

MARK HARDING

Introduction II: Recent History of Dead Sea Scrolls Scholarship

The article surveys recent scholarship on the Dead Sea Scrolls and traces the contours of interpretative trends in scroll research since the 1990s. The publication of all of the Dead Sea texts in the early 1990s has given scholars unprecedented access to the entire corpus. Many aspects of the scholarly consensus that emerged out of the enterprise of the first generation of scroll researchers in the 1950s have proven remarkably resilient. However, in other respects, the scrolls have raised new questions about their authors and their community, as well as the early Jewish environment in which the corpus came to be written.

Today younger scholars and students may take for granted their access to the entire corpus of Dead Sea Scrolls. The story of the struggle to win access to the complete texts, which, with the exception of the Temple Scroll (11QT), had all been photographed in the 1950s and early 1960s, has been frequently told. Culminating in the early 1990s, scholars of early Judaism the world over mounted an effective campaign in the media and at scholarly conferences for immediate release of the texts. Up until that time, the successors of the original seven-man international team established in 1953–1964 by Roland de Vaux, Head of the *École Biblique* in Jordanian Jerusalem, to work on the mass of textual material from cave 4, defended their exclusive right to continue producing and sponsoring official editions of the scrolls in the official Qumran publication project, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* (DJD). However, after the speedy publication of the first seven scrolls from cave 1 by the mid 1950s, that labour had been proceeding at a frustratingly slow pace with respect to the tangled mass of fragmentary material from cave 4. John Strugnell, who had held the chief-editorship of the DJD series since 1984, fell foul of the Israeli authorities in 1991, who replaced him as chief editor of the Qumran publication project with Emanuel Tov of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem. The international team, which by then numbered twenty, was immediately expanded to fifty-five members. Incidentally, none of the original members of the international team were Jewish, a legacy of the Jordanian control of East Jerusalem and the West Bank in which the *École Biblique* and the Palestine

Archaeological Museum, the site of the “Scrollery,” were situated, not to mention the caves and the site of Qumran itself.

In 1991, Ben Zion Wacholder and Martin Abegg published an edition of 17 cave 4 manuscripts generated from a restricted access scroll concordance compiled in the late 1950s.¹ Two further volumes followed in 1992 and 1995. In defiance of the Israel Antiquities Authority, the Huntington Library in San Marino, California, announced that it would be making its collection of photographs deposited there in 1982 available to all scholars. In the same year, two volumes of the Palestine Archaeological Museum (PAM) photographs appeared. This work, entitled *A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, was edited by Robert H. Eisenman and James M. Robinson.² The photographs had been made available clandestinely to the editors, who did not reveal their source. The edition was soon superseded by Emanuel Tov’s *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche*.³ This resource was published with the official authority of the Israeli Antiquities Authority in which was vested the copyright of the PAM photos published by Eisenman and Robinson. The Microfiche Edition included not only the PAM photos but also photographic collections from the Shrine of the Book, the Israel Antiquities Authority, the West Semitic Research Project, and photos of the archaeological remains — 6000 photos in all. Subsequently, Tov produced *A Companion Volume to the Dead Sea Scrolls Microfiche Edition*, which included a list of the negative numbers of the texts, an index of the microfiche, and sections on the history of the Dead Sea discoveries, sites in the Judaean desert where texts have been found, and an account of the photographing of the texts.⁴ There is also a CD ROM of all of the Qumran manuscripts. There is as much interest as ever, if not more, in the scrolls and the people who wrote them.

Handsome volumes of DJD with translations, notes, introductions and photographs have been appearing regularly during the 1990s. DJD 1 had appeared in 1955. DJD 7 appeared in 1982. DJD 8, a volume devoted to the Greek Minor Prophets scroll from Naḥal Ḥever, was published in 1990. DJD 9, only the fourth volume in the series devoted to cave 4 texts, appeared at the beginning of 1993. By the end of 2001, over twenty-five more volumes had been published, most of these devoted to texts from cave 4. Only one volume of calendrical texts (due December 2001), another volume of texts from Wadi Daliyeh and Qumran miscellanea (due January 2002), and the final volume of the series, “Introduction and Indexes” (due February 2002), remain to be published of the projected thirty-nine volumes of the series. The first six volumes of the series have also been reprinted.

1. Ben Zion Wacholder and Martin Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave 4* (Washington: Biblical Archaeological Society, 1991–95).

2. Robert H. Eisenman and James M. Robinson, eds. *A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls I–II* (Washington: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991).

3. Emanuel Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche* (Leiden: Brill, 1992).

4. Emanuel Tov, *A Companion Volume to the Dead Sea Scrolls Microfiche Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1995).

Not only is there the DJD series, the industrious Princeton scholar James H. Charlesworth has also been busy producing four volumes of a projected ten volume Princeton Theological Seminary (PTS) edition of the non-biblical scrolls. This edition features the original text and facing English translation, together with introduction and notes; there are no photographs. Complementing the DJD series, which published texts from the one cave, the PTS series groups similar texts from different caves in the one volume. Prior to this, Charlesworth and a Seminary team had published the *Graphic Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls*.⁵ In addition to the resources of the DJD and PTS series, there are three separate editions of the complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English translation — plus the first volume of the *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* edited by Martínez and Tigchelaar — all published in the last decade.⁶

With the public release of the scroll texts, scholarly books and articles are being published apace. A new journal, *Dead Sea Discoveries* (1994–), now supplements the venerable *Revue de Qumran*. There is no shortage of articles in more popular journals such as *Biblical Archaeology Review* and there are several commendable, recently published, general introductions to the corpus of scrolls in their historical and religious context.⁷ Yet there is still much value in the older introductions by Cross, Milik, and Black.⁸ The more recent contributions of Knibb and Vermes should also not be forgotten.⁹ James Charlesworth has been instrumental in the reprinting of a number of seminal volumes relating the scrolls to the New Testament, as well as Helmer Ringgren's *The Faith of Qumran*.¹⁰ It is good to see substantial monographs

5. James H. Charlesworth *et al.*, eds. *Graphic Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Tübingen/Louisville: Mohr [Siebeck]/Westminster/John Knox, 1991).

6. Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition: Volume 1, 1Q1–4Q273* (Leiden: Brill, 1997); Florentino García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English* (Leiden/Grand Rapids: Brill/Eerdmans, 1996 [Spanish edition published in 1992]); Michael Wise, Martin J. Abegg, Jr, and Edward Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996); Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1998).

7. James C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids/London: Eerdmans/SPCK, 1994); Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia/Jerusalem: Jewish Publication Society, 1994); Florentino García Martínez and Julio Trebolle Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices* (Leiden: Brill, 1995 [Spanish original, 1993]); Hartmut Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge/Leiden: Eerdmans/Brill, 1998 [German original, 1993]).

8. Frank Moore Cross Jr, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*. 3rd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995; J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (London: SCM, 1959); Matthew Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1961).

9. Michael A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987) and Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (London: SCM, 1977 [revised in 1982 and 1994]), and recently reprinted as *An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: SCM, 1999).

10. Krister Stendhal, ed. *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (New York: Crossroad, 1992 [originally published in 1957]); James H. Charlesworth and Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, eds. *Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Crossroad, 1990 [originally published in 1968]); James H. Charlesworth, ed. *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Crossroad, 1990 [originally published in 1972]); Helmer Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran: The Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Expanded edition, with a new Introduction by James H. Charlesworth (New York: Crossroad, 1995 [originally published by Fortress Press, 1963]).

appearing on the subject of Qumran prayers and hymns.¹¹ In addition, the surveys by Esther Chazon and Rodney Werline, as well as the first six entries in the anthology *Prayer from Alexander to Constantine*, are worth consulting.¹²

Hebrew Scripts and the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible

The revolutionary impact of the biblical scrolls cannot be understated for the study of the development of Hebrew scripts and the Hebrew Bible. Recent radiocarbon dating of the scrolls largely confirms the dating of the scripts pioneered by Frank Moore Cross and followed by many others.¹³

A substantial work on the development of Hebrew texts has been published by Emanuel Tov.¹⁴ He argues that prior to 70 CE there were five text groups — proto-masoretic, pre-Samaritan, Qumranic, Septuagintal, and nonaligned — with no type predominating. After the First Jewish Revolt (66–73 CE) Jewish texts, such as those found at Naḥal Ḥever and Wadi Murabba'at, reflect what we know as the medieval masoretic text (MT). The Samaritans sponsored their own Hebrew text; as did the largely Gentile Christians, in the form of the Greek Septuagint. It would not be correct to claim that the MT overwhelmed the pluriform tradition. Adam van der Woude has argued that those Jews with a vested interest in the text of the Bible and who survived the war, namely, the Pharisees, promoted the development of what became the MT. It is likely that they supported a uniform text before the war. For them the voice of prophecy was dead. The Qumran community, on the other hand, had access to the revelation imparted by the Righteous Teacher. Uniformity of text was not the issue at Qumran, but it was with the Pharisees for whom revelation was now limited to the written word and to the oral tradition on which it was based.¹⁵ Eugene Ulrich has advanced the theory that rather than more or less distinctive text types, (which, on his analysis, are hardly

11. Bilhah Nitzan, *Qumran Prayers and Religious Poetry* (Leiden: Brill, 1994); Georg Molin, *Das Geheimnis von Qumran: wiederentdeckte Lieder und Gebete* (Freiburg im Breslau: Herder, 1994).

12. Esther G. Chazon, "Hymns and Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment, Volume 1* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 244–70; Rodney Werline, *Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism: The Development of a Religious Institution* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998); Mark Kiley et al., eds. *Prayer from Alexander to Constantine: A Critical Anthology* (London/New York: Routledge, 1997).

13. Frank Moore Cross Jr., "The Development of the Jewish Scripts," in G. Ernest Wright, ed. *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in honor of W. F. Albright* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1961), 133–202, and more recently his "Palaeography and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Flint and VanderKam, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*, 379–402. Readers should consult A. J. Timothy Jull, Douglas J. Donahue, Magen Broshi, and Emanuel Tov, "Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls and Linen Fragments from the Judean Desert," *Radiocarbon* 37 (1995): 11–19; A recent survey can be found in discussion format entitled "Report and Discussion Concerning Radiocarbon Dating of Fourteen Dead Sea Scrolls" in Michael Wise, N. Golb, John J. Collins, and D. G. Pardee, eds. *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (*Annals of the New York Academy of the Sciences*, Volume 722; New York, 1994), 441–53.

14. Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992).

15. Adam S. van der Woude, "Fifty Years of Qumran Research," in Flint and VanderKam, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*, 42–3.

distinctive but mixed), there were “successive literary editions” of individual biblical books.¹⁶

The publication of the *Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* will prove of immense interest to students of the Tanak/Old Testament. The volume presents the modern English text with italicised Qumran variants.¹⁷

Qumran Archaeology

Roland de Vaux, the chief archaeologist at Qumran during the excavation of the early 1950s, died in 1971. His *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, based on his Schweich Lectures of 1959, was published in 1973.¹⁸ That work confirmed the consensus that Qumran was established after the middle of the second century BCE as a community centre. It had been occupied almost continuously until its likely destruction by the Romans in the course of Vespasian’s campaign in the vicinity of Jericho in 68 CE. According to Josephus, Vespasian reached Jericho in 68, took the city (*War* 4.451), visited the Dead Sea near Jericho (4.477), and established a camp at Jericho from which he began the subjugation of Judea (4.486–90). The evidence for the possible abandonment of the site in the late Herodian period has been the subject of a recent article by Jodi Magness.¹⁹ The first of a projected four volume series of de Vaux’s field notes has been published by J.-B. Humbert *et al.*²⁰ While most scholars agree with de Vaux’s interpretation of the site, there have been some challenges to the prevailing consensus.

Norman Golb argues that Qumran was a fortress protecting the commercial route from the Dead Sea to Jerusalem, and that the scrolls discovered in the caves represent the contents of libraries in Jerusalem that were secreted there as the Romans closed in on the city.²¹ Those buried in the cemetery were all killed by the Romans when the site was overwhelmed during the first Jewish War. Scholars have not supported Golb’s views. Lester L. Grabbe’s review concisely summarises the case against his arguments.²² Lena Cansdale believes that Qumran was a trading post for goods that were manufactured locally and ferried up the Dead Sea, destined for Jerusalem.²³ The cemetery, she surmises, may be evidence that the site could have served as a hospice.²⁴

16. See Eugene Ulrich, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text” in Flint and VanderKam, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*, 79–100; Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origin of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), esp. 99–120.

17. Martin G. Abegg Jr, Peter Flint, and Eugene Ulrich, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999).

18. Roland de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973).

19. Jodi Magness, “The Chronology of the Settlement at Qumran in the Herodian Period,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995): 58–65.

20. J.-B. Humbert *et al.*, eds. *Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân et de Ain Feshka I* (Freiburg/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1994).

21. Norman Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* (New York/London: Scribners, 1995).

22. Lester L. Grabbe, “Review of *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* by Norman Golb,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 4 (1997): 124–8.

23. Lena Cansdale, *Qumran and the Essenes: A Re-Evaluation of the Evidence* (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1997).

24. Note the following reviews of Qumran and the Essenes: Jodi Magness, “A Re-Evaluation of the Evidence,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 5 (1998): 99–104; Émile Puech, *Revue de Qumran* 18 (1998): 437–41; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118 (1999): 731–3.

Humbert has argued that the Qumran community occupied the site of a Hasmonean villa.²⁵ The team of R. Donceel and P. Donceel-Voûte also contends that Qumran was a villa.²⁶ The Donceels suggest that one of the Qumran finds — a long table-like object approximately 50 cm wide — served as a triclinium; part of the furniture associated not with a scriptorium (as de Vaux had argued), but with a sophisticated dining room. This theory has been countered by Ronny Reich, who argues that de Vaux's interpretation of the function of the room remains plausible.²⁷ Comparative studies reveal that the object is too narrow to be a triclinium. Jodi Magness has convincingly responded to the villa theory.²⁸ After examining the remains of villas of the era from Jericho, Jerusalem, and elsewhere in Judea, Magness concludes that Qumran was not the site of a villa. There is no evidence of the swimming pools, bath houses, built up bath tubs, and hypercaust systems associated with villas. Moreover, there are workshops throughout the site, there is no interior decoration (highly significant for Magness), and there is a cemetery adjacent to the site comprising one thousand or more graves — unprecedented for any contemporaneous villa. The pottery found at the site is unadorned and utilitarian, and there are no imported amphoras such as are found at the sites of contemporaneous villas. Those dwelling at Qumran fashioned their pottery on the site. A 1998 television documentary featured a report by Jan Gunneweg of the Hebrew University claiming that scientific analysis of the clay comprising the jars in which scrolls were found conclusively supports the theory that the jars were manufactured at the Qumran site and nowhere else.²⁹

Unexpected confirmation that the site was indeed a community centre has come from the recent discovery of two ostraca found in the wall separating the centre from the cemetery. The texts have been published by Cross and Eshel, and are discussed — and their texts conveniently included — in Vermes' *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*.³⁰ The first ostrakon, which appears to be an account of the transfer of property over to the Qumran overseer to fulfil an oath to the Community (*yahad*), establishes a probable material link between the settlement and the *yahad* of the scrolls.

The Qumran cemetery has excited considerable discussion since a number of graves were opened in the 1950s. It was observed then that there is a main cemetery with several extensions. The remains of women and children have

25. J.-B. Humbert, "L'espace sacré à Qumrân: Propositions pour l'archéologie", *Revue biblique* 101 (1994): 161–214.

26. R. Donceel and P. Donceel-Voûte, "The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran," in Wise, Golb, Collins, and D. G. Pardee, eds. *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site*, 1–32 (see note 13).

27. Ronny Reich, "A Note on the Function of Room 30 (the 'Scriptorium') at Khirbet Qumran," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 46 (1995): 157–60.

28. "A Villa at Qumran?," *Revue de Qumran* 16 (1994): 397–419; "Archaeology," in Flint and VanderKam, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*, 46–75.

29. "As it Happened. The Dead Sea Scrolls: Voices from the Desert" (Provo, Utah: Scandinavure Films U.S.A. and KBYU Television Salt Lake City, 1998), television documentary.

30. Frank Moore Cross Jr and E. Eshel, "Ostraca from Khirbet Qumran," *Israel Exploration Journal* 47 (1997): 17–28; Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 21, 596–7.

been found in the southern extension. One view that has commended itself is that the women and children who were buried in the Qumran cemetery may have been pilgrims from Essene communities elsewhere in Palestine and who frequented the “mother house” for the renewal of the covenant ceremony envisaged in the opening columns of 1QS.³¹ It is also possible that the Qumran community at one time included married men and their partners. Z. J. Kapera is one scholar who argues that the remains of women and children call into question the celibacy of the members of the community, as the consensus view has maintained.³² Having been mislaid for decades, the relevant human remains have only recently been located. Joseph E. Zias has subjected the bones exhumed from some of the graves to scientific analysis.³³ The remains of women and children, he concludes, are likely to be later intrusions, probably Bedouin, and buried (unlike all those males excavated thus far in the main cemetery lying in a north–south axis) on an east–west axis in Moslem fashion.

New Qumran archaeological discoveries are also authoritatively discussed by Joseph Patrich and in Hanan Eshel’s contribution to this issue of the *Journal of Religious History*.³⁴

The History of the Qumran Community

The newly released scrolls do not substantially increase our knowledge of the origins of the Qumran sect. However, the document known as 4QMMT (4Q394–9) is the exception among the new material. In his studies of 4QMMT, Lawrence Schiffman has argued that the originators of the community were Sadducees.³⁵ His argument is based on the view that some of the halakot of this document are parallel to those recorded of the Sadducees, as recorded in the Mishnah. Schiffman’s theory has not been favourably received.³⁶ He may be on firmer ground when he contends that 4QMMT was written by a community leader (possibly the Righteous Teacher himself) to the Jerusalem priestly/political establishment detailing halakhic differences between the two groups. The text, Schiffman argues, points to quite profound disputes that had occasioned the schism that had seen the Righteous Teacher leave the temple to make common cause with those already marginalised to form the Qumran community.

31. See Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery*, 117; Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 44–5.

32. “Some Remarks on the Qumran Cemetery,” in Wise, Golb, Collins, and Pardee, eds. *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site*, 97–110.

33. “The Cemeteries of Qumran and Celibacy: The Confusion Laid to Rest?,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 7 (2000): 220–53.

34. Joseph Patrich, “Khirbet Qumran in Light of New Archaeological Explorations in the Qumran Caves,” in Wise, Golb, Collins, and Pardee, eds. *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site*, 73–95.

35. Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*; “Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1 (1994): 285–99.

36. See responses in Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “The Qumran Community: Essene or Sadducean?,” in his *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2000), 249–60; John J. Collins, “Review of *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, by L. H. Schiffman,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995): 244–7.

Scholars continue to debate the origin of the Essenes and the Qumran community. A common view held since the scrolls were discovered is that the Essenes originated with the warrior Hasideans, mentioned in 1 Maccabees 2 and 7, with whom the Maccabean rebels made common cause against renegade Jews and Seleucid armies, their ranks later supplemented by dissident priests no longer in fellowship with the Hasmonean establishment.³⁷ However, Martínez argues that the Essenes originated far earlier among third/second century BCE apocalyptic groups.³⁸ He argues that the Qumran community (in whose library were copies of four of the five sections of the composite apocalyptic work we know as 1 Enoch) was the result of a schism within Essene circles between the Righteous Teacher and the “Liar.”³⁹ The attraction of Martínez’s theory is that many of the non-biblical writings from Qumran do testify to a decided apocalyptic world view.

The theory that the Righteous Teacher may have been the High Priest between Alcimus (d. 159 BCE) and the accession of Jonathan Maccabeus (152–143 BCE) has been recently restated by Hartmut Stegemann.⁴⁰ According to Stegemann, this unnamed High Priest left the priestly establishment in 152 and joined the marginalised Hasideans. The identity of the Wicked Priest continues to occasion debate. Jonathan Maccabeus and his successor and brother Simon are both plausible candidates.⁴¹ Adam van der Woude has recently restated his “Groningen” hypothesis. The Wicked Priest of the scrolls is not to be identified with one high priest but with a succession of Hasmonean priests/rulers.⁴² Van der Woude now associates this theory with the view that the origin of the Essenes is to be found in third century Jewish apocalypticism.⁴³

The Prayer for King Jonathan (4Q448) has prompted renewed analysis of the relationship between the men of the community and the Hasmonean establishment. The Jonathan of this scroll is likely to be Alexander Jannaeus, who also features in the Naham Peshar (4QpNah 1) as the “furious young

37. See, for example, Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 18; though see the caveats in Phillip R. Callaway, *History of the Qumran Community: An Investigation* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988).

38. See Martínez and Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 77–96; Martínez, “The History of the Qumran Community,” in Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thompson, eds. *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 194–216.

39. See also John J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London/New York: Routledge, 1997), 26–9.

40. Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, 142–52.

41. Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 61–2, argues the case for Jonathan Maccabeus in his “The Origin and Subsequent History of the Authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Four Transitional Phases among the Qumran Essenes,” *Revue de Qumran* 10 (1981): 213–33 (218–22), James H. Charlesworth, identifies the Wicked Priest with his brother and successor Simon.

42. See Adam S. van der Woude, “Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests?: Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Commentary,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33 (1982): 349–59.

43. Florentino García Martínez and Adam S. van der Woude, “A ‘Groningen’ Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History,” *Revue de Qumran* 14 (1990): 521–41 (536–41); van der Woude, “Fifty Years of Qumran Research,” in Flint and VanderKam, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*, 35.

lion who hangs men alive.”⁴⁴ Indeed, Eisenman and Wise contend that this scroll decisively undermines the view that the members of the Qumran community were a marginalised, anti-Macabbean, schismatic group, but rather, militant Zealots.⁴⁵ However, readers should also consult the interpretation of this text — the only one to mention by name a Hasmonean priest/king — offered by VanderKam and Stegemann.⁴⁶ Jannaeus, involved in a crucial campaign of defending the Jewish homeland against Demetrius III with whom the Pharisees had allied themselves, might reasonably have elicited the prayers of the community. Hanan and Esther Eshel argue for a non-Qumranic origin of the scroll and a setting earlier in the reign of Jannaeus.⁴⁷

The Essenes and the Classical and Jewish Sources

The general consensus is that those who hid the scrolls and who may have written those usually categorised as “sectarian,” and for whom the site functioned as a community centre, were Essenes. This identification tallies with Pliny the Elder’s placement of a celibate community of Essenes between Jericho and En Gedi south of them.⁴⁸ Vermes and Goodman, and Beall have underscored the aptness of the identification of the members of the community with Essenes as known in the classical and early Jewish sources.⁴⁹ Yet the identification is not quite as neat as might be popularly supposed. Beall notes twenty-six parallels between Josephus’ account of the Essenes and the scrolls, twenty-one probable parallels, ten statements in Josephus with no known Qumran parallel, and six “apparent discrepancies.” Nevertheless, he contends that these six do not undermine the identification of the community with the Essenes. Per Bilde’s survey of the Essenes in the works of Josephus and Philo also underscores the value of these for understanding Qumran as an Essene community.⁵⁰ Indeed, he argues that Martin Hengel’s thesis of the hellenisation of all Jewish groups, the Essenes and the Qumran community included, has been affirmed in the early Jewish sources on the Essenes and in the scrolls. The community in the scrolls and in Philo and Josephus, he argues, is a Jewish adaptation of the Hellenistic voluntary association. Furthermore, if Zias’ arguments referred to above are valid, the presence of the remains of women and children in an *extension* of the Qumran cemetery removes one of the main difficulties for identifying Qumran as the site of a celibate community of Essenes, as reported by Pliny.

44. See also Josephus, who records the crucifixions of eight hundred Pharisees after the withdrawal of the Seleucid Demetrius III, *War* 1.97 (see also *Ant.* 13.379–80).

45. Robert H. Eisenman and Michael Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1992), 273–81.

46. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 106–7; Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, 133–4.

47. See Hanan and Esther Eshel, “4Q448, Psalm 154 (Syriac), Sirach 48:20, and 4Qp1sa^a,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 119 (2000): 645–59.

48. *Natural History* 5.73: “infra hos Engada.”

49. Geza Vermes and Martin Goodman, *The Essenes According to the Classical Sources* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989); Todd S. Beall, *Josephus’ Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SNTSMS 58; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

50. Per Bilde, “The Essenes in Philo and Josephus,” in Cryer and Thompson, eds. *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*, 32–68.

The Scrolls and Early Jewish and Christian Literature

The 4QMMT text has an unquestioned significant place in establishing the halakah of the Dead Sea community at an early stage of its history, and for tracing the distinctiveness of the community over against its Jewish contemporaries. However, the text has thrown up an important matter for the study of the law in Paul. Scroll 4Q398 shows that the “works of the law” (*erga nomou* in Rom 3:20, 28; 4:2, 6; 9:11, 32; 11:6; Gal 2:16; 3:2, 5, 10), appearing for the first time in extant Jewish literature outside Paul, encapsulate behaviour consistent with faithfulness and obedience to covenant ritual obligations, performance of which will be “reckoned as righteousness.” This phrase is also found in the Tanak and in early Judaism (Psa 106:31; 1 Macc 2:52; Jub 30:17), as well as in Paul (Rom 4:3, 5, 6, 9, 22; Gal 3:6). In much exegesis since the time of Martin Luther, the phrase “works of the law” has been understood to signify the “good” (i.e., moral) works that are integral to a religion of “works” (as opposed to a religion of grace) by which, alone, a person seeks (falsely) to establish a righteous claim on the mercy of God. Although he did not have access to 4QMMT, E. P. Sanders identified a heightened sense in the scrolls — and in other literature of early Judaism for that matter — both of divine grace and of the need for the elect to perform works consistent with their membership of the people of God by virtue of their incorporation into the covenant. Grace, he argues, is not a substitute for performance. Rather, grace brings a person into a covenant relationship with God. The performance of works is not an alternative way to salvation but the result of electing grace and the condition for remaining in the covenant relationship.⁵¹ Commenting on 4QMMT, J. A. Fitzmyer draws attention to these two complementary aspects of Qumran theology. He notes that a life commitment devoted to performing the works of the law, as newly understood in light of the Qumran texts, was seen as establishing righteousness, though he is also aware that the community confessed that the source of their righteousness (or, their “justification”) was from God alone (see, for example, 1QS 11).⁵² Commenting on the significance of 4QMMT for the New Testament, James D. G. Dunn argues that Paul felt obliged to counter among the Galatian churches the view that the performance of works of the law, understood as distinctive markers of a Jewish identity, would be reckoned as righteousness to the doers.⁵³ Paul’s argument is that it is faith in Christ, not performance of such works, that would be reckoned thus.

The scrolls have raised awareness of the role of angels in the thought, life, and worship of the community.⁵⁴ In a number of texts, the fellowship of the

51. See the comments on the scrolls in E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 287–98.

52. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *According to Paul: Studies in the Theology of the Apostle* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 1993), 19–24 (esp. 24–6).

53. James D. G. Dunn, “4QMMT and Galatians,” *New Testament Studies* 43 (1987): 147–53, and his “Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in James H. Charlesworth, ed. *Caves of Enlightenment*. Proceedings of the American Schools of Oriental Research Dead Sea Scrolls Jubilee Symposium 1947–97. (North Richland Hills, T.X.: Bibal Press, 1998), 105–27 (122–7).

54. See, for example, Maxwell J. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992).

men of the community and the angels is affirmed. In the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (4Q400–7) it is clear that the community enters into the worship offered to God by the angelic host. The implications of these texts have not been lost on recent scholars who have researched the links between the Qumran texts and the trajectories of mysticism and apocalypticism in early Jewish and New Testament texts.⁵⁵ Qumran angelology, particularly that of 4Q400–7, has implications for the interpretation of Col. 2:18. As long ago as 1963, Fred O. Francis, on the strength of several texts from cave 1 (but without positing a formal causal link), had suggested that this passage dealt not with some kind of cult offered to angels but with mystical participation with the angels in the worship of God.⁵⁶ The publication of the cave 4 texts has vindicated Francis' contention.

The newly released text, 4Q225, has revealed that the willingness of Isaac to be sacrificed did not originate with the Tannaim and Amoraim, perhaps to counter the early Christian presentation of the uniqueness of Jesus' self offering, but antedates both them and the New Testament.⁵⁷ Indeed, Jewish speculation on the binding of Isaac may have influenced the New Testament presentation of the death of Jesus.

Studies of messianism and related ideas at Qumran constitute a considerable corpus of scholarly literature. The discussion below is highly selective of necessity. Among the many offerings on messianic ideas in the scrolls is the collection of conference papers edited by Evans and Flint.⁵⁸ In his own contribution, Evans briefly surveys several cave 4 texts impinging on the New Testament, including 4Q246 (Aramaic Apocalypse), 4Q525 (Beatitudes), and 4Q521 (Messianic Apocalypse).⁵⁹ The Son of God/Son of the Most High terminology of 4Q246 parallels strikingly Luke 1:32, 4Q525 parallels the Beatitudes recorded in Matt. 5:3–11, and 4Q521 evokes the days of the Messiah in terms of the program of Isa. 61:1, and anticipates the raising of the dead. Evans concludes that the scroll affirms the fact that Jesus, as recorded in Luke 4:18–19 and Matt. 11:2–6, could have perceived himself as Israel's Messiah in line with early Jewish expectations exemplified in this text.⁶⁰ However, the interpretation of this text, which has the Messiah raising the dead, is challenged by a number of scholars.⁶¹ They argue that it is more

55. See, for example, Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John* (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1995).

56. Fred O. Francis, "Humility and Angel Worship in Col. 2:18," *Studia Theologica* 16 (1963): 109–34. This article was reprinted in Fred O. Francis and Wayne A. Meeks, eds. *Conflict at Colossae* (Missoula, M.T.: Society of Biblical Literature/Scholars Press, 1975). However, readers should also consult Loren Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration*, 111–9. The third fascicle of *Dead Sea Discoveries* 7 (2001) is given over to six articles on the theme of angels and demons.

57. Geza Vermes, "New Light on the Sacrifice of Isaac from 4Q225," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 47 (1996): 140–6.

58. Craig A. Evans and Peter W. Flint, eds. *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1997).

59. Craig A. Evans, "Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls from Qumran Cave 4," in Evans and Flint, eds. *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 91–100.

60. Evans, "Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls from Qumran Cave 4," 97.

61. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 87–9; Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, 248; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Qumran Messianism," in his *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*, 73–110 (94–5).

likely that God himself is the one raising the dead, not the anointed one. Incidentally, although Josephus claims that the Essenes believed in the “immortality of the soul” — his way of interpreting the Jewish idea of the resurrection — 4Q521 is the only non-biblical text discovered at Qumran that explicitly mentions the hope of a resurrection. John J. Collins, a prolific contributor to the literature on messianism in early Jewish literature, argues that 4Q521 furthers his argument that Jesus saw himself as a prophetic anointed one “of the Elijah type” rather than a royal messiah.⁶² Considerable excitement was occasioned by the report that 4Q285 furnishes early Jewish evidence (outside the New Testament) for the concept of a suffering Messiah. For instance, Eisenman and Wise argue that this text envisages the execution of an anointed leader.⁶³ However, the Hebrew is far more likely to refer to the execution of an enemy prince, the King of the Kittim, by the anointed one (cf. 4Q161, fragments 8–10).⁶⁴ Finally, the survey of messianism at Qumran by Martínez and Barrera, and the essays collected in Charlesworth, Lichtenberger, and Oegema, should be consulted.⁶⁵

Generally speaking, the impression one gains from reading the Dead Sea texts is that the early Christian movement, even the Palestinian Jesus movement, had little in common with the distinctive tenets articulated in the scrolls, particularly with respect to halakah. The newly published scroll texts do not substantially change the assessments of the first generation of scroll scholars of the relationship between the scrolls and the New Testament.⁶⁶ However, as illuminations of the early Jewish cultural and religious milieu of New Testament origins, the scrolls continue to bear a most significant witness. Incidentally, the extravagant claim advanced in the 1970s by José O’Callaghan, and by one or two scholars since, that fragments of the New Testament has been found in cave 7 seems to have effectively rebutted.⁶⁷ Finally, I recommend to readers the extensive review of 50 years of Dead Sea scroll literature by Adam van der Woude.⁶⁸

62. John J. Collins, “The Works of the Messiah,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1 (1994): 98–112.

63. Eisenman and Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, 24–9.

64. See Vermes, “The Oxford Forum for Qumran Research: Seminar on the Rule of War (4Q285),” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 43 (1992): 85–90; Martin G. Abegg Jr, “Messianic Hope and 4Q285: A Reassessment,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113 (1994): 81–91; Martínez and Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 166–8; Fitzmyer, “Qumran Messianism,” in his *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*, 101–3.

65. Martínez and Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 159–89; James H. Charlesworth, H. Lichtenberger, and G. S. Oegema, eds. *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectation in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1998).

66. See, for example, Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 146–84 (1958 edition) or 143–70 (1995 edition).

67. See, among others, S. R. Pickering and R. R. E. Cook, *Has a Fragment of the Gospel of Mark Been Found at Qumran?* (Sydney: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, 1989); Émile Puech, “Des fragments grecs de la grotte 7 et le Nouveau Testament?” *Revue biblique* 102 (1995): 570–84; Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 440–1.

68. “Fifty Years of Qumran Research,” in Flint and VanderKam, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*, 1–45.