

GARRY W. TROMPF

## Introduction I: The Long History of Dead Sea Scrolls Scholarship

---

The history of scholarship about the Dead Sea Scrolls contains many intriguing twists and turns. By now over a hundred distinct theories have been spun about the significance of these astounding finds from the Judean Desert, with many scholars having sought to link the Scrolls to the New Testament. As background to the articles that follow, this is an attempt to trace landmark studies in the Scrolls' interpretations from the discovery of the so-called Zadokite work in 1898 to around 1990.

---

The history of scholarship on the Dead Sea Scrolls properly starts back in 1898 when Solomon Schechter managed to bring a valuable collection of manuscripts from the Jewish *Genizah* (text cemetery) of Old Cairo to Cambridge University.<sup>1</sup> By 1910 he had gone on to publish an edition and translation of the so-called Zadokite Work from these findings. After some preliminary scholarly discussion and a few other translations, the eminent Robert Henry Charles placed the work at the end of his renowned two-volume *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (1913).<sup>2</sup> It can be hard for contemporary scholars to realize that over two-thirds of the *Damascus Document* — or *Rule* (denoted by CD or DR[B] and 4QD<sup>a-h</sup>) — that we have in our collections of the Dead Sea Scrolls is not from the well-known site of Khirbet Qumran at all, but fortunately overlaps with one of the remarkable scrolls found there in 1947, to help make up a larger if still incomplete text.<sup>3</sup> It was at the turn into the twentieth century, however, when

1. P. E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959), 9–13, 17–19.

2. S. Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work edited from Hebrew MSS in the Cairo Genizah Collection, etc.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910). Cf. R. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), II: 796–7 on research in the 1910s.

3. For details, C. Rabin, ed. and trans. *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958). The textual variations between the Cairo and Qumranite texts have made it difficult to decide on the preferable ordering of the sections; see J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, translated by J. Strugnell (London: SCM, 1959), 151–2, for the most determinative choice. For an earlier analysis of text divergences and parallels, P. Wernberg-Møller, "Some Passages in the 'Zadokite' Fragments and their Parallels in the Manual of Discipline." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 1 (1956), 110–28. For a recent bibliography of translations and studies, M. Broshi, ed. *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*. (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992), 63–83.

scholars first learnt of a “Teacher of Righteousness,” of the “Messiah[s] of Aaron and Israel,” and of a group fleeing to Damascus to form a “New Covenant” (ca 180–50 BCE), from this Zadokite work. Surprisingly little fuss was made over such matters. Most followed Shechter in deriving the document from a breakaway group of Sadducees (linking themselves to the priestly lineage of Zadok, King David’s high priest).<sup>4</sup> One daring interpreter, George Margoliouth, took the manuscript to be the product of Dositheans, early “Sadducean Christians . . . who regarded John the Baptist as the Messiah and Jesus as the Teacher of Righteousness,” but he was not taken seriously.<sup>5</sup> The Essenes were not then brought into the picture. The great Talmudist, Louis Ginzburg, who had no reason to neglect Jewish theories about the Essenes, nonetheless decided that the *unbekannte jüdische Sekte* behind the Zadokite fragments held nothing that could not have been written by a Pharisee.<sup>6</sup> And so half a century was to pass before perspectives were to alter and the level of excitement was to rise dramatically. Even the well-known but controversial Robert Eisler — who simply modified Margoliouth’s position in the 1920s with talk of Dosithean beliefs in John as the Teacher of Righteousness — never thought his conclusions to be based on an Essene text.<sup>7</sup>

When the revolutionary shift of scholarly emphasis occurred, however, it was not only propelled by the extraordinary discovery (especially between 1947 and 1977) of more than 600 manuscripts in very varied states of preservation and with multiple copies of some works.<sup>8</sup> What seemed just as momentous was that most of these finds were located in eleven caves proximate to the site of Khirbet Qumran, near the north-western shores of the Dead Sea. A place left out of consideration in the days of Schechter and Charles,<sup>9</sup> the main ruins of Qumran were later thought to be those of a fort, until excavations under Roland de Vaux (and corroborative interpretations after him by J. T. Milik and J. P. M. van der Ploeg) saw them reassessed as probable leftovers of an ascetic community.<sup>10</sup> The Essenes became the obvious choice

4. Start with I. Lévi, “Un Écrit Sadducéen antérieur à la ruine du Temple.” *Revue des Études Juives* 51 (1911), 161–205; cf., for example, 1 Kings 4:4, 2 Chron. 31:10 for background.

5. G. Margoliouth, “The Sadducean Christians of Damascus,” *The Expositor* 14 (1911), 499–517; 18 (1912), 212–35. On Dositheus, pseudo-Clement, *Recog.* 1:54.

6. Thus L. Ginzburg, *Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte I* (New York: [Ginzburg], 1922); cf. e.g., C. D. Ginsburg, *The Essenes: Their History and Doctrines: An Essay* (Liverpool: Literary and Philosophical Society of Liverpool, 1864).

7. R. Eisler, *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist*. Edited and translated by A. H. Krappe (London: Methuen, 1931), 254–5; cf. 23, 257–8; yet cf. e.g., I. Jones, *Joshua: The Man they Called Jesus* (Melbourne: Lothian, 1999), 62, who wrongly supposes Eisler took the text as Essenic.

8. For a working list, start with F. G. Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*. Translated by W. G. E. Watson (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 467–513; and for a list of other lists, J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study*. For the Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study, no. 20 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 107.

9. See, for example, G. A. Smith, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1894), Map 9.

10. The primary excavation period was 1951–1956. In 1952, De Vaux found 15,000 fragments of 574 MSS in cave 4, as close as 200 yards from Khirbet Qumran. See esp. J. Milik, *Dix ans*

as its ancient members. Although they were never specifically mentioned in Biblical, apocrypho-pseudepigraphical or rabbinic literature,<sup>11</sup> they were documented by Pliny Major (*Natural History* 5.17.4, cf. his *Esseni*) as practising an austere communal life near the Dead Sea, and what was said about them in less precise geographic terms by Josephus (esp. *Antiq.* 15.371, yet cf. *Bell. Jud.* 2.124) and obliquely by Philo Judaeus (*De vit. contemp.* 3.29, cf. 10.80–84) could be dovetailed with Pliny's account.<sup>12</sup> The attractive probability then presented itself, that the Essenes fell vulnerable to the Roman forces in the last stages of the Jewish War (68–73 CE), and were forced to hide texts precious to their group's existence in mountain caves that were separated from their settlement(s) by ravines. The initial champion of this Essene hypothesis was the French scholar, André Dupont-Sommer,<sup>13</sup> and in broad terms this deduction soon became the most popular view held academically. The logical inference made from the Damascus Document (previously the Zadokite Fragment) was that the Essenes (not the Sadducees) originated in Damascus before 176 BCE, and later moved south to Judaea and into the desert.<sup>14</sup> Two of the original archaeologists involved with the finds concurred with this view after considering evidence for a scriptorium, cisterns (for ritual lavation), and a communal cemetery,<sup>15</sup> while others, including the Jewish scholar Eleazar Sukenik who played a leading part in the early collating and preserving of (most of) the Scrolls in Jerusalem, were more cautious.<sup>16</sup>

*découvertes* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1957 [and see note 3 sup.]); cf. J. van der Ploeg, *The Excavations at Qumran*. Translated by K. Smyth (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1958); R. de Vaux, *L'Archéologie et les manuscrits de la Mer Morte*. Schweich Lectures 1959 (London: Oxford University Press, 1961).

11. S. Z. Leiman, "The Identity of the Dead Sea Sectarials in the Light of Talmudic Evidence." Paper on Beth Sin and Bethusians in the Talmud, read to the Society of Biblical Literature, 24 October, 1974 (Washington D. C., 1974).

12. The Jewish communalists of lower Egypt, named by Philo Judaeus as the *Therapeutae* (also in *Quod omnis prob. lib.* 12–13; *Hypothes.* 11), confirmed the wider existence of asceticism in Hellenistic Jewry, with its likely connection to Essenism an attractive inference.

13. R. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1950); and later, *Nouveaux aperçus sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1953), translated by R. D. Barnett as *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes* (London: Vallentine, Mitchell and Co., 1954).

14. Thus esp. G. Vermes [orig. Vermès], *Les manuscrits du Désert de Juda* (Tournai: Desclée, 1954), 66; J. M. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1956), 160; F. F. Bruce, "Qumran and Early Christianity," *New Testament Studies* 2 (1955–56), 176–90; F. M. Cross Jr, *The Ancient Library of Qumrân and Modern Biblical Studies* (London: Gerald Duckworth, 1958), 37–52. Among less convincing yet widely read advocates were H. Schonfield, *Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Jewish Chronicle Publications, 1956) and A. P. Davies, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: New American Library, 1958).

15. Van der Ploeg, *Excavations at Qumran*. With de Vaux, van der Ploeg is better known for his later defences, after excavations of farming areas were undertaken. In recent times de Vaux, as director of l'École Biblique et Archéologie Française in Jerusalem and coordinator of research on unpublished Scroll fragments, was charged by critics with being the most vehement defender of the Essene theory and holding up scholarship to secure it. See below, esp. note 82.

16. E. Sukenik, ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1955), 22–6 (although Sukenik was apparently the first scholar to raise the possibility of the Scrolls/Essene connection, as early as 1948). See also D. Barthélemy and J. Milik, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert: Qumran Cave 1* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 3–7; W. Wirgin, "Numismatics and the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Revue de Qumran* 2,5 (1959), 69–73; G. R. H. Wright, "The Archaeological Remains at El Mird in the Wilderness of Judaea," *Biblica* 42 (1961), 1–21.

Of the earlier cluster of post-War Scroll interpreters who questioned the Essene hypothesis, the spectrum of opinions varied widely. A sticking-point was the lack of clinching proof that the deposited scrolls were connected with the site claimed to be monastic. Among archaeologists, Sukenik provided the healthy reminder, as the romantic story of recovering the scrolls from various Bedouins unfolded, that the documents were originally wrapped in linen (a piece of which was carbon-dated to between 167 BCE and 233 CE), and that the books were therefore “buried.”<sup>17</sup> Kahle, a man of experience with comparable phenomena in Cairo, predictably came to the fore with talk of a *Genizah*, but it was the French scholar Henri del Medico who put forward the strongest possible case that the archaeology of Khibert Qumran and the text cemeteries of the caves need not bear any relationship. The palaeography of the scrolls varied enough (from the third century BCE to the second century CE) to make the depiction of them as products of a homogeneous community look questionable. The accounts of Josephus about the Essenes really put them more in the towns (*Bell. Jud.* 2.124) than the desert, and all the signs of a *Genizah*, rather than a community’s hiding place, were present (the discarded Isaiah Scroll, as an obvious case, was a Biblical work kept intact, while nonscriptural works seemed deliberately half burnt or partly destroyed).<sup>18</sup> This approach amounted to the beginning of what is now a long-standing controversy, between those wanting to link Qumran and the Scrolls and those wanting to separate them.

There was an early mediating view between these poles, that of Yale’s Professor for Biblical Theology, Millar Burrows, who stands among the first translators of the Scrolls for a popular readership. He could not see how the site and the texts could be divorced, as the substantive materials in the major set of Scrolls were interrelated, bespeaking a shared, homogeneous set of beliefs; but he demurred from concluding that the community was an Essene one, preferring instead to talk of certain “covenantors.”<sup>19</sup> Two basic alternatives first presented themselves from such wariness: if the Scrolls were not Essenic, which group did they belong to? Or, might the Scrolls still belong to the Essenes, yet to a particular “camp” of them? Those who opted for the first

17. E. Sukenik, *'wsr hmgylwt hgnwzwt* [in Hebrew] (Jerusalem: Bialik Foundation and Hebrew University, 1954), cf. Y. Yadin, *The Message of the Scrolls* (London: Wiedenfeld and Nicholson, 1957). The author of this article also interviewed Yadin about his “crossing the barbed-wire of enemy lines” to secure as many scrolls on the Israeli side as possible, Jerusalem 4 March 1963. Sukenik took the view that a Jewish group buried their books before going north to Damascus, a reverse journey to the Essene hypothesis.

18. H. Del Medico, “Peut-on dater les manuscrits de la Mer Morte?” *Dieu Vivant* 7 (1951), 119–26; id. “Les Esséniens dans l’oeuvre de Flavius Josèphe,” *Byzantoslavica* 13 (1952), 1–45 (1953), 189–226; id. H. Garner, trans. *The Riddle of the Scrolls* (London: Burke, 1958).

19. M. Burrows, first in “The Discipline Manual of the Judaean Covenantors,” *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 8 (1950), 156–92, and then in *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1956), esp. 294, cf. chap. 4, and 349–415 for translations. For comparable caution, see H. H. Rowley, *The Zadokite Fragment and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1952), 78–83; G. R. Driver also opted for the usage of “covenantors,” but he had a different agenda developing. Start with *The Hebrew Scrolls from the Neighbourhood of Jericho and the Dead Sea* (London: Oxford University Press, 1951) but see further information.

alternative made up a group of rather diversified voices. Those who chose to explore the latter path had the arduous task of making the contents of the Scrolls fit an Essene profile, when the texts actually made no internal direct reference to this grouping.

Among some of the more portentous theories in the former grouping were those linking the Scrolls to early Christianity. The best known of their early translators was the American Hebraist Theodor Gaster who initiated what has become a kind of Jewish/Christian tension in interpretation in recent times by flirting with the idea that “the Dead Sea Scrolls indeed open a window upon the little community of Jewish Christians clustered around James [“the Just,” the brother or cousin of Jesus] in Jerusalem.”<sup>20</sup> The scholar who went farthest in making a Christian identification, though, was the stimulating Cambridge Semiticist, J. L. Teicher, who decided that the texts were those of the early Jewish Christian Ebionites (renowned for taking Jesus as Messiah but not the Son of God), because the sectarian group evidently named its members as *Ebionim* (the congregation of the poor; e.g. 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup> 1–2ii.9; 1QpHab 12.3, 6, 10). In Teicher’s estimation, we were in a revolutionary position to uncover hitherto-unknown sayings of Jesus (the Teacher of Righteousness) and reconstruct the pre-Pauline, pristine nature of Christianity.<sup>21</sup> This was not completely unaccommodating toward the Essene theory, as the Essenes (of differing kinds) had also appeared in listings of early Christian heresies (e.g. Hippolytus, *Refut.* 9.13–23), but Teicher’s theory presupposed a group apparently unconnected with the Qumran settlement, and one that had left their scrolls in chosen hiding places because of persecution.

Others favoured different connections. The Zealot party (which Josephus added as a latecomer to the trio of Sadducees, Pharisees and Essenes, see *Antiq.* 18.23–4) were not left out of contention.<sup>22</sup> Oxonian Semiticist G. R. Driver developed a reputation for making war on the Essene theory, and by 1965, published his massive countering “solution” that traced the “Covenantors” — as he concurred with Burrows in calling them — to the long-hidden background history of Zealotry (between Judas the Galilean [flor. 4 BCE–7 CE] and the fully-fledged Zealot cause of the Jewish War [65–72 CE]). These covenant makers took their name from an anti-Roman agitator named Saddok, who continued Judas’ resistance movement, and they were thus a special Sadduceean grouping distinct from the Sadducees of Josephus and the New Testament (but listed nonetheless by Justin Martyr).<sup>23</sup> However, pinning a

20. T. Gaster, “Introduction,” *The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect in English Translation* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1957), 26, yet cf. 28–31.

21. J. Teicher, “The Dead Sea Scrolls — Documents of the Jewish Christian Sect of the Ebionites,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 2 (1951), 67–99; “Jesus’ Sayings in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *ibid.*, 5 (1954), 38; “The Teachings of the Pre-Pauline Church in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *ibid.*, 3 (1952), 111–8, 139–50; 4 (1953), 1–13, 49–58, 93–103, 139–53.

22. Start with C. Roth, *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958).

23. G. Driver, *The Judaean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965), esp. 240–1, 258–9, cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* 18.23; *Bell. Jud.* 2.118; Justin Martyr, *Dial. Tryph.* 80. See also note 47.

precise name and chronology on the Teacher of Righteousness was always going to be difficult. Suggestive epithets of spiritual leadership varied and were often discussed in the context of an expressed hope of upholding and re-establishing the Torah,<sup>24</sup> as if the Teacher might be none other than a key Biblical figure. Moses was indeed a possibility, thus sometimes being referred to as the past person and at other times as a returning or future figure (e.g. “the one who will teach righteousness at the end of Days” of CD 6.8, or “the coming Law Interpreter [*Doresh haTorah*]” of 7.18), with such hopes in a second Moses even being linked to Samaritan eschatology.<sup>25</sup> Another, if unlikely, candidate was Isaiah, now endowed with messianic attributes and his prophecies (the famous Isaiah Scroll) carefully preserved.<sup>26</sup> According to these conjectures, neither with Moses nor with Isaiah were we dealing with the founder or latter-day leader of the Essenes. The most extreme of the non-Essenic positions took the Qumran community to be early mediaeval, and not ancient at all. The mode of interpreting the Bible in the Scrolls, especially the more definite commentary or *peshet* — spelling out the contemporary applications of Biblical prophecies rather than making targumic additions or midrashic deferrals to rabbinic debates — appeared to be of a later time. Parallels with the methods employed by the strictly Bible-focused Jewish sect of the Karaites suggested that these anti-Talmudic ascetics themselves, spreading from Persia to the nearer East in the eighth century CE,<sup>27</sup> may have been the non-Essenic group in question.

Apart from this last alternative, which lost sway as palaeographical studies went on apace and pointed to a late antique time frame (ca. 250 BCE–135 CE),<sup>28</sup> all of these non-Essenic views had some merit. The uneasy business of “matching” bits and pieces of information between the Scrolls themselves, let

24. Throughout CD, for instance, the implication is that a new eschatological teaching of righteousness shall be available to those already truly practising the Mosaic law in the era of wickedness: esp. 5.10–11; 15.1–16.20.

25. For orientation into these various positions, N. Wieder, “The Idea of a Second Coming of Moses,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 46 (1955), 356–54; “Law-Interpreter of the Dead Sea Scrolls: the Second Moses,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 4 (1953), esp. 161, 170; J. Bowman, “Contact between Samaritan Sects and Qumran,” *Vetus Testamentum* 7 (1957), 184–9; J. MacDONALD, “The Samaritan Doctrine of the Second Moses,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 13 (1960), 153–4; for notes of critical caution, cf. F. Dexinger, “Samaritan Eschatology,” In: A. Crown, ed. *The Samaritans* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1989), 286–7. Note that, with few exceptions (e.g., Yohanan ben Zabbai) earlier, premediaeval rabbinic writers apparently played down any expectations about an “eschatological Moses” so as to counter Samaritan claims.

26. D. Flusser, “The Connection Between the Apocryphal *Execusio Isaiae* and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Bulletin of the Israel Exploration Society* 17 (1952), 28–46.

27. For background on the Karaites, begin with the classic J. Fürst, *Geschichte des Karaërthums* (Leipzig: O. Leiner, 1862–1869), I–III; Then see S. Zeitlin, “The Alleged Antiquity of the Scrolls,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 40 (1949), 57–78; A. N. Poliark, “The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Approach,” *ibid.* 49 (1958–1969), esp. 107. For early assessments of commentary methods see Y. Yadin, “Some Notes on Commentaries on Genesis xlix and Isaiah from Qumran Cave 4,” *Israel Exploration Journal* 7 (1957), 66–71; J. Allegro, “More Isaiah Commentaries from Qumran’s Fourth Cave,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 77 (1958), 350 (followed by a translation of 4QIsa<sup>a</sup>).

28. Cf. esp. M. Martin, *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Bibliothèque de Muséon, no. 44–5 (Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1958), I–II, questioning previous methods and analyses by W. F. Albright, J. C. Trever, and esp. S. Birnbaum, with the latter’s *The Qumran (Dead Sea) Scrolls and Palaeography* (New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1952).

alone between them and the classical accounts of the Essenes, called for great caution. Moreover, as all the smaller fragments fell under scrutiny, along with items (such as the mysterious copper scroll) that were less easy to place in an imagined community,<sup>29</sup> the possibility of texts having different origins outside the Qumran region could hardly be ignored. The range of money specie in the area persuaded at least one numismatist that coins were discarded near the Dead Sea, just as scrolls and other goods were, because rabbinical teaching required this abandonment of items that once had taken on sacred properties (cf. the Mishnaic *Abod. Zara* 3–4).<sup>30</sup> Del Medico had reason to agree; and a hypothesis that the Scrolls were actually leftovers of the Jerusalem temple library itself also got an airing.<sup>31</sup> As for possible Jewish Christian, Samaritan and Zealot connections, no one could ignore the potential importance of the Scrolls for the contexts in which both Christianity originated as a Jewish sect and Jewish resistance fighters rose to spark off the Jewish War. A veritable industry took shape to test the organisational parallels and similarities of belief between the Scrolls and the New Testament (and, to a lesser extent, Samaritan books). At more or less the same time, Yigael Yadin (Sukenik's son) undertook crucial excavations of Masada during 1963–1965, and fragmentary texts found there, at the last Zealot stronghold against the Romans (71–3 CE), pointed to the possibility that the fates of any Qumran group and revolutionary Jewish patriots were bound up with each other.<sup>32</sup> Suspicions that the Scrolls were Sadducean in one way or another, going back after all to the turn of the century, still lingered in the minds of a minority.<sup>33</sup>

What of developments in the Essene theory? As expected, the major and persisting challenge for its espousers concerned how one could create a coherent picture of an Essene community at Qumran when there were problematic inconsistencies in the evidence. The general disparity between Josephus' broad characterisation and the communal regulations in the Scrolls' *Damascus Document* (CD) and the *Community Rule* (or *Manual of Discipline*; CR or IQS, respectively) could be explained in terms of the historian's apologetic

29. See J. Allegro, ed. and trans. *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll: The Opening and Decipherment of the most Mysterious of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1960). Allegro fell foul of the chief archaeological investigators for trying to find the Qumranites' most precious possessions on the basis of this scroll; see the Rutgers University web site, "The Dead Sea Scrolls: Timetable of Discovery and Debate," 3–4. <http://religion.rutgers.edu/ihd/dss.html>

30. Thus W. Wirgin, "Numismatics and the Dead Sea Scrolls," esp. 91–3.

31. K. H. Rengstorf, *Hirbert Qumran and the Problem of the Library of the Dead Sea Caves*. Translated by J. R. Wilkie (Brill: Leiden, 1963).

32. See C. Roth, "The Zealots and Qumran: The Basic Issue," *Revue de Qumran* 2,5 (1959), esp. 81, after the 1955–1956 preliminary excavations at Masada; Y. Yadin, *The Excavation of Masada 1963/64: Preliminary Report* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1965); cf. *Masada* (London: Abacus, 1978) chap. 13.

33. L. H. Schiffmann returns to this case in the terms of a Sadducean sect in "The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect," *Biblical Archaeologist* 53 (June 1990), 64–73; and later in "The Sadducean Origin of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Bible Review* (October 1990), reproduced in H. Shanks, ed. *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reader from the Biblical Archeological Review* (New York: Vintage, 1993), chap. 5. Previously, Strugnell and E. Qimron had — at least temporarily — taken 4QMMT to be a letter from the Teacher of Righteousness to the Wicked Priest. (Rutgers University, "Dead Sea Scrolls," 5–6).

mode.<sup>34</sup> He apparently sought to educate his anticipated Graeco-Roman audience into the mysteries of Hebrew schools of thought by evoking the model of a philosophy (cf. *Antiq.* 15.371; *Bell. Jud.* 2.155), and by “familiarizing” Essenism as holding to “the immortality of the soul” (*Antiq.* 18.18; *Bell. Jud.* 2.154).<sup>35</sup> Yet the two fundamental Hebrew texts themselves contain tantalising differences: *inter alia* technical terms for community leadership vary, the *Damascus Document* allows marriage yet the *Manual* does not mention either women or marriage, and the former projects only one Messiah while the latter mentions three (with other relatable documents referring to two).<sup>36</sup> The *Damascus Document* speaks both of those “new covenantors” who dwell in Jerusalem or in towns and “any assembly that is in the camps” (text BII, 8; 10; 13–14), while the *Manual* apparently only preconceives a communal life in holy separation.<sup>37</sup> These differences already suggested the possibility of squaring Josephan assertions that Essenes were mainly in towns, and the documentation of monasticism by Pliny.<sup>38</sup>

Some scholars, including Geza Vermes, were early off the mark on this matter by arguing that the differences could only be explained by positing developments in the history of Essenism.<sup>39</sup> The volatility of the Levantine situation under the Romans was suspected to induce various organisational and interpretative adjustments that explained textual differences.<sup>40</sup> It was Charles Fritsch, however, who first suggested that the *Community Rule* reflected a sectarian development from a larger movement.<sup>41</sup> And if most scholars have still tended to the general working assumption that there has been an “evolution in the structure and life of the community,”<sup>42</sup> it has been the Polish scholar, Witold Tyloch, who has gone on to put the case most skilfully and in the most detail, that the *Damascus Document* was a foundation platform

34. See H. Conzelmann, *Gentiles/Jews/Christians: Polemics and Apologetics in the Greco-Roman Era*. Translated by M. E. Boring (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 203–25.

35. See esp. J. S. McLaren, “Josephus’ Summary Statements Regarding the Essenes, Pharisees and Sadducees,” *Australian Biblical Studies Review* 18 (2000), esp. 42–6.

36. The most enduring elucidation of such differences was made by G. Vermes in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1962), 18–25, 30–1, 48–51; cf. P. R. Davies, *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Brown Judaic Studies 94 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), chap. 5.

37. Readers should note the variant readings of these texts in other fragments, especially from cave 4: 4Q266–73, 4Q255–64.

38. See J. Strugnell, “Flavius Josephus and the Essenes: *Antiquities* XVIII: 18–22,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 77 (1958), 106–12; cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* 18.19 on Essenes and “working the land.”

39. Vermes, *Les manuscrits*, esp. 66; cf. I. Rabinowitz, “Sequence and Dates of the Extra-Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls and ‘Damascus Fragments,’” *Vetus Testamentum* 3 (1953), 175–85; L. E. Toombs, “The Early History of the Qumran Sect,” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 1 (1956), 367–75. Of these, only Vermes has updated his assessments, in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (London: SCM, 1982 and 1994), 116–36, on classical allusions to the Essenes.

40. See H. Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963).

41. C. T. Fritsch, *The Qumran Community: Its History and Scrolls* (New York: Macmillan, 1956).

42. The phrases of T. S. Beall, *Josephus’ Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series, no. 58 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); J. A. Fitzmer, *Responses to 101 Questions on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Paulist Press, 1992), 101–2 (quotation, and on the consensus view).



for Essenism, with the *Community Rule* being a particular application of it for the monastics at Qumran.<sup>43</sup> *Pari passu*, the question as to why the Essenes would have called themselves “the Sons of Zadok” in the 170s BCE was being cleverly handled by the great Spanish translator of the scrolls García Martínez, who sensed the usage marked a deliberate group replacement of the Hasmonaean Sadducean (Zadokite) party because the latter had bent so far to Hellenising winds.<sup>44</sup> Such a deduction built on the prior working inference that many Jews had lamented the corruption of the high priestly role and the temple in the 180s, when Onias II established a rival temple in Egypt and installed his brother Jason as high priest in Jerusalem.<sup>45</sup> However, whether the key source of Josephus could be brought into line with these inferences, and whether he was trying to draw some kind of a distinction between monastic and active Essenes groups — even perhaps with his two Greek usages *Essēnoi* and *Essaioi* — were questions never satisfactorily resolved.<sup>46</sup>

Now, with the prospect of (some kind of) an Essenic community not far from Jericho and the lower Jordan River (where John the Baptist traditionally baptized), questions were bound to be raised soon enough about the implications of the new finds for the foundations of Christianity. Dupont-Sommer played early *agent provocateur* by interpreting “the Teacher of Righteousness” as the unnamed founder of the Essenes, treating him as a proto-Jesus figure, and one who suffered at the hands of a persecutor at that; while John Allegro maintained that Jesus arose out of “the same religious movement” as the Qumranites.<sup>47</sup> As John the Baptist’s ministry had apparently been so

43. W. J. Tyloch, first in *Rekospisy z Qumran nad Morzem Martwym* (Warsaw: Panstwowe Wydawn, 1963), and better in *Aspekty Społeczne gminy z Qumran* (Warsaw: Panstwowe Wydawn, 1968) using the Portuguese translation by T. Lenartowitz, *O socialismo religioso dos Essēnos* (Saõ Paolo: Editora Perspectiva, 1990), esp. chap. 5. For related interpretative developments see A. P. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*. Journal of Studies of the Old Testament Supplementary Series, no. 25 (Sheffield: JOT Press, 1983); P. R. Callaway, *The History of the Qumran Community*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha, Supplementary Series, no. 3 (Sheffield: JOT Press, 1988), including the Eastern European industry on the matter inspired by Tyloch; H. Burgmann, *Die Geschichte der Essener, der essenischen Gemeinden von Qumran und Damaskus* (Qumranica Mogilanensia 5) (Krakow: Zdzis’aw J. Kapera, 1990); B. W. W. Dombrowski, *Ideological and Socio-Structural Developments of the Qumran Association as suggested by Internal Evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls, etc.* (Krakow: Enigma, 1994).

44. F. Martínez, “Orígenes apocalípticos del movimiento esenio y orígenes de la secta qumránica,” *Comunio* 18 (1983), 353–68; cf. with J. Trebolle, *Los hombres de Qumran* (Madrid: Trotta, 1994).

45. Therefore summarising earlier conclusions, e.g., V. Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Translated by S. Appelbaum (New York: Athenaum, 1970), 12; D. E. Gowan, *Bridge Between the Testaments* (Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1980), 218–32.

46. On Eisler’s early interest in pacifist and sword-bearing Essenes, see *Messiah Jesus*, esp. 250–8. The author attempted to draw a distinction between these two epithets in terms of political quietism and activism in his work “Jewish Eschatology and the Political Standpoint of the Historical Jesus,” BA (Hons) thesis, University of Melbourne (1962), 6–7 and Appendix A; yet cf. H. J. Schoeps, “Beobachtungen zum Verständnis des Habakkukkommentars von Qumran,” *Revue de Qumran* 5 (1959), 76, in defence of their synonymy.

47. Esp. *The Jewish Sect of Qumran*, chap. 9. This is a view popularised early by journalist Edmund Wilson in *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea* (London: Collins, 1955), 91–6, and see an updated version of Wilson’s book, *The Dead Sea Scrolls 1947–69* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969), 135–42, for the Driver/Dupont-Sommer clash and misunderstandings over this and other issues; J. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls [and the Origins of Christianity]* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1956), 161.

proximate to Qumran, it was hard for some Biblical scholars not to imagine him being connected with the community there,<sup>48</sup> and by the mid-1950s the Harvard scholar Krister Stendahl had culled a collection of significant articles that tested the newly discovered texts' possible relationships to the New Testament.<sup>49</sup> It was at this juncture that some hitherto less-noticed Scroll researchers came into prominence. Such was the case with the American scholar William Brownlee, for example, who agreed it was time to talk about "John the Essene," not just "the Baptist."<sup>50</sup> Three chapters by Karl Georg Kuhn (the German New Testament scholar who had been first to show an interest in the Qumranite phylactery texts)<sup>51</sup> addressed the controversial questions as to whether the Qumran group's "community meal" was a possible prototype of the Christian communion, and whether the two movements harboured comparable messianic hopes and parallel discourses on sin and temptation.<sup>52</sup> The learned Catholic Bible scholars Raymond Brown and Joseph Fitzmyer, who were to distinguish themselves over the next three decades, made their first impressive appearances in the Stendahl volume; the former on the motif of light versus darkness in Qumran and John (and Zoroastrian ethical dualism), and the latter on the Ebionite hypothesis.<sup>53</sup> Generally speaking, the assessment of this academic cluster was cautious and wise, and by and large its conclusions have prevailed: the Qumranite materials provide important background insights into the New Testament period, allowing for fruitful comparative analyses of Jewish ways of life at the time of the Christian movement's inception, but — *pace* Brownlee — we cannot safely deduce any direct connections between the Dead Sea community and earliest Christianity. Mind you, these were assertions that might have been expected from a caste largely made up of Christian, albeit eminent, Biblical scholars.<sup>54</sup>

Now, there were going to be points of religious comparison that would attract the attention of Jewish scholars. They themselves were interested in Jesus and Christian origins, and if any apologetics might have lain behind their approaches, they were now in a good situation to stress the "very human"

48. Cf. e.g., J. A. T. Robinson, "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Community: Testing a Hypothesis," *Harvard Theological Review* 50 (1957), 175–91.

49. K. Stendahl, ed. *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1957).

50. W. H. Brownlee, "John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls," in *Scrolls and NT*: 52; B. Reicke, "Nytt Ijus över Johannes döparens förkunnelse," *Religion och Bibel* 11 (1952), 5.

51. K. Kuhn, *Phylakterien aus Höhle 4 von Qumran*. Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, 1 (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag, 1957).

52. K. Kuhn, "The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," translated by Brownlee, "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran," and "New Light on Temptation, Sin, and the Flesh in the New Testament," all in *Scrolls and NT*: 54–64, 65–93, 94–113.

53. R. E. Brown, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospels and Epistles;" and J. Fitzmyer, "The Qumran Scrolls, the Ebionites, and their Literature," both in *ibid.*, 183–207, 208–231 (the latter rejecting Teicher's view on the basis of decisive dissimilarities). After Brown, note H. M. Teeple, "Qumran and the Origin of the Fourth Gospel," *Novum Testamentum* 4,1 (1962), 6–24; R. H. Charlesworth, ed. *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Christian Origins Library (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1972).

54. Cf. also M. Burrows, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1958), chap. 6–10; M. Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson, 1961).

continuities and probable interactions between (later) Judaism(s) and early Christianity, and thus the better to dispell traditional Christian readings of the New Testament as revelations de novo. Both Yadin and Czech–Israeli comparative religionist David Flusser (who was also a biographer of Jesus), were ready to make much of the Melchizedek Fragment (11QMelch; in which the priest-king of Genesis 14 and Psalm 110 was deemed a heavenly judge and a “son of God”) as a means of explaining the apparently idiosyncratic priestly theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews.<sup>55</sup> A thorough cosmopolitan, however, Flusser was under no illusions about the differences in spirit between the message of the Gospels and that of the Qumranites. After poring over Thanksgiving Hymns (1QH<sup>a</sup>) allegedly composed by the Teacher of Righteousness, he stated in a famous hotel interview to journalist Edmund Wilson that, “there was nothing of Jesus . . . in the morality of the Teacher,” for the latter “felt nothing but hatred for his [enemies] and expected the Lord to avenge him.”<sup>56</sup>

Jewish scholars, of course, were also interested in sorting out the diversities of their tradition before the age of the rabbinic sages (when a greater unity was demanded of Judaism after the trauma of 70 CE). Yet these concerns would naturally carry various implications for the study of early Christianity in their train. Two sizeable Qumranite documents of particular relevance here were called the Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness (1QM), and the so-called Temple Scroll (11QTemple<sup>a-b</sup>), the latter only being available for study as late as 1967, and it was the Israeli archaeologist Yadin, as their leading editor and English translator, who had a defining influence on the discussion of these two works during the 1960s and 70s.<sup>57</sup> The first document pointed to issues concerning messianism, eschatological expectations, and apocalyptic visions of intertestamental and earliest Christian times; and the second raised questions about attitudes to the Jerusalem temple, and whether non-Toraic texts had come to play a more important role in defining certain Jewish “group identities” than hithero expected.

Right from the start there was some fascination with the fact that fragments of Daniel and various pseudepigraphical apocalyptically charged works sat among the Qumran finds.<sup>58</sup> The War (or Battle) Scroll, however, was quite unique in giving instructions for a final showdown between the righteous and

55. Thus, Y. Yadin, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Scripta Hierosolymitana 4 (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1958); D. Flusser, “The Son of Man,” In: A. Toynbee, ed. *The Crucible of Christianity* (New York: World Publishing, 1993), esp. 229; cf. id. *Jesus* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969); cf. Heb. 5–9.

56. *Dead Sea Scrolls 1947–69*: 88.

57. Y. Yadin, ed., comm. and trans. *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), and note that Rabin and van der Ploeg had made translations before him; G. Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und Neuen Testament*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, no. 7 (Göttingen; Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1971); Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect* (Jerusalem: Steimatzky, 1985).

58. Start with H. H. Rowley, *Jewish Apocalyptic and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Ethel M. Wood Lecture 1957 (London: Athlone, 1957); Later analyses become more technical, e.g., A. Mertens, *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der Texte vom Toten Meer*. Stuttgarter Biblische Monographien, no. 12 (Würzburg: Echter, 1971).

the evil *Kittim* (the Greeks or the Romans). How did all of this fit in with Essenic monasticism, conventionally associated with a pacifistic habit of life? One solution lay in the arguably composite nature of the text, so that one could suppose that an original draft might have been meant as inspiration to the Maccabean warriors who fought off the Seleucids (at the time when Daniel was written, ca 160s BCE).<sup>59</sup> Another solution lay in a more mature understanding of “millenar[ian]ism,” a category being deployed in sociological literature while Biblical exegetes were refining their comprehension of apocalypticism, eschatologies, and messianic hopes.<sup>60</sup> The Israeli sociologist Yonina Talmon was typical in typologising the Biblical millennium (or one thousand year rule of Christ in Rev. 20:6–7) for social scientific analysis, and brilliantly distilled the current scholarly trend by describing “millenarian movements” as those whose members expected “imminent, total, final, collective, this-worldly salvation.”<sup>61</sup> On relating the intricacies of social (scientific) studies to the complexities surrounding the Qumranite case, the present author argued that the Qumranite sect offered the first clear documentable instance of a highly intense, expectant group that could be classed as a “millenarian movement” *in novo sensu stricto*. It was not merely that the main documents shared a set of eschatological dreams common to the Judaism(s) of the time, but that they were bound together by a characteristic retributive discourse that looked to a divine vindication (“the Day of Vengeance,” etc.) coming “soon and suddenly.”<sup>62</sup> The War Scroll was fundamental in this connection, yet the sectarians treasuring it were waiting for God to act; their ascetic discipline and piously pacifistic ways would only change when angels handed them golden weapons of inevitable triumph against Israel’s enemies.

The Temple Scroll presented different yet related matters of interest. It contained measurements of the temple that differed from those found in the Pentateuch; was it therefore meant to be a special Torah of its own, providing legitimacy for the existence of a Temple in Jerusalem that was never prescribed in the Mosaic code?<sup>63</sup> Or was it a model for a reconstructed second

59. Esp. A. Davies, *IQM, the War Scroll from Qumran*. *Biblica et Orientalia* no. 32 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977), pt. 4; following upon the earlier hunch of Rabin in C. Rabin and Y. Yadin, eds. *Mehkarim ba-megilot ha-genuzot: sefer zikaron le-Eli'ezer Lipa Sukenik* (Jerusalem: Hekhal Ha-Sefer, 1961).

60. A high point of Biblical scholarship in this connection is exemplified by D. Hellholm, ed. *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and Near East* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1989); For textual documentation of various types of Jewish movements reacting to ancient colonial intrusion, note A. Z. Aescoly, *HaTenu'oth ha-meshihiyoth be-Yisra'el*. Edited by Y. Even-Shenual (Jerusalem: Mosad Byalik, 1987), pt. 1, chap. 1.

61. Y. Talmon, “Millenarian Movements,” *Archives de Sociologie Européennes* 7 (1966), 159 (with 126 on the Qumranites).

62. G. Trompf, “When was the first Millenarian Movement? Qumran and the Implications of Historical Sociology”, In: A. Sharma, ed. *The Sum of our Choices: Essays in Honour of Eric J. Sharpe*. McGill Studies in Religion, no. 4. (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996), 230–64 (cf. esp. IQM 3.20–3; IQH 15.15–7 on the Day of Vengeance, etc.); Talmon, 166–7 for the other quoted phrase. Of course, “millennial” ideas and visions precede Qumran, but they do not provide the evidence of an identifiable social coherence as we find near the Dead Sea; For theoretical background, see G. Trompf, “Millenarism: History, Sociology and Cross-Cultural Analysis,” *Journal of Religious History* 24,1 (2000), 103–24.

63. Cf. esp. Yadin, *Temple Scroll*: 112–6.

temple framed in exilic times, comparable to Ezekiel's descriptions (Ezek. 40:1–47:2) but never enjoying common acceptance as a holy book? In the latter case, it would be all the more important for a Qumranite editor to use older materials as reasons to dispute the purity and probity of what had emerged in Jerusalem, and thus present the vision of a future replacement of a contaminated temple by a heavenly one — when the great day of reckoning arrived.<sup>64</sup>

On the other hand, the prospect of someone writing an alternative Torah could be used against the argument that the scrolls were Essenic in any way. Ben Zion Wacholder bravely resisted tradition, to illustrate, by treating most of the texts as the creation of a quite independent Zadok (back in the third, not second, century BCE), who conceived himself to be a second Moses and who was bent on writing a second Torah.<sup>65</sup> He at least accepted that there was an obvious relationship of common creativity between the major texts. Furthermore, the existence of any ascetic community at Qumran was vigorously rejected by Jewish–American historian Norman Golb, who decided that the original identification of Qumran as a fort was more sensible, and that a few inkwells and benches were hardly enough to confirm the site of a monastic scriptorium, especially when bones of women and children had been found in an allegedly strict community's supposed cemetery. On Golb's reckoning, the Scrolls most likely came out of Jerusalem before it was besieged by the Romans, and were deposited for safekeeping out of the way of war; the six hundred texts thus represented all sorts of disparate interests and treasured sources of inspiration in the Jerusalemite life of the first century CE. To account for those works with obvious relationships or strikingly common beliefs, Golb wrote of the *Yahad* or Unity sect, whose platform lay in the Community Rule yet who were not based at Qumran.<sup>66</sup> This approach flouted

64. Esp. H. Stegerman, "Is the Temple Scroll a Sixth Book of the Torah — Lost for 2,500 years?" In: Shanks, 235–6; Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, chap. 11, 23; cf. 68–74. See 11QTemple 2.1–8; 58.4–17; 60.20; 61.12–3; 62.14–5; 63.10, cf. 4QD/CD 3.19; 1QS 8.4–6; 4Q493, cf. 4QNew Jerusalem and 5Q15 fragments, and 4Qflor; A. J. McNicol, "The Eschatological Temple in the Qumran Peshet 4QFlorilegium 1:1–7," *Ohio Journal of Religious Studies* 5.2 (1977), 133–41; cf. M. O. Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Cave 11*. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, no. 49 (Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990).

65. B. Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983).

66. *Yahad* (and also the phrase "Sons of Light"), we note to explain this deduction, are entirely absent from the Damascus Document (CD). Note also, then, that Golb does not follow Rengstorff (see above note 31), in deducing that the Scrolls derive from one Jerusalem library. After an initial foray in 1970, Golb's case starts formally with, "The Problem of Origin and Identification of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 124 (1980), 1–24, and runs on to his *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (New York: Scribner, 1995), esp. chap. 1–2, 7. Linchpin texts in his argument were 4QMMT<sup>a</sup> (see above note 33 for Schiffmann's use of it in his Sadducean theory), and 4Q448, which contains a prayer to Jonathan the Maccabee (when the Qumranites were supposed to be anti-Hasmonaean). In the 1990s, Australian Scrolls scholars A. Crown and L. Cansdale were affected by Golb's conclusions, enough for the former to postulate Qumran as a staging post for pilgrims to Jerusalem (yet cf. his "The Dead Sea Scrolls," *Current Affairs Bulletin* 58.2 [1981]: 4–9), and the latter to express grave caution over the Qumran/Essene connection in her *Qumran and the Essenes: A Re-evaluation of the Evidence*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum, no. 60 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1997).

the argument used eminently in retort that an ancient library did not have to contain works with uniform theological views.<sup>67</sup> Golb's reactive position was also to be outdone, as the relevant articles in the issue of this journal confirm, by ongoing archaeological investigation.<sup>68</sup>

Despite this questioning of the mainstream position, the Essene hypothesis held into the 1980s, while more and more of the less intelligible, decipherable, and more readily placed fragments were being studied and published upon by a growing international team of scholars. Vis-à-vis early Christianity, the Scrolls were now accepted to bear no direct historical connections with the earliest church. Geza Vermes, who produced his third and expanded edition of *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* by 1987, went further than most. "The formation and organization of the Christian Community," he wrote "are no longer phenomena *sui generis* but are strictly paralleled at Qumran. The Teacher of Righteousness of the scrolls was, like Jesus, believed to have served as a transmitter and interpreter of God's definitive revelation. Like Jesus, he was surrounded by faithful disciples, who continued to adhere to and practise his doctrines after his death."<sup>69</sup>

The possibility that there was more than just a parallel, however, refused to go away. After all, had not the great liberal *savant* Ernest Renan conjectured in the 1860s that earliest Christianity was an Essenism in one form or another?<sup>70</sup> The view that Jesus himself was an Essene grew popular in Western theosophical circles, in which Jesus' part-Aryan ancestry was also posited.<sup>71</sup> Largely unnoticed by Scrolls specialists, the conceived link was also passed down into twentieth century New Age thought, especially through Bordeaux Szekely's forged *Essene Gospel of Peace*.<sup>72</sup> While such interesting possibilities always lurked in prying minds, by the 1980s both the weight of

67. For a librarian's view, see K. P. Pedley, "The Library at Qumran," *Review de Qumran* 2,5 (1959), 21–6; For Josephus on the Essenes adopting children, to help explain their presence in a cemetery, *Bell. Jud.* 2.120.

68. Although Golb was ready to keep up the struggle on this front; see M. O. Wise *et al.*, eds. *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects*. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, no. 722 (New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), esp. 51–72.

69. G. Vermes, "Jewish Studies and New Testament Interpretation," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 31,1 (1980), 11. For the third edition of his translation, London: Penguin, 1987.

70. E. Renan, *Origines du Christianisme* (Paris: Michel Lévy frères, 1863), I–II. Before him, a memorable idealization of Essenic piety may be found in French jurist Montesquieu's *De l'esprit des lois* (Geneva: Barrillot et fils, 1748), XXIV, 9, and in the Anglican churchman Joseph Bingham's *Origines Ecclesiasticae: or, The Antiquities of the Christian Church*, in *Works* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1855), I, 1; presumably deriving from Eusebius of Caesarea, *Hist. eccles.* 2.17 *et al. loc.*

71. Esp. foundress of the Theosophical Society, H. P. Blavatsky, *Isis Unveiled* (London: Theosophical Publishing Society, 1910), II, 323–4; and founding Anthroposophist R. Steiner's, *The Fifth Gospel* (London: Rudolf Steiner, 1968), which at least connects Jesus to the Essenes; cf. G. Trompf, "Macrohistory in Blavatsky, Steiner and Guénon," In: A. Faivre and W. Hanegraaff, eds. *Western Esotericism and the Science of Religion*. *Gnostica*, 2 (Louvain: Peeters, 1998), 269–96; W. Hanegraaff, *New Age Religion and Western Culture* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 314–19; on the continuing saga, e.g., M. Poynder, *The Lost Magic of Christianity: Celtic Essene Connections* (Cork: Collins Press, 1997).

72. E. B. Szekely, trans. *The Essene Gospel of Peace* (San Diego: Academy Books, 1974). Szekely ran an Essene School of Life at Tecate, California, in the 1940s.

palaeographic assessments and work on historical allusions in the crucial *pesher* texts (esp. 4Q169 [4QpNah]; 1QpHab; 4Q171 [4QpPs<sup>a</sup>]) had pressed most scholarly interest to the second and first centuries BCE, not in Jesus' time. The Nahum Commentary mentioned two known historical figures from pre-New Testament contexts (the two Seleucid rulers Demetrius and Antiochus [IV?] [4Q169 i]), while Queen Alexandra Salome, John Hyrcanus (II) and M. Aemilius Scaurus (the first Roman governor of Syria, 65–2 BCE) figure in a liturgical calendar (4Q323).<sup>73</sup> It was unsettling, then, to find an outlandish attempt to prove that the Scrolls had everything to do with Jesus.

The Australian Biblical scholar Barbara Thiering, who had some very intelligent detailed observations to make about the organisation of the ascetic community (including its solar calendar, which had already beckoned attention)<sup>74</sup> went on to make the claim that the schismatic group involved comprised “a coalition of Essenes and lay militarists.”<sup>75</sup> In her elaborate reconstruction of the stages in the group's life and expectations, she inferred that the historical Teacher of Righteousness (as distinct from an eschatologically charged figure under that title), belonged to the Roman period. Her choice for identification, considering the initiatory rites of water purification at Qumran, was John the Baptist. This meant that she had to dispute prevailing views about palaeography (placing both hymns by the Teacher and writings extolling him in the early first century CE)<sup>76</sup> and, in the course of time, needed to justify a number of re-identifications of figures mentioned in the Scrolls. As for sociological issues, however, it did not seem to cross her mind that John the Baptist could have acted out his ministry in ascetic isolation from any community as the Gospels suggest he did (esp. Matt 3:4), and as Josephus tells of a certain Bannus he once followed, who “lived in the wilderness” wearing “bark clothes” and eating “wild plants” (*Vita* 11).

Among other figures to be placed afresh were the Wicked Priest and the “Man [or Spouter] of Lie[s]” in the crucial *pesherim* texts of Habakkuk and Psalms. The dominant strain of interpretation, championed by the German Stegemann and the American Murphy-O'Connor, was that the Wicked Priest was the one-time military commander Jonathan Maccabee (the first Hasmonaean to take over the high priesthood at Jerusalem in 152 BCE), while

73. The latter was not published until 1992, see R. Eisenmann and M. O. Wise, comm. and trans. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (Shafesbury: Element, 1992), 122–5, but the list of allusions was known earlier; cf. Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 3rd edn., 26; For ongoing palaeographical research, M. D. McLean, “The Use and Development of Palaeo-Hebrew in the Hellenistic and Roman Period,” PhD thesis, Harvard University, 1982.

74. Esp. A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966) chap. 5–6; cf. Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* 2.128, on Essene veneration of the sun.

75. B. Thiering, *Redating the Teacher of Righteousness*. Australian and New Zealand Studies in Religion, no. 1 (Sydney: Theological Explorations, 1979), 148, cf. 183, on the deduction of a *yahad* schismatic group comparable to Golb's.

76. *Ibid.*, chap. 4, cf. chap. 8 on initiations and chap. 11 on John. Of late, Thiering has taken heart from attempts at dating revisions in more recent numbers of *Radiocarbon* (41, 2 [1999]: 182; 43 [2001]); cf. F. Martinez, J. C. Tigchelaar and A. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11: II, 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, no. 23 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 364, on *pesherim* being in Herodian script.

the identity of the Liar remained in dispute.<sup>77</sup> Thiering quite rightly pointed out that the Wicked Priest and Man of Lies were both described as “shedders of blood” and “builders [of a house/group],” yet without clear textual mandate, she took it that the opponent, indeed plotter, against the Teacher (i.e., John the Baptist) led a schism against the community’s heavy legalism. Signs of tension between the followers of John and the earliest Christians in the New Testament led her to the dramatic conclusion that the secessionist was Jesus of Nazareth.<sup>78</sup>

The idea that the Wicked Priest, the Man of Lies, and Jesus were the same man was not new. The present author floated this hypothesis in an honours thesis as early as 1962, suggesting that the scrolls’ *pesharim* might well be very early anti-Christian documents, whose author(s) alleged Jesus to have turned against the Law of Moses (i.e., the Teacher of Righteousness), but the theory was abandoned after exchanges with David Flusser.<sup>79</sup> The big problem for the Thiering thesis was that according to 4Q171, a Psalms *pesher* (4 on Ps. 37: 32–30), the Wicked Priest (Jesus) sought to plot to kill the Teacher (John), something totally against her idealisation of Jesus who, while remaining true to Essene discipline in his Palestinian ministry, was the bearer of a message of true freedom for all peoples.<sup>80</sup> In any case, there was a contrasting theory in the making that most of the Scrolls were Christian, but of a particular — and implicitly very unlikeable — brand.

This last theory was connected with the frustration felt during the 1980s that progress in publishing the rest of the Scrolls — many in small fragments that were difficult to match — was too slow. Right from the start Harvard’s

77. H. Stegemann, *Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde* (Bonn: [Stegemann], 1971); J. Murphy-O’Connor, “The Essenes and their History,” *Revue Biblique* 81 (1974), 215–44. Other figures to be determined were “the Young Lion of Wrath” in 4QpNah i (on Nah, 2:12) and the “cursed man” of 4QTestim 29–30.

78. See B. Thiering, *Qumran Origins and the Christian Church*. Australian and New Zealand Studies in Theology and Religion, no. 3 (Sydney: Theological Explorations, 1983); cf. *Redating the Teacher*, 15, on the shared descriptions. All of these deductions foreshadowed her works, *Jesus the Man: A New Interpretation of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Sydney: Doubleday, 1992) = *Jesus and the Riddle of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Unlocking the Secrets of his Life Story* (San Francisco: Harper, 1992), and subsequent works that became so methodologically free wheeling that they left scholars in the field nonplussed. See Vermes’ characteristic comments in the article in this issue.

79. Trompf, “Jewish Eschatology,” esp. 18–25; here also referring to an interview with Flusser in Jerusalem on 4 March 1963, and a letter from Flusser to Trompf, 24 November 1963. Whether Thiering knew of the Melbourne subthesis remains unknown. The view that there were two separate wicked priests referred to in 1QpHab, note also, was not mooted until later in I. R. Tantlevskij, *The Two Wicked Priests in the Qumran Commentary on Habbakkuk*. Special issue of *The Qumran Chronicle*, no. 5 (St Petersburg: Enigma, 1995).

80. G. Trompf, review article, “The Crippling Perils of the Faddish Jesus,” *Sydney Morning Herald* 24/2/1992, 11; cf. *Jesus the Man*, 101, 121–5. Vehement Australian reactions to Thiering’s work (e.g., C. Wilson and M. Adamthwaite, *Jesus was no Wicked Priest* [Melbourne: Pacific School of Graduate Studies, 1990]) might give the impression that Thiering abandoned Christianity, as another scrolls scholar, J. Allegro, did very ostentatiously in *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross* (London: Abacus: 1973), *The End of the Road* (London: Panther, 1972), and *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Myth* (Newton Abbot: Westbridge, 1979) with his (revised) view that early Christianity was a type of mushroom cult. Thiering, however, was bent on rendering the New Testament rational by contemporary standards: by re-reading it as a “*pesher* code,” with the Scrolls and other texts in view, it allegedly turned out to be inerrant; Thiering, “My Quest,” unpublished address to “The Soirée,” Sydney, 4 July 1990.



John Strugnell had been concerned about this problem because he thought publishing some materials in advance might give a conveniently unbalanced impression of the whole corpus.<sup>81</sup> Later on, Golb was vociferous about this matter, and even accused Strugnell, among others, of delaying publication of various fragments, especially of what he took to be a Mishnaic text (4QMMT<sup>a</sup>) that could explode the Essene hypothesis.<sup>82</sup> Although the number of scholars involved in placement and translation had increased, suspicion remained that the Catholic scholars who were part of the original international team, especially de Vaux, were deliberately holding up the pace of production. Inevitably, claims were heard that the Catholic Church knew certain fragments to be worrying for the faith of its flock: thus stated Michael Baigent from “New Age,” neo-esoteric, anti-institutional quarters.<sup>83</sup> But it was above all a Jewish Professor of Religious Studies who dared to campaign for genuine results and so wrest fame from apparent inactivity: Robert Eisenmann.

On 19 November 1991, the Biblical Archaeology Society issued two volumes edited by Eisenmann and James Robinson (renowned for his role in the translation of the Nag Hammadi library), with 1,785 photographs of virtually all of the fragments being brought to view.<sup>84</sup> Eisenmann did not make it clear how, from September 1989, the Scroll photographs “began coming to him,”<sup>85</sup> and yet the opportunity to bypass others’ slowness was too great. Before long he had cooperated with Michael Wise, Chicago Aramaist and author of a book on the Temple Scroll, to publish *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered: The First Complete Translation of 59 Key Documents Withheld for Over 35 Years*.<sup>86</sup> Despite the remarkable diversity of materials, with obscure calendrical and divinatory bits and pieces now included, Eisenmann and Wise decided that the Scrolls were little else than the archive of the early Jewish Christian movement surrounding James, head of the Jerusalem church. It could not be

81. J. Strugnell, with P. Benoit *et al.*, “Le travail d’édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumran,” *Revue Biblique* 63 (1956), 49–67. Note, however, that Strugnell is English by background.

82. N. Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* chap. 7. As a result, and with Strugnell’s inaction, Shanks took the step of “seizing” the latter’s fragments. Signs of Jewish scholars’ frustration with Catholic dominance over the Scrolls now came clearly into view, as Strugnell had become part of l’École Biblique in Jerusalem and converted to Catholicism (pers. com. chiefly with Thiering, 26 November 2001).

83. M. Baigent and R. Leigh, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1991), listing allegations by Allegro that went back to 1966. Among respected scholars, reporting on growing reaction against the stalling voiced at the Third International Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, note M. Wilcox, “Dead Sea Scrolls — Winds of Change,” public lecture, Society for the Study of Early Christianity, Macquarie University, 26 November 1989), soon after the Mogilany Colloquium, Poland.

84. See B. Eisenmann and J. Robinson’s introduction to *A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991), I–II. For later outcomes, note the more recent text and translation volumes of J. H. Charlesworth *et al.*, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1994–2001), I–VI.

85. See G. Vermes, “The War over the Scrolls,” *New York Review of Books* 41,14 (11 August, 1994), 11. I decline to comment on the legal implications of the actions and subsequent publications by Eisenmann (and Wise, see below), but their actions contributed to the Society of Biblical Literature resolution (November 1991) to allow all scholars free access to the facsimile reproductions.

86. (Shaftsbury: Element, 1992). On Wise’s previous work, see above note 64.

initially recognised because it seemed “virtually the opposite of the Christianity” with which we are familiar; but there it was now for all to see — “zealot, nationalistic, engagé, xenophobic, and apocalyptic.”<sup>87</sup> Eisenmann went on to reconstruct a “Zaddikim” cause, with James at its centre, in yet another attempt to connect the Scrolls with the New Testament. But it was a case that hardly matched up with other scholarly assessments of James the Just,<sup>88</sup> and in its prolixity and circumambulations, it failed to convince other specialists. If Thiering’s (widely sensationalised) reconstructions were now bound to crumble before evidence not available to her, Eisenmann’s theory consistently avoided the complexities of the materials, even though he now possessed them all. In any case, with the eventual radiocarbon dating of many of the fragments by 1990,<sup>89</sup> the evidence that most of the scrolls belonged to a context prior to the first century CE seemed confirmed. If this meant that the pre-Christian Jewish origins and impetus of the Scrolls’ possessors were now being substantiated, this did not preclude the sociologically important fact that, in Jesus’ time, there existed an eschatologically charged separated community longing for the rule of the *Kittim* (as Romans) to be removed and the temple to be transformed. Evidence had been mounting that there were texts other than 1QM prescribing preparations for a final conflict, and besides, Qumranite-connected fragments had turned up in the ruins of Masada.<sup>90</sup>

As all of these major or more noteworthy exercises in interpretation went their way, many other less sensationalised efforts were being made at understanding the significance of the Scrolls. Many of these were highly technical, concerning textual studies of the Bible and Biblical literature in particular, while others related to *Religionsgeschichte* and comparative religion. Of most interest in textual studies from the start were differences between the Qumranite Bible versions (especially 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>) and the Massoretic text of the Hebrew Bible. By the time Fitzmyer produced his resources book for the study of the Scrolls in 1990, it was amazing to find just how many passages of the Hebrew Bible, Apocrypha, and other extra-Biblical Jewish books were located among the Scrolls, and how many researchers had been at work trying to give reasons for any fine differences.<sup>91</sup> Because there had been apparent semantic

87. *Ibid.*, 10, cf. 11–13. Foreshadowing this position, see R. Eisenmann’s less well known work *Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians, and Qumran*. *Studia Post-Biblica*, no. 34 (Leiden: Brill, 1983). See also R. Eisenmann, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the First Christians* (Boston: Element, 1996); M. O. Wise, M. Abegg Jr and E. Cook, trans. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1996).

88. R. Eisenmann, *James The Brother of Jesus: Recovering the True History of Early Christianity* (London: Faber and Faber, 1997), esp. 959–63. For reactions, start esp. with J. Painter’s view in *Just James: The Brother of Jesus in History and Tradition* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1997), 277–88; cf. P. A. Bernheim, *Jacques, Frère de Jésus* (Paris: Éditions Noësis, 1996).

89. G. Bonani *et al.* “Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Atiqot* 20 (1991), 27–32; A. J. T. Jull *et al.* “Radiocarbon Dating of the Scrolls,” *Radiocarbon* 37 (1995), 11–17.

90. G. Vermes, “The Oxford Forum for Qumran Research. Seminar on the Rule of War from Cave 4 (4Q285),” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 43,1 (1992), 86–90; Y. Yadin, *Masada VI: Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–65: Final Reports* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1999), esp. 120–35.

91. Use Fitzmyer, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 205–39.

(and therefore apparent textual) discrepancies between New Testament quotations of the Old Testament in Hebrew, the older reasons given for these — that the New Testament authors tended to follow the Greek Septuagint over the previously known Hebrew version(s)<sup>92</sup> — began to be replaced by less monochrome assertions, that a more complex history of Hebrew versions of the Bible could provide either better solutions to the various puzzles involved or a preferable general background explanation.<sup>93</sup>

At times, interest lay in signs of older versions of the Hebrew books; one Qumranite version of Deut. 32:43, for instance, calling upon all the “gods” in heaven to worship God (om. MT, with LXX reading “angels”),<sup>94</sup> thus leaving possible vestiges of less-monotheistic days. At other times, the focus was on interlanguage relationships: on the history of Aramaic up to Jesus’ time (as some texts were in Aramaic and few Aramaic texts from New Testament times were available);<sup>95</sup> or on fragments of Hebrew versions of intertestamental texts previously known either only from the LXX Greek (such as Tobit), or from Greek or some damaged Hebrew texts (e.g. Ecclesiasticus),<sup>96</sup> or in other languages (as was the case with 1 Enoch).<sup>97</sup> Questions always had to be asked, too, whether Qumranite pesharists might have altered slightly the sense of passages, especially those in apocalyptic works, to suit current circumstances.<sup>98</sup> In any case, what were “characteristic” Qumranite hermeneutics as

92. E.g., T. W. Manson, “The Old Testament in the Teaching of Jesus,” *Bulletin of John Rylands Library* 34 (1952), 312–7.

93. Start with A. Guillaume, “Some Readings in the Dead Sea Scroll of Isaiah,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 76 (1957), 40–3; J. Allegro, “More Isaiah Commentaries from Qumran’s Fourth Cave,” *ibid.*, 77 (1958), 215–21; J. de Waard, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, no. 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1965), esp. 78–84 (guarded).

94. For a listing of scholarly work on Qumran’s Biblical MSS, see F. Martínez, trans. *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 467–8, 470–1, 473–83, 508–9; on the particular case cited, see G. Vermes, “War over the Scrolls,” 13. For another interesting variant in the Deuteronomic work, see J. Trebolle, “Textual Variants in 4QJudg<sup>a</sup> and the Textual and Editorial History of the Book of Judges,” In: F. Martínez, ed. *The Texts of Qumran and the History of the Community: Proceedings of the Groningen Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls (20–3 August 1989)*, 1, *Biblical Texts* (Groningen: Universiteit te Groningen, 1990), 229–45.

95. For a summary of assessments thus far, see K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, des Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alien talmudischen Zitaten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1984), and E. Puech’s introduction to *Qumran Cave 4, 22: Textes Araméens*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, no. 31 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), I; The most famous specimen of Aramaic from Jesus’ time is the Targum of [pseudo-]Jonathan.

96. E.g., 4QTob hebr (but Aramaic fragments of Tobit are also present in ar<sup>b-d</sup>); and see Y. Yadin, *Megilot ben me-metsada* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and Shrine of the Book, 1965) on the fragment[s] MasSir; cf. esp. 2Q18. For background taking us back to the Cairo Genizah, H. P. Rieger, *Text und Textform im hebräischen Sirach: Untersuchungen zur Textgeschichte und Textkritik der hebräischen Sirachfragmente aus der Kairoer Geniza* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1970).

97. For the complexities, start with J. T. Milik, “Problèmes de la littérature hénochique,” *Harvard Theological Review* 64 (1971), 333–78, and later *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976). C. P. Thiede carries a racy account of the debate as to whether 7Q4 and 5 are Greek fragments of 1 Tim. 3:16–4:1, 3 and Mark 6:52–3 or (as Puech stoutly maintains) a Greek version of Enoch 103: 7–8; *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Jewish Origins of Christianity* (Oxford: Lion, 2000), chap. 7, cf. before that, *Die Älteste Evangelien-Handschrift* (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus, 1986).

98. For a general example, see M. P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (Washington: CBA, 1979); specific, Mertens, *Buch Daniel*, esp. 170–1; for a more recent,

opposed to other styles?<sup>99</sup> Quite apart from their apocalyptic interests, there were signs that the myth history of 1 Enoch was of as much, if not more, interest to the Qumranites than the early passages of Genesis (1–11). Was this because they were more interested in the cosmic fall of the angels than the disobedience of Adam and its consequences?<sup>100</sup>

As for the Dead Sea Scrolls and their importance for the study of the history and comparison of religions more broadly, the most obvious areas of interest concerned Zoroastrian–Iranian influences, the implications of the Scrolls for the study of gnosticism(s), and the commonalities of Qumranite theological interests and those of lesser known strands in ancient Christianity. As was noticed early by Lucetta Mowry, apparently the first female scholar to enter Scrolls scholarship, the accentuation of a conflict between light and darkness (esp. in IQS and IQM) bespoke Zoroastrian doctrines about the human struggle between cosmic forces of good and evil — or Ahura Mazda versus Ahriman.<sup>101</sup> The questions have long remained: What sorts of anti-Roman resistance ideologies were shared across the Persian–Jewish frontier?<sup>102</sup> Did the transition in the Qumranite history of apocalyptic writing to prepare for cosmic war have any sort of background elsewhere (when in other Jewish eschatological texts God does not seem as dependent on his earthly saints for an ultimate victory)?<sup>103</sup>

Apropos Gnosticism, long-burning issues have been concerned with whether what we called Gnosticism preceded its well-known forms in the Christian heresies (of Basilides, Valentinus, etc.), and whether its origins were Jewish, Hellenistic, or both. Previously, such a document as “The Hymn of the Pearl” was central to this debate, and signs in the New Testament of an effort to combat “Gnosticising” tendencies (e.g., Col. 2:8–3:11; 1 Tim. 6:20b) were taken to be against Hellenistic cosmological distortions of the Gospel

relevant survey of the literature, J. J. Collins, “Was the Dead Sea Sect an Apocalyptic Movement?” In: L. H. Schiffman, ed. *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*, 25–52. *Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha*, Suppl. Ser., 8; JSOT/ASOR Monographs, no. 8 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990).

99. For introductory comments, R. B. Laurin, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and Interpretation,” In: B. L. Ramm *et al.* *Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids, M.I.: Baker House, 1971), 67–80.

100. Note esp. M. Barker, *The Older Testament* (London: SPCK, 1987) and *The Lost Prophet* (London: SPCK, 1988) carrying this provocative thesis. For recent incursions into related issues, G. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids, M.I.: Eerdmans, 1998); D. R. Jackson, “Three Defining Exemplars of Enochic Judaism 250 BCE–70 CE,” PhD thesis, University of Sydney, Sydney, 2001.

101. L. Mowry, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Background for the Gospel of John,” *Biblical Archaeologist* 17 (1954), 86–9.

102. See G. Widengren, “Iran and Israel in Parthian Times with Special Regard to the Ethiopic Book of Enoch,” In: B. Pearson, ed. *Religious Syncretism in Antiquity*, 85–129. Series on Formative Contemporary Thinkers, no. 1 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975); cf. J. W. Swain, “The Theory of the Four World Monarchies: Opposition Histories under the Roman Empire,” *Classical Philology* 35 (1940), 1–9; G. Trompf, “When Was the First Millenarian Movement;” and “An Agenda for Persian Studies,” In: G. Trompf and M. Honari, eds. *Mehregan in Sydney: Proceedings of the Seminar in Persian Studies, Sydney, Australia 28 October–6 November, 1994*. Sydney Studies in Religion, no. 1 (Sydney: Persian Cultural Council of Australia, 1998), 2–4, 234–43; cf. 4Q552–3.

103. Cf. J. J. Collins, “The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll: A Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic,” *Vetus Testamentum* 29,3 (1979), 596–612.

message.<sup>104</sup> Interest in the relevant Semitic materials made the tide change, however, and the Dead Sea Scrolls contributed to the shift.<sup>105</sup> Critical for this reappraisal were the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (esp. 4QShirShab<sup>a-f</sup>), which could be read alongside obscure calendrical, horoscopic, and Mystery fragments (e.g. 1QMyst).<sup>106</sup> These songs are also important for the long-term history of the *merkabah* mystical tradition in Judaism.<sup>107</sup> Other Judaic-influenced Gnosticisms to reconsider in light of the Scrolls were Manichaeism, and Mandaeism (with Thiering believing that the latter were the direct descendants of her preconceived community of Qumran, because they honoured John the Baptist rather than the “defective” Jesus).<sup>108</sup>

As for lesser known strands of Christianity, it is certainly significant that the earliest Jewish Christianities, like the Qumranites, indulged in a good deal of angelological speculation and had strong eschatological leanings.<sup>109</sup> The range of books taken as sacred by the Qumran community was wider than the collection that became canonical for rabbinic Judaism after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE and the decisions surrounding the so-called Council of Jamnia, ca 120). The desert collection made it necessary to speak of “Judaisms” rather than any one monolithic Jewish orthodoxy/praxy before Judaea’s collapse. Paradoxically, early Christianity and its variants were more the inheritors of this diversity than the Jewish survivalists under the rabbi “Sages.”<sup>110</sup> The Book of Enoch, as a famous example, became a central and sacred work for the Ethiopian Christians. We should also note that as the range of literature appealed to at Qumran manifested itself, Catholic Christians could be the more fascinated that books they had inherited from the LXX — and which, unlike the Protestants, they had not wilfully set aside from the Bible — appeared to have been treated as sacred scriptures in the ancient desert context.

104. Note also C. H. Talbert, *Luke and the Gnostics: An Examination of the Lucan Purpose* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1966).

105. Start with J. E. Fossum, “The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Origins of the Idea of Intermediation in Gnosticism,” Doctoral dissertation (Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht, Utrecht, 1982). Note also Pearson, “Jewish Haggadic Traditions in the Testimony of Truth from Nag Hammadi,” In: C. J. Bleeker, ed. *Ex Orbe Religionum: Studis Geo Widengren*. Studies in the History of Religions: *Numen*, Supplement 21 (Leiden: Brill, 1972), I, 457–70.

106. For earlier work, J. Strugnell, “An Angelic Liturgy at Qumrân. 4QSerek Shirôt “ôlat hashshabbât,” In: *Congress Volume, Oxford 1959*. Supplement to *Vetus Testamentum*, 7 (Leiden: Brill, 1960), 249–55. For recent work, cf. esp. C. Newsom, ed. and comm. *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*. Harvard Semitic Studies 27 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985).

107. For background, G. G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1965).

108. B. Thiering, “Mandaeans and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Mandaeen Thinker* 4 (1995), 10–15; cf., on claimed Manichaean connections, L. Koenen, “Manichäische Mission und Klöster in Ägypten,” In: G. Grimm, H. Heinen and E. Winter, eds. *Das römisch-byzantinische Ägypten: Akten des internationalen Symposiums 26–30 September 1978 in Trier*, 93–103. (Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1983).

109. Cf. J. Daniélou, *The Theology of Early Jewish Christianity*. Translated by J. Baker for the Development of Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea, no. 2 (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1964), chap. 4, 14; cf. his *Les manuscrits de la mer Morte et les origines du Christianisme* (Paris: Éditions de l’Orante, 1957); A. Deasley, *The Shape of Qumran Theology* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000). Josephus remarks on Essene interest in angels, *Bell. Jud.* 2.142.

110. For background, see esp. the Australian Jewish scholar (now in Jerusalem), M. Stone, *Scriptures, Sects and Visions: A Profile of Judaism from Ezra to the Jewish Revolts* (London: Collins, 1980), esp. chap. 7.

Many other (if marginal) elements could be brought into this account, relevant to the history of special messianic and macrohistorical ideas, purificatory precepts and rites, monastic organisation, meditation (although we lack the mysterious Book of Meditation referred to in the Scrolls [in CD and IQsa]), medical ideas and healing, notions of magic and the occult, and so on. Much ink has been spilt over thousands of intriguing details and points of distinction. Over a hundred discrete theories have been spun. The use of bibliographic guides will be necessary to approach a comprehensive picture.<sup>111</sup> In an historical survey such as this, which is inevitably selective, one's eye must be attentive to developments that stand out intellectually and culturally in the wider world of scholarly endeavours. Certainly, as over a century has passed since the uncovering of the Damascus Document (then the Zadokite work), and fifty years since the discoveries at Qumran,<sup>112</sup> we can safely assert that the Dead Sea Scrolls testify to the extraordinary significance of these archaeological finds for our time. While the work on them proceeds, the Scrolls call for constant contemporary reassessment, as the articles to follow will confirm.

111. Consult E. Tov, ed. *Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library*, esp. pt. 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1999); on the most recent debates about messianism and the reference to the Son of God in 4Q426, J. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), esp. chap. 3–5.

112. For the relevant celebratory markings with books, J. M. Baumgarten, E. G. Chazon and A. Pinnick, eds. *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery*. Studies in the Texts of the Desert of Judah, no. 34 (Leiden: Brill, 2000); P. W. Flint and J. C. Vanderkam, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (Leiden: Brill, 1999).