testament: Ein Bericht über 10 Jahre Forschung (1950-1959)', *Theologische Rundschau*, 28 (1962), pp. 192-234; 29 (1963), pp. 142-176; 30 (1964), pp. 1-38.

J. Hempel, *Die Texte von Qumram in der heutigen Forschung* (Göttingen, 1961).

K. G. Kuhn, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 85 (1960), cols. 649-658.

R. Meyer, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 88 (1963), cols. 19-28 (Murabba'at Caves).

⁸ R. de Vaux, *L'archéologie et les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (London, 1961).

(1) The earliest occupation was during the Iron Age. The foundations of the fort from this period still remain.⁹

(2) Much later, in the second century B.C., the site was again occupied, and as the series of some five hundred coins indicates, the community flourished here until about the year 30 B.C., when the site was once more abandoned.¹⁰

(3) A few years before the Christian era, it was again re-occupied, only to be totally destroyed in A.D. 68-69 by the 10th Roman Legion. It was apparently at this time that the community's library of scrolls was hidden in the various caves nearby.¹¹

(4) On the ruins, the Roman Legion maintained an encampment until about the end of the first century A.D.¹²

(5) During the second Jewish Revolt in the second century, some of the underground rooms of the tower were used as a hide-out, and thereafter the place was completely abandoned and forgotten until the epoch-making discoveries in 1947.¹³

Harding notes further the preliminary excavation in 1956 of other remains near 'Ain Fesha, which were fairly extensive and 'of precisely the same period as the Qumram settlement'. He remarks, 'In one of the rooms we even found a pottery inkwell similar to that found in the Scriptorium at Qumram', and concludes, 'So we have here another smaller establishment related to that at Qumram, perhaps connected with the cultivation and irrigation of the narrow strip of land between the hills and the Dead Sea'.¹⁴

Early in 1958, de Vaux conducted a thorough exploration of this area south of Qumram, and from his report Harding suggests that 'the whole structure appears to have been a branch of Khirbet Qumram, an agricultural centre for the tending of date-palms, flocks and so forth . . . smaller than Khirbet Qumram, but evidently having a similar history'.¹⁵

Interesting is Harding's description of the discovery of Cave 11 which was, he writes, 'a little to the north of Cave 1 and only a few yards from where we pitched our camp when in 1952 we examined some fifty caves in the vicinity. The cave is situated some fifty feet up the scarp, and the entrance had collapsed anciently, leaving only a very small hole to give access to the interior, which was why we had missed it'.¹⁶ He describes briefly a few of the more significant MS finds from Cave II, mentioning

⁹ G. Lancaster Harding, 'Recent Discoveries in Jordan', *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, 90 (1958), p. 15.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹⁵ Harding, 'News and Notes', *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, 91 (1959), pp. 1 ff.

¹⁶ Harding, 'Recent Discoveries . . .', p. 17.

first 'a very beautiful leather scroll of part of the book of Leviticus in the proto-Hebrew script'. He notes also 'many large pieces of an Aramaic Apocalypse of New Jerusalem' and the 'Targum or translation of the Book of Job into Aramaic, of which only the central portions of the scroll remain'.¹⁷ He also mentions 'a particularly fine, nearly complete scroll of the book of Psalms. Of this, only about the lower quarter is missing'.¹⁸

On the basis of the listing of coins in de Vaux's report, Bardtke, however, in disagreement with de Vaux, feels there was a small occupation of the site before 150 B.C. The disagreement is over the interpretation of the five copper coins from the reigns of Antiochus III, IV and VII found during the excavations at Khirbet Qumram. De Vaux feels that these are too few to establish the existence of a group at Qumram in the first half of the second century B.C. But Bardtke feels that these coins are particularly significant, since such copper coins have a very short period of currency and consequently their date of mintage testifies most directly to the date of usage.¹⁹ The largest number of coins found are the 143 coins from the reign of Alexander Jannaeus, 107-76 B.C.²⁰ Bardtke is probably correct in interpreting this distribution of coins to mean that a small and relatively poor group existed at Qumram before 150 B.C., and that it attained a considerable increase in size and wealth during the reign of Alexander Jannaeus.²¹

Bardtke also disagrees with the theory of the total abandonment of Khirbet Qumram during the time of Herod the Great. His view will be discussed later in this paper. It may be noted, however, that he finds partial support for this view in the occurrence of ten undated coins which are on other grounds definitely from the time of Herod the Great. De Vaux had suggested that they were brought back to Qumram by those who returned after A.D. 6.²²

South of Qumram, in the area between En-gedi and Masada in Israel, a number of explorations beginning early in 1960 were carried out.²³ The preliminary notice of this activity appeared in the *Israel Exploration Quarterly* for that year, pp. 125 f. Upon hearing reports that Bedouin had found some MSS in Nahal Seelim caves, Dr. Y. Aharoni led a ten-day expedition to the region, which is about five kilometres north of Masada, from 25th January to 2nd February, which convinced him that the area

¹⁷ Harding, 'Recent Discoveries . . .', p. 17.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ Bardtke, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, cols. 816 f.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, col. 817.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² Cf. *Ibid.*

²³ A convenient survey of these explorations is given by T. L. Coss, *Secrets from the Caves* (New York, 1963), pp. 163-165, cf. also Y. Yadin, 'New Discoveries in the Judean Desert', *The Biblical Archaeologist*, XXIV (1961), pp. 34-50, 86-92.

needed thorough investigation. With the help of the Israeli army, which furnished helicopters and mine detectors, together with twenty students of the Hebrew University and sixty other volunteers, four groups were given different sections for thorough exploration, with S. Aviram as the co-ordinator. The expeditions worked from 23rd March to 5th April, 1960, and their detailed reports are published in the 1961 volume of the *Israel Exploration Journal*, pp. 1-72. Group A, under N. Avigad, which had been assigned the area by En-gedi found nothing very significant.²⁴ Group B, under the leadership of Y. Aharoni, worked in the region of Nahal Seelim, which Aharoni had originally surveyed. A number of interesting finds were made on these two occasions.²⁵ They found that the Bedouin had thoroughly searched one of the caves, designated Cave 32. They had, however, missed another cave, now designated the cave of the scrolls, No. 34. Here the Aharoni group found some phylactery fragments of Exod. 13: 2-10 and 13: 11-16; the earlier verses agree in part with the LXX and Peshitta against the MT, whereas vv. 11-16 are identical with the MT. They seem to have affinities with the material from the Murabba'at caves of about the same period.²⁶

The third group, under P. Bar-Adon, investigated the area of Nahal 'Asahel, which is midway between En-gedi and Masada. In the Cave of the Scouts they found, among other things, a few fragments of Greek and Hebrew papyri from the Bar Kokhba period.²⁷

The most significant finds were made by Group D under the direction of Yadin in Nahal Hever.²⁸ Apart from a large number of Bar Kokhba letters, to be described later, they uncovered in the co-called Cave of Horrors a burial niche, bronze ritual vessels, and a Bar Kokhba coin with the inscription *Leherut Yerushalayim*, 'for the Freedom of Jerusalem'. An interesting MS find was a Psalm fragment dating probably from the first half of the first century A.D., containing parts of Pss. 15 and 16, but omitting the first part of 16. The main discovery, however, was the fifteen Bar Kokhba letters, some of considerable length, of which eight are written in Aramaic, five in Hebrew, and two in Greek. One was written on wood, the rest on papyri. The form of Bar Kokhba's name in the Greek and Aramaic letters is *Kosiba*, and this agrees with the spelling found at Wadi Murabba'at.

From 14th to 27th March of the same year, the four groups went out once more to the same regions they had worked earlier. Group A found evidence of three periods of occupation in Nahal David, near En-gedi, the earliest of which was from the fourth millennium B.C.; the second was Israelite of the seventh century B.C., and the third was Roman from about 130 A.D. In addition

²⁴ Cf. *Israel Exploration Journal*, 11 (1961), pp. 6-10.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 11-24.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ Cf. also *ibid.*, pp. 36-52.

there was evidence of burials in other caves spanning the period from the second century B.C. through the first century A.D.²⁹

In the so-called Cave of Horrors, Group B found remains of the Chalcolithic period and the Roman era, as well as four coins of Bar Kokhba dating from the second and third years of the revolt, and also bearing the legend 'for the Freedom of Jerusalem'. Fragments of Jonah in Hebrew and Greek were found, differing from the LXX and approaching the MT. These fragments are part of the same scroll, fragments of which had been published earlier by P. Barthelemy in *Revue Biblique* (1953), pp. 18-29. The more than forty skeletons of men, women and children found there suggest a long siege and were the occasion for the naming of the cave by the excavators.

Group C investigated Nahal Mishmar, slightly south of their original base. They found a large collection of implements, scepters, grain stores, and some beautifully fashioned ivories. Bar-Adon suggests that 'these materials seem to have originated from a temple or palace', and that they were hidden 'either as a cache or as spoils of war'.³⁰

Once again it was Group D under Yadin that made the largest MS finds. In two rooms back of the original 'Cave of Letters', they found other remains and MSS from the Bar Kokhba period.³¹ In the second room were found two rolled up papyri.³² 'The main finds, however', writes Yadin, 'were made in the third room. All of them represent objects which the followers of Bar Kokhba had carefully hidden in crevices between huge rocks, the entrances to which they had covered with smaller stones; these objects were obviously valuable to them'.³³ Among the finds two bundles of leather and papyri should be specially noted, which were later carefully opened by Prof. J. Biberkraut. *Bundle A* contained five documents, three of which were 'written in elegant Mishnaic Hebrew' with an 'extremely fine script far superior to that of any secular document so far found in either Israel or Jordan'. The two other documents in this bundle were written in Aramaic. All five documents deal with property transactions.³⁴ *Bundle B* contained forty or more documents, of which only four were opened at the time of the report. All were inscribed on 'very large papyri' in Greek, with summaries and signatures in Aramaic. They are legal documents dealing with marriage, trusteeship, etc.³⁵ In clearing the second cave a small portion of Numbers 10 was found, as well as a fragment in Nabatean.³⁶

²⁹ Cf. 'News Reports', *Israel Exploration Journal*, 11 (1961), pp. 77 f.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² *Ibid.*

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 80.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 80 f.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

This concludes a brief survey of recent archaeological exploration on the western side of the Dead Sea. One may hope that still further discoveries may be made as more of the remote caves in the Judean desert are investigated.

II. ASPECTS OF THE STUDY OF THE SCROLL MATERIAL

First, concerning the dating of the scrolls, in addition to the remarks above about the coins, and in addition to the controlled temperature technique of measuring shrinkage, Fitzmeyer has recently discussed the more refined dating now possible by the improvements in the Carbon 14 method.³⁷ The new average obtained on some palm wood is A.D. 8, plus or minus forty years. Thus coins, paleography,³⁸ linguistics, pottery and shrinkage all agree that the materials of Qumram are from the period of the last two or three centuries B.C. through the first century A.D.³⁹ Martin Noth has suggested that Khirbet Qumram was built on the site of 'ir hammelah, 'city of the Salt (Sea)', a fairly large seventh century city mentioned in Joshua 15 : 62.⁴⁰

The language of the Qumram scrolls is largely that of the O.T. However, Betz notes that four fragments from 'Cave 4 show elements of the Mishnaic grammar, like frequent participles or the relative particle *sh*'.⁴¹ The frequent use of vowel letters in some of the MSS gives an insight into the vocalization of Hebrew just before the Christian era, and in a number of instances it clearly differs from later Masoretic practice.⁴² The finds of Aramaic documents from around the beginning of the Christian era will have increasing significance for the investigation of the evidences of Aramaic in, and its influence upon, the N.T. writings.

As Cross indicates, however, the 'most obvious and direct contribution' of the MS finds is to the field of the history of the

³⁷ J. A. Fitzmeyer, 'The Date of the Qumram Scrolls', *America*, 104 (18th March, 1961), pp. 780 f. Discussed in LaSor, 'Historical Framework. The Present Status of Dead Sea Scrolls Study', *Interpretation*, XVI (1962), p. 265.

³⁸ As Kuhn has pointed out, the numerous fragments from many different MSS spanning a period of three hundred years have been a real boon to the paleographical study of Hebrew and Aramaic, cf. *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 85 (1960), col. 651.

³⁹ LaSor, *ibid.*

⁴⁰ Cf. O. Betz, 'Dead Sea Scrolls', *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. 1, p. 793.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² Cf. J. Hempel, *Die Texte von Qumram in der heutigen Forschung* (Göttingen, 1961), pp. 50 ff.; cf. also M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, *Linguistic Structure and Tradition in the Qumram Documents*, (Jerusalem, 1958); *The Qumram Scrolls and their Linguistic Status* (in Modern Hebrew) (Jerusalem 1959); *Text and Language in Bible and Qumram* (Jerusalem 1960); E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Complete Isaiah Scroll* (in Modern Hebrew) (Jerusalem, 1959); R. Meyer, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 75 (1950), cols. 721 ff. and 83 (1958), cols. 40 ff.

text of the O.T.⁴³ Before these discoveries, the studies of Lagarde had shown that *ca.* A.D. 100, an official Hebrew text was adopted for the O.T. which rapidly drove out all other varying traditions: this was the Masoretic text. The Samaritan Pentateuch and the LXX often disagree with the Masoretic text, but it was not possible for scholarship, with the materials available, to come to agreement either concerning the relationship of these three text types to one another, or concerning the pre-Christian history of the Masoretic text of the O.T.

With the discovery of MSS and fragments of large numbers of MSS in the Dead Sea area, however, there is increased possibility of gaining a clearer insight into the recensional history of the Hebrew O.T. The fact that all of the MSS from Wadi Murabba'at agree with the MT⁴⁴ indicates that by the date of these documents (*ca.* A.D. 150) the Hebrew text had reached the standardization claimed earlier by Lagarde and others.

At first sight the relatively few variants found in the two Isaiah MSS from Cave 1 would appear to confirm an even earlier, pre-Christian unity in the textual tradition of the Hebrew O.T. But this is not the case, since in Isaiah the LXX and the MT happen to be very similar, and thus little can be deduced from the agreement of the Qumran Isaiah MSS and the traditional text.⁴⁵

It was indeed, as Cross writes, 'incredibly good fortune' to find in Cave 4 fragments of over a hundred different Biblical MSS.⁴⁶ The full significance of these fragments will become apparent only after their complete publication in the forthcoming volumes of *Discoveries in the Judean Desert*. The preliminary studies of them by Cross, Skehan and others have, however, already made a number of things clear. The most significant fact to emerge is that Hebrew MSS are represented in these fragments which agree with the LXX and the Samaritan Pentateuch against the MT.⁴⁷ This means that much more serious consideration will often have to be given to the variations found in the Greek version and the Samaritan recension. It does not *necessarily* mean that these two traditions are better than the MT.⁴⁸ It does mean, however, that often the LXX represents a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from, and even earlier than, the present Masoretic tradition. For example, the Pentateuch is represented, Cross tells us, by over thirty MSS in Cave 4. While the majority of these MSS are in the Masoretic tradition, Hebrew MSS with readings paralleling the LXX text are also 'well represented', and texts similar to the

⁴³ F. M. Cross, 'Dead Sea Scrolls', *The Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. 12, p. 650.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*; cf. also Betz, *op. cit.*, p. 796.

⁴⁵ Cf. Cross, 'Dead Sea Scrolls', p. 653.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ Cf. Betz, *loc. cit.*, also Cross, *ibid.*, pp. 653-655.

⁴⁸ Cross, *ibid.*, p. 654.

Samaritan recension also occur (among others, the fragment of Exodus written in Paleo-Hebrew script).⁴⁹

Concerning the historical books, Cross has found fragments of three different MSS, which have readings agreeing with the LXX, or which are better than either the present MT or LXX.⁵⁰ This was especially clear in the two Samuel fragments. The one, 4Q Sam.^b agreed thirteen times with the LXX against the MT and only four times with the MT against the LXX. The other fragment, 3Q Sam.^a, we are told has an even higher proportion of agreement with the LXX against the received text.⁵¹

In Jeremiah, the LXX text has been a particularly knotty problem, since the Greek version is considerably shorter than our present MT. Interestingly enough, fragments of Hebrew texts were found in Cave 4 which agree with the 'omissions' of the LXX. In chap. 10, for example, some of these fragments omit four verses and change the order of another verse, exactly as is done in the LXX.⁵² Other MSS are represented which agree with the present longer form of the MT also.⁵³

What is the relationship of these Hebrew texts agreeing with the LXX to the Masoretic tradition? Since the same non-Masoretic tradition is now known to have existed in Egypt (used by the translators of the LXX) and in Palestine (used by the community at Qumram), both the Egyptian and Palestinian forms are best understood as descending from an even earlier and common tradition. Albright had suggested that this tradition originated in Egypt;⁵⁴ Cross, on the other hand, is more likely to be correct when he suggests concerning the historical books that this non-Masoretic tradition stems from the 'fifth century B.C. Jewish community in Palestine, and that the ancestral Egyptian textual tradition diverged from the Old Palestinian text no earlier than the fourth century, not later than the early third century B.C.'⁵⁵

What then is to be considered the origin of the Masoretic form of the tradition? Because it diverges radically from the Palestinian, non-Masoretic form, and because often its readings are inferior, Cross feels that it is unlikely that this is a parallel tradition from Palestine, which eventually ousted the form of the text lying behind the LXX of the historical books.⁵⁶ Rather, he suggests that the proto-Masoretic tradition is probably to be associated with the Jewish community in Babylon, and was re-introduced to Palestine in the Hasmonean period.⁵⁷ Whether detailed study of all the fragments from Cave 4 will bear out such a reconstruction

⁴⁹ Cross, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 654.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 653.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 655.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ Albright, *New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible*, *BASOR*, 140 (1955), pp. 27-33.

⁵⁵ Cross, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 656.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

can only be known after their publication, which we may hope will soon be achieved. The work on the material from Cave 11 has hardly begun, and it is likely to be many years before those MSS and fragments will be available for general study.⁵⁸

In another area the finds in and around Qumram have special significance. This is concerning the Canon of the O.T. It is clear from the large number of fragments of known and of previously unknown apocryphal writings that the third part of the O.T. Canon, the Writings, crystallized from a body of literature much larger than was previously suspected.⁵⁹ The relative stability of the first two sections of the canon, as well as the fluidity of the third section during the last century B.C., have also been substantiated by the MS finds in the region of the Dead Sea.⁶⁰ The recovery of the Aramaic 'Prayer of Nabonidus', as well as fragments of other non-canonical Daniel material, supports the commonly held view that the stories appearing in the early chapters of Daniel are a selection from a larger group of stories, which circulated independently in Aramaic before they were taken up by the writer of the book.

Study of the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha will be aided by the publication of the Hebrew and Aramaic fragments of writings, which were known previously only in Greek, Latin, Syriac or Ethiopic translations.⁶¹ The fact that the second section of Enoch and most of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs were not represented at all, may suggest that these parts are of later composition, and also raised the possibility that the extant portions may actually have been composed at Qumram.⁶² In Cave 6 a fragment of a Hebrew MS of Ecclesiasticus was found, which parallels very closely the Cairo text discovered some sixty years ago.⁶³

In the field of O.T. quotations, it should be noted that the most popular canonical writings seem to have been Genesis, Deuteronomy, Isaiah and the Psalms;⁶⁴ and the fragments of florilegia discovered establish beyond doubt the use of *collections* of O.T. passages on specific subjects before the Christian era.

As to the nature and history of the group at Qumram, a few things are becoming clearer. There can be little doubt that the Qumram community is to be related both to the Hasidim and to the later Essenes, and is pre-Christian in its origins and early history.⁶⁵ A recent attempt to find an alternative to the theory,

⁵⁸ Cf. Kuhn, *loc. cit.*

⁵⁹ Cf. Hempel, *op. cit.*, p. 334.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ Cf. Betz, *op. cit.*, p. 796.

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 795; cf. also Hempel, *op. cit.*, p. 334.

⁶⁵ Cf., for example, Betz, *op. cit.*, p. 801; cf. also LaSor, 'Historical Framework', p. 265; Bartke, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 87 (1962), col. 814; and H. H. Rowley, 'Comparison and Contrast', *Interpretation*, XVI (1962), pp. 292 f.

explaining the Qumram settlement as Essene, is that of K. H. Rengstorf in his book, *Hirbet Qumram and the Problem of the Library of the Dead Sea Caves*, first published in German in 1960.⁶⁶ He considers the MSS and the fragments to be the remains of a library of the Jerusalem Temple, and the settlement itself a part of the lands administered by the Temple. Rengstorf finds a number of references in ancient literature to such Temple archives, to which Bardtke supplies two more, namely F. Milkan *et al.*, *Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft*, 3 (1953), pp. 1-145, and H. Otten, 'Bibliotheken in Alten Orient', *Das Altertum*, 1 (1955), pp. 67-81. The nature of the MS finds, however does not accord very well with this view: nevertheless Rengstorf does emphasize a number of details which are not easily explained on the Essene theory, such as the somewhat surprising fact that the name 'Essene' never occurs in the material from Qumram; nor is there any evidence in ancient sources concerning the Essenes of a specific Essene scribal school, as may be implied by the occurrence of the Scriptorium at Qumram.⁶⁷

Two things are clear from the archaeology of Khirbet Qumram. First of all, the main buildings of the monastery were erected most probably around 130 B.C.⁶⁸ The distribution of coins and earlier smaller structures suggest that there was a small group there already by 150 B.C. and that the period of Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 B.C.) saw the most intense activity at the site.⁶⁹ This suggests the following reconstruction:⁷⁰

About 160 B.C. a small group of Hasidim went to Khirbet Qumram. During the time of Jonathan or Simon, the Teacher of Righteousness and others of the Hasidim broke with the Jerusalem priesthood and joined the pioneers at Qumram, establishing the monastic order. As a result of persecutions under Hyrcanus and Alexander Jannaeus a considerable number of Pharisees became members of the community also. Sometime during this period, the death of the Teacher and perhaps the removal of a part of the group to Damascus occurred.

It has been generally held that throughout the reign of Herod the Great, and to some extent related to the earthquake of 31 B.C., Khirbet Qumram was completely abandoned. Bardtke, however, has maintained that the agricultural activity in connection with the monastery was continued by Qumramites until the reactivation of the order early in the Christian era, though on a reduced scale.⁷¹ He bases his view on a number of significant details. First of all, as he points out, it is unlikely that an agricultural

⁶⁶ Cf. the detailed review by Bardtke, *ibid.*, cols. 820-824.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 823.

⁶⁸ Cf. Bardtke, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 87 (1962), col. 818.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, cols. 816 f.

⁷⁰ For a convenient survey of the varying reconstructions up to 1957, cf. Burrows, *op. cit.*, pp. 191-225. For the status of the problem since that time cf. Hempel, *op. cit.*, pp. 57-66.

⁷¹ *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 85 (1960), cols. 268 f.

development carefully laid out with many years of labour would be completely abandoned as the result of an earthquake, which would not really affect the actual process of cultivation very much.⁷² De Vaux, in his final report, also granted that the agricultural remains at Qumram only indicate a drastic reduction of activity, not necessarily total cessation.⁷³ Further, the earthquake faultline only passes through the most eastern part of the main complex with no evidence of destruction at the same time to the buildings on the west.⁷⁴ While this decline took place at Khirbet Qumram, Bardtke notes that there was an increase in activity at nearby 'Ain Fesha, which he feels is best dated after 31 B.C. and before the Christian era.⁷⁵ Here there is no sign of water failure such as was evident at Qumram at the time of the earthquake. Bardtke suggests accordingly that the main centre of agricultural activity had shifted to 'Ain Fesha, but these Qumramites still continued some activity at their former site in order to preserve their legal rights to the cultivated land developed by their group over so many years.⁷⁶ The difference in pottery noted at 'Ain Fesha can readily be explained by the fact that the pottery works at Qumram were in the quake faultline and consequently destroyed in the catastrophe. Thus pottery used by those posted at 'Ain Fesha to care for the agricultural work was probably brought in from outside.⁷⁷ The strength of Bardtke's view is that it explains the obvious similarities observable in the two periods of occupation of the site, although these are separated by a period of abandonment lasting some forty years. The more Zealot character of the group in the Christian era is to be explained along the lines suggested already by Milik,⁷⁸ and this may be the element of truth in the otherwise improbable reconstruction of Cecil Roth.⁷⁹ Such Zealot tendencies make the final destruction of Khirbet Qumram by the 10th Roman Legion in A.D. 68 more understandable.

In keeping with the above history of the group, the nature of the community can be expected to vary in the different periods. Until the death of the Teacher of Righteousness, it was largely priestly in membership and character. During the latter half of the first century B.C., there was considerable influence from the Pharisees, who seem to have joined the group in fairly large numbers at that time. During the first century A.D. Zealotism is to be more and more reckoned with in the interpretation of the group's history and thought.

Much of the discussion concerning these discoveries in the

⁷² *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 85 (1960), col. 268.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, col. 269, cf. also Milik, *op. cit.*, pp. 95 f.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, col. 268.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, col. 269.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

⁷⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 94-97.

⁷⁹ Cf. Bardtke's critique, *op. cit.*, 87 (1962), cols. 824-826.

Judean wilderness has, of course, dealt with the question of contacts between Qumram and Christianity. The pre-Christian dating, now assured by so many lines of evidence noted earlier, shows many of the earlier suggestions to be impossible. There still remain, however, many points of contact between Christianity and the Qumram literature. H. H. Rowley, who has so frequently with sound critical judgement surveyed problems which have been extensively debated, in a recent article in *Interpretation* has once again performed an invaluable service in connection with the question of the relation of Qumram to the N.T.⁸⁰ In much greater detail H. Braun in *Theologische Rundschau* has undertaken a similar task in his series entitled 'Qumram und das Neue Testament: Ein Bericht über 10 Jahre Forschung (1950-1959)', vols. 28-30 (1962-1964). In addition to these two articles, the volume edited by Krister Stendhal, published in 1957, *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, is a very valuable and stimulating contribution to this aspect of Qumram studies.

One must, however, agree with Rowley at the conclusion of his survey: 'In all of the discussion of the Scrolls there has been too much reading of the N.T. into the Qumram texts, thus creating an illusory similarity where none appears, while at the same time eyes have been closed to patent differences'.⁸¹

It is in this connection that I wish to conclude this paper with a few remarks concerning one of the latest and, to my mind, most significant books on Qumram, H. Ringgren's work, *The Faith of Qumram*, translated last year by Emilie T. Sander from the Swedish edition first published in 1961.⁸² The first paragraph of his Preface is worth noting. He writes:

'This book was written in the conviction that before we start comparing isolated beliefs and practices of the Qumram community with those of the N.T. Church, we should establish their meaning in their original context. For this purpose there is need of a systematic account of the doctrines and practices of the Qumram community as set forth in the Dead Sea Scrolls. It is true that we do not yet have access to the complete bulk of material from the caves, but it seems likely that what we have enables us to draw a fairly correct picture of the community and its beliefs. The documents that are still to be published might modify our views in certain questions of detail, but their publication will probably not necessitate any fundamental change of the total picture.'

He devotes the first twenty-four pages to a brief discussion of the contents and literary character of the individual non-Biblical

⁸⁰ H. H. Rowley, 'Comparison and Contrast', *Qumram and the Early Church, Interpretation*, XVI (1962), pp. 202-304.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 304.

⁸² H. Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumram. Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1963), p.v. (This can be obtained in a paperback edition from C.L.S. Madras).

scrolls and some of the fragments. In twenty additional pages he surveys the historical problems of the group, its nature and history, with special emphasis on the identification of the Kittim and the Teacher of Righteousness, as well as a brief note on the migration to Damascus. He rightly maintains that the meaning of Kittim varies in the different writings, and offers the following proposal: 'In the War Scroll, which seems to be the oldest, the word "Kittim" taken from the Bible is used to designate all nations who are enemies of God's people, Israel, and the Kittim of Assyria are Seleucids. The Habbakuk Commentary and the Nahum Commentary belong to a later period—between 88 and 63 B.C., and the Kittim there are the Romans.'⁸³

Admitting the scanty details available from the Scrolls and the difficulties of interpreting them,⁸⁴ and noting the six main theories as to the date of the teachers' appearance,⁸⁵ he favours dating the beginning of the Teacher's work at Qumram about the year 130 B.C., though granting that the Zadokite emphasis really favours an earlier origin for the group itself.⁸⁶ He concludes cautiously, 'At present it seems impossible to reach any more exact date for the Teacher of Righteousness . . . (than) that he must have flourished some time between 170 and 63 B.C. and rather before than after 100 B.C.'⁸⁷

The main part of Ringgren's book (pp. 47–198) is devoted to a detailed discussion of the theological concepts evident from the extant writings presented under the five headings, God (pp. 47–67), Dualism (pp. 68–80), Angels and Demons (pp. 81–93), Man (pp. 94–151), and Eschatology (pp. 152–198). In the last sixty pages of the book, he discusses organization and cult (pp. 201–229) and the place of the group within the development of Judaism (pp. 233–254), of which pages 243 to 254 deal explicitly with contacts with Christianity and post-Christian Jewish developments. Concerning the nature of the group, he writes, 'The conclusion of this discussion must either be that the people of Qumram are Essenes, or that they are very close to the Essenes. But is it actually probable that two communities, which were as similar as the Essenes of Josephus and the Qumram community, had lived so close to each other without having had anything to do with each other? Hardly. The differences which still exist, however, must be explained on the basis that our sources were not sufficiently well informed, or on the assumption of various movements within the Essenes' own circle—it should be noted that the three informants (Philo, Josephus and Dead Sea Scrolls) do

⁸³ H. Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumram. Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1963), p. 31.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 31–38.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 38–41.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 42 f.

not entirely agree with each other'.⁸⁸ His treatment of N.T. contacts is brief, suggestive and restrained. Appended to the book is a thirty-page bibliography of books and articles up to ca. 1961.

From the above survey, it will perhaps be clear that the main value of Qumran studies for N.T. research must be in the sphere of better understanding of the developments within Palestinian Judaism of the last two centuries before the Christian era; and that N.T. scholarship will benefit from Qumran studies by being enabled better to understand some of the up to now less known aspects of the background and environment in which Christianity arose and developed.

Selected Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls

(1957 and later)

- Adam, A. *Antike Berichte über die Essener (Kleine Texte 182)*. Berlin, 1961, 63 pp.
CBQ, 23 (1961), 528, J. A. Fitzmeyer. ZAW, 73 (1961), 340, G. Fohrer. JTS, 13 (1962), 364, M. Black. RB, 69 (1962), 456, M. E. Boismard.
- Allegro, J. M. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of Christianity*. N.Y., 1957, 250 pp.
PSB, 50 (1957), C. T. Fritsch. RB, 64 (1957), 628 ff., de Vaux, R.
———. *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Texts and Pictures*. N.Y., 1958.
Interp, 13 (1959), 363, J. R. Cochrane, Jr.
———. *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*. London, 1960, 191 pp.
JSS, 6 (1961), 275-78, G. R. Driver.
- Avigad, N., and Yadin, Y. *A Genesis Apocryphon*. Jerusalem, 1956. 40, 48 pp.
Bib, 38 (1957), 461 f., E. Vogt. RB, 64 (1957), 623 ff., de Vaux, R. ZAW, 69 (1957), 233 f., J. Hempel. JSS, 3 (1958), 304 ff., W. D. McHardy. TLZ, 83 (1958), 343-46, H. Bardtke.
- Baillet, M., Milik, J. T., and de Vaux, R. *Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan. III. Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumran; Exploration de la falaise. Les grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q a 10Q. Le rouleau de cuivre, Vol. 1: Texte, Vol. II Planches, xiii+317 pp*, Oxford 1962.
RQ IV (1963), 279-97, S. Segert, J. Pelikan. PEQ, July-Dec. 1963, 142-44, F. Bruce.
- Bardtke, H. *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer (Band II). Die Sekte von Qumran*. Berlin, 1958. 337 pp.
RQ, 2 (1959), 89-94, G. Molin. Ex Tim, 71 (1959), 191 H. H. Rowley. JSS, 5 (1960), 103 ff., F. F. Bruce. RB, 66 (1959), 459 ff., P. Benoit.
———, (ed.). *Qumran—Probleme*. Berlin, 1963. 368 pp.
- Baumbach, G. *Qumran und das Johannes-Evangelium. Eine vergleichende Untersuchung der dualistischen Aussagen der Ordensregeln von Qumran und des Johannes-Evangeliums mit Berücksichtigung der spät jüdischen Apokalypsen (Aufsätze und Vorträge zu Theologie und Religionswissenschaft, 6)*. Berlin, 1958, 60 pp.

⁸⁸ H. Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran. Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1963), pp. 241 f.