
THESIS

SUBMITTED TO RHODES UNIVERSITY BY ROBERT J.A. SHERIFFS IN PART
FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF DIVINITY

OCTOBER 1953.

A COMPARISON OF THE VIEWS OF MODERN SCHOLARS ON THE ORIGIN,
DATE AND IMPORTANCE FOR O.T. STUDY OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

- A) Finding of the Scrolls
- B) Description of the Scrolls
- C) Description of the Containers
- D) Nomenclature and Abbreviations

I. CONTENTS OF THE DOCUMENTS.

The Isaiah Scroll 'a'
The Isaiah Scroll 'b'
The Habakkuk Commentary Scroll
The Lamech Apocalypse
The Manual of Discipline
The Hymns of Thanksgiving
The Scroll of War between Light and Darkness

II. DATING OF DOCUMENTS & VIEWS OF SCHOLARS.

E.L.Sukonik	- The Cave a Jewish Genizah
F.M.Cross	- The Pre-Maccabean Period
C.R.Sellers	- The Pre-Christian Period
R.de Vaux	- The 2nd. Half of 1st Century A.D.
A.Bentzen	- About the Beginning of Christian Era
M.Delcor	- Before the Christian Era
Lanchester Harding	- Before 70 A.D.
R.P.R.Tournay	- Probably Herodian Period
O.H.Lehmann	- A Roman Date Possible
P.Kahle	- About the First to Second Century A.D.
B.J.Roberts	- After the First Century A.D.
G.R.Driver	- About the Third or Fourth Century A.D.
S.Zeitlin	- In the Middle Ages
E.R.Lacheman	- At Several Points in History
S.A.Birnbaum	- First Century B.C. to 70 A.D.
W.F.Albright	- Not Later than Herodian Period
J.Mauchline	- Second Century B.C. to Second Century A.D.
H.H.Rowley	- Second Century B.C. to Second Century A.D.

SUMMARY AND CONSPECTUS OF VIEWS ON DATING OF DOCUMENTS.

SEQUENCE AND DATES OF THE EXTRA-BIBLICAL DS AND THE ZADOKITE WORK.

III. ORIGIN OF THE DOCUMENTS.

A) WHO USED THE SCROLLS?

- a) The Zadokite Work
 - i. Date
 - ii. Contents
 - iii. Date of Sect of Zadokite Work
 - iv. Nature of Sect
 - v. Identification of Sect

- b) Links between DS & Zadokite Work
 - i. The Teacher of Righteousness
 - ii. The Wicked Priest
 - iii. The Kittim
 - iv. The House of Absalom
 - v. Nature of War in DSW
 - vi. A 'Rule' of War in DSW
 - vii. A Twofold Division of Sect
 - viii. A Messianic Hope
 - ix. A Link between DSW & DST
 - x. A Covenant Relationship

Summary

- c) Historical Connexion between Sect of DS and Zadokite Work
 - i. Origin of Sect of DS
 - ii. Dupont-Sommer's View of Origin
 - iii. View of Maccabean Origin of Sect
 - iv. House of Absalom
 - v. Onias - the Teacher of Righteousness
 - vi. Menelaus - the Wicked Priest
 - vii. Antiochus - the Man of Scorn
 - viii. The Sect's Marriage Laws
 - ix. Ptolemaic Origin of Sect
 - x. The Sect's Migration to Damascus
 - xi. The Star - the Leader of the Sect

Summary

B) WERE THE USERS OF THE SCROLLS ESSENES?

- a) The Excavations at Kirbet Qumran

- b) Was it an Essene Retreat?
 - i. Dupont-Sommer - The Essenes are Hasidim
 - ii. Bloddy Roberts - Difficulties of identificat.
 - iii. P. Kahle - Identification possible
 - iv. Lanchester Harding - Kirbet Qumran H.Q. of Group
 - v. R.J. Tournay - Not Essenes but Zealots
 - vi. G.R. Driver - Admits identif. with Zadokite
 - vii. A. Parrot - Essenes possibly, doubtful.
 - viii. O.H. Lehmann - Early Group of Christian era
 - ix. B. Reicke - Zadokites in Hasmonean era
 - x. S. Zeitlin - Karaite Sect of Middle Ages
 - xi. P.R. Weis - Arabic influence shows Isawite Sect or Judganite Sect.

Summary

C) AN ATTEMPTED ANSWER TO THE QUESTION OF ORIGIN.

IV. IMPORTANCE OF THE DOCUMENTS FOR O.T. STUDY.

A) INTRODUCTION

B) BEARING ON THE O.T.

C) VIEWS OF SCHOLARS

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| i. W.F.Albright | - Value for Text and Canon |
| ii. A.Bontzen | - Value for Form-criticism |
| iii. O.H.Lehmann | - Value of Early Texts for Critical Study |
| iv. A.Parrot | - Value of Early Texts for History of O.T. |
| v. A.Dupont-Sommer | - Value for Literary & Historical Study |
| vi. G.L.Harding | - Value for Detailed Study of O.T. |
| vii. B.J.Roberts | - Value for Textual Study |
| viii. M.Deleor | - Value not to be exaggerated but Considerable |
| ix. P.Kahle | - Value for Hebrew Linguistics |
| x. G.R.Driver | - Value for Textual-criticism demonstrated |
| xi. W.H.Brownlee | - Value for Theological Study of O.T. |

SUMMARY

D) CONCLUSION.

WORKS CONSULTED AND BIBLIOGRAPHY.

INTRODUCTION

- A) FINDING OF THE SCROLLS
 - B) DESCRIPTION OF THE SCROLLS
 - C) DESCRIPTION OF THE CONTAINERS
 - D) NOMENCLATURE AND ABBREVIATIONS
-

A COMPARISON OF THE VIEWS OF MODERN SCHOLARS ON THE ORIGIN,
DATE AND IMPORTANCE FOR O.T. STUDY OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS.

INTRODUCTION

A) Finding of the Scrolls

In the early part of 1948 an announcement was made concerning the discovery of some ancient manuscripts in Palestine; to this discovery sober and distinguished scholars applied adjectives like 'sensational' and 'phenomenal' - words which are not commonly applied to the discovery of manuscripts in the world of scholarship. 'The most important discovery ever made in Old Testament manuscripts' (original italics) was officially announced in April by Dr. Millar Burrows of Yale University, who during the past year has been Director of the American Schools of Oriental Research in Jerusalem. The entire Book of Isaiah in Hebrew was found on a well-preserved scroll of parchment; and the date - first century B.C., (original italics) says Dr. Burrows: This is amazing, for complete Hebrew manuscripts of Isaiah, or for that matter of any part of the Old Testament, have hitherto been unknown before the 9th century A.D. One exception to this is a tiny fragment of Deuteronomy known as the Nash Papyrus; and it was this fragment which gave the clue to the date of the newly found manuscript.

This Scroll of Isaiah and other scrolls came into the possession of the American Schools of Oriental Research through the agency of His Eminence Mar Athanasius Y. Samuel, Syrian Archbishop-Metropolitan Jerusalem and Hahemite Jordan. The first news of the discovery came to Dr. John C. Trever on February 18, 1948. He was informed by telephone that his advice was needed in connexion with some 'ancient Hebrew manuscripts'. The call came from Father Butros Sowmy, a priest of St. Mark's Syrian Orthodox Convent in the Old City of Jerusalem, and concerned five scrolls written in ancient Hebrew in the possession of St. Mark's Convent Library and about which there did not seem to be any information in the catalogue. The troubles caused by the Jewish-Arab conflict at this time made it difficult for any business to be conducted in the Old City, and so Dr. Trever invited Father Sowmy to meet him at the American School and to bring the scrolls with him.

The following afternoon, February 19th. Father Sowny came with a small suitcase containing five scrolls wrapped in newspapers, and a small fragment which measured about $4\frac{1}{2}$ x $6\frac{1}{2}$ cm. The visitors, opening the suitcase, removed from it one of the smaller scrolls, offering it for Dr. Trever's inspection. This scroll has since proved to be part of the manuscript which scholars have now named the Sectarian Document. Owing to the frangible nature of the Scrolls they had to be handled with great care, but the largest was able to be unrolled. This scroll was found to be rolled with the end of the manuscript on the outside, and last two columns, being on a single sheet of parchment, had become separated from the rest when the thread with which it had been sewn had disintegrated. The last column covered only five-eighths of the available space and was badly worn from constant handling. Dr. Trever unrolled about a dozen columns, doubtful about its authenticity. The script was obviously Hebrew but was of a type which seemed strange to him.

Among the possessions of Dr. Trever there was a box of lantern-slides containing a selection from early Hebrew manuscripts. One slide which Dr. Trever looked at showed the Nash Papyrus, a small fragment which contains the Ten Commandments (Deut.v.6-21) and the Shema' (Deut.vi.4f) written in square Hebrew. This fragment is thought by some scholars to belong to the 2nd century A.D., but Professor W.F. Albright would date it in the period 165-37 B.C. The Nash Papyrus bore a striking resemblance to the script of the scrolls and this persuaded Dr. Trever that the scrolls were likely to be genuine and no forgeries. Desiring to make further study of them, he was allowed by Father Sowny to copy out by hand several lines from the scrolls.

It was during this visit of Father Sowny that Dr. Trever heard the story of how the scrolls had come into the possession of St. Mark's Orthodox Convent. Wandering bedouin of the Tadmire tribe had by chance stumbled upon a cave high up in the side of a cliff towards the north end of the Dead Sea. The main entrance of this cave had been closed by a fall of rock which had broken some jars containing scrolls which had been deposited in the cave in former times. The bedouin had seen these scrolls jutting out from the

rubble scattered on the floor of the cave. They had pulled out a few scrolls, dragging off the cloth-wrapping in which they had been enclosed. These they took to Bethlehem and offered them to a Sheikh who, thinking they were written in Syriac, suggested the bedouin should take them to the Syrians in Bethlehem. This they did, and the Syrians got in touch with Mar Athanasius Y. Samuel, the Syrian Metropolitan in Jerusalem, who offered to buy them.

Further enquiries showed that the scrolls had been discovered as early as the summer of 1947 and that the cave where they had been found had been visited by a priest from the Syrian Convent, Father Bulos by name. He had gone with the bedouin but had been unable to stay long owing to the intense heat. However, he had observed that the floor of the cave had bits of cloth-wrappings, several potsherds which seemed to belong to jars in which the scrolls had been concealed, and a number of fragments of manuscripts lying on it. Father Bulos noticed nearby what looked like ancient graves. The bedouin who were with him claimed to have taken some of the unbroken jars in order to use them as water-pots. Dr. Trevor made the suggestion to the Metropolitan that an attempt should be made to purchase through the bedouin any of these jars, but this he was not able to do.

The Acting-Director of the American Schools in Jerusalem soon turned his attention to the lines which he had copied out by hand from the largest of the scrolls. One phrase (𐤒𐤗𐤁) which can be transliterated either as llw' or lly' occurred twice in one of the lines. Now it happens that this expression is a rare one in the Old Testament and is found only in Amos vi.13, II Chron.xiii.9, II Chron.xv.3, Isaiah lxxv.1 (twice), Job xxvi.2,3 and Job xxxix.16. A survey of all these passages eliminated all except Isaiah lxxv.1 and on reading over this passage Dr. Trevor was startled to find that there in this same passage was what he had written down from the scroll he had copied.

He began to speculate on the length of the large scroll and to try to imagine how much of the Book of Isaiah it could contain, and whether it could be authentic. He had noticed signs of what seemed to be the hand of a corrector on the last twelve columns

of the scroll and this brought a conviction of the authenticity of the document, but he was puzzled that so perfect a manuscript could possibly be as old as the Nash Papyrus.

It was very unsafe to enter the Old City at this time, but Dr. Trever managed to get to the Syrian Orthodox Convent and interview the Metropolitan. The topic of the scrolls was introduced at once and permission was sought to photograph them. As the Metropolitan was reluctant to allow this, it was pointed out that it was advisable for publication, preservation, and for the sake of further research. Permission being granted at last, it was decided that the scrolls should be taken to the American Schools of Oriental Research the next morning. Dr. Trever was then allowed to review the scrolls. On unrolling the Isaiah scroll for the second time, Dr. Trever noticed that there were large insertions in several columns and that these were in a different hand. In one case there was evidence that three separate hands had been at work. The first thirteen columns were in a very poor state of preservation and required great care in handling, and the last few columns were disintegrating, rendering it difficult to tell whether they belonged to the beginning or end of the Book of Isaiah. Picking out what seemed to be the upper part of the first column, a transcription was made of it.

He found later that the words he had copied were indeed the opening words of Isaiah. Assisted by a colleague, he made search to gather reading on ancient manuscripts and an article by Dr. W. F. Albright on the Nash Papyrus was consulted; reference was also made to a photograph in I. M. Price's book 'The Ancestry of Our English Bible'. Both men were soon convinced that the Isaiah Scroll was as old, if not older than, the Nash Papyrus. The next thing was to obtain a good photographic record of the scrolls.

This was done under difficulties, but, nevertheless, the whole of the Isaiah Scroll was photographed and the other scroll which was afterwards identified by Dr. Brownlee as the Habakkuk Commentary. Thus a photographic record was made of them in colour, in Black and White. Two of the scrolls having been photographed, permission was obtained from the Syrians to retain

two of the other scrolls and a small fragment in order to repair them and to deal with them as they had with the previous two. Dr. Trever found that the two remaining scrolls fitted together perfectly to make one complete scroll of eleven columns. This scroll is the one now known as the Sectarian Document. It was not in as good condition as the Isaiah Scroll or the Habakkuk Commentary, being tightly rolled and very friable. One scroll could not be safely unrolled and Dr. Trever did not retain it, but after photographing it, without unrolling it, with the fragment which had broken away from its outer edge, he wrapped it in a special box and returned it to the Syrians. This small fragment can scarcely be read owing to its very poor condition. Dr. Trever was of the opinion that the small fragment could be fitted into the broken scroll which had been returned earlier, but since trying it in position (it appeared to fit perfectly) he is now less confident and thinks it may belong to another scroll.

As soon as the first prints were ready, they were sent off to Dr. Albright, Professor of Semitic Languages, John Hopkins University, in order to have his opinion on the scrolls.

Owing to the uncertainty of the times through the termination of the British Mandate in Palestine, the safety of the Americans required their leaving the country, and, because of this, permission was sought and granted by the Metropolitan to take new and better photographs of the scrolls. Permission was also asked to attempt to unroll the fourth scroll, but this was withheld. However, Dr. Trever was assured that the manuscripts would be taken to America where it would be possible to make use of better facilities.

In March word came from Dr. Albright which made it clear that in his opinion the scrolls were authentic and of outstanding worth for the history of the Hebrew Text of the Bible. His words show that the script of the scrolls, coupled with a profound knowledge of Semitic languages and practical experience of archeology in Palestine during his Directorate of the American Schools of Oriental Research, had fully convinced him that the scrolls were of early date. He wrote, "My heartiest congratulations on

the greatest manuscript discovery of modern times. There is no doubt in my mind that the script is more archaic than that of the Nash Papyrus....I should prefer a date around 100 B.C.....What an absolutely incredible find! And there can happily not be the slightest doubt in the world about the genuineness of the manuscript".

Naturally the Americans were very anxious to pay a visit to the cave where the scrolls had been found, but this was not possible in the circumstances. Before leaving Jerusalem Dr. Trever, following up an urgent message from the Syrian Convent, went there and was given a folded piece of paper which contained a piece of one of the scrolls. At once Dr. Trever recognised it as a part of the Habakkuk Commentary by the colour of the leather on which it was written, and the script and size and shape which were the same. Its edges were worn-eaten and so were the edges of the Habakkuk Scroll at its commencement. Dr. Brownlee had been disappointed when he found that the right-hand portion of the first was missing; this bit would fill the gap, and since half of a previous column was on it as well, clearly the original scroll must have had at least an additional column at the beginning.

That morning Father Butros left, taking all the manuscripts with him to a place of safety. This was fortunate for the cause of scholarship, since, during the days of heavy fighting in the Old City, the Orthodox Convent of St. Mark's was severely damaged and Father Sowny was killed.

At a later date it was learned that when the bedouin had first come to the Convent they had been turned away and had taken the scrolls away with them. Two of them returned to Bethlehem to the Syrian merchant who had acted as intermediary on their behalf. Back at Bethlehem they were persuaded to leave their scrolls in the shop of the merchant, once they were convinced it would be perfectly safe to do so. One of the three tribesmen was distrustful of leaving the scrolls in custody with the merchant and decided to take his share of the find elsewhere. It is clear from subsequent events that it was this man's share of the scrolls that was purchased by the Hebrew University in Jerusalem; according to accounts the bedouin had sought to find

purchasers for seven scrolls at the first, whereas when the Metropolitan purchased from them he was able to purchase only five scrolls. The Bethlehem merchant is sure that when the bedouin first visited St. Mark's Convent they had at least seven scrolls to offer and that some of these were still in their original black cloth-wrappings.

Attempts to purchase the jars in which the scrolls had been concealed were fruitless, but later it was found that Dr. Susenik had purchased two whole jars from a Muslim dealer in Bethlehem. It is clear that Dr. Susenik had also purchased some scrolls from dealers in Bethlehem in November, 1947.

A Belgian officer, Lieutenant Philippe Lippens, who had shown an interest in the manuscripts while at the American Schools in the capacity of a United Nations Observer, came into contact with Mr. Lanchester Harding, Director of Antiquities, at 'Amman and suggested to him that the officers of the Arab Legion should take some action in connexion with the location of the Cave. As a result a trip was made to 'Ain Feshkha where it was reported that the cave was situated. A number of caves in this locality were explored and at last one was discovered which seemed to be the right one. An Arab Legion guard was then placed over it to prevent unauthorised persons from entering into it. Mr. Lanchester Harding then visited it as Director of Antiquities and was able to confirm the identification of the site by finding some fragments of manuscript and some potsherds which he considered to be Hellenistic. Excavations were begun which lasted over a period. Twice the site was visited by Dr. Sellers in company with Mr. Baranki of the Palestine Museum. The staff in charge of this work were Mr. L. Harding, Director of Antiquities, Père de Vaux of the Dominican Ecole Biblique, and three skilled workmen, two museum guards from Jerusalem and one from 'Amman.

Dr. Sellers tells how digging was done with the greatest care by hand and with small instruments such as knives. As a rule there was only sufficient room in the cave for two men to work simultaneously. The task of the investigators was made more difficult than it would have been because the cave had been visited and dis-

turbed by previous clandestine excavators. In these excavations no new documents were found, but there was part of one scroll and also hundreds of bits of manuscripts, as well as a number of potsherds. There is no doubt in the minds of those who investigated the cave that it was the same one in which the Dead Sea Scrolls had been concealed. The proof for this lies in the fact that among the portions of scrolls found during this visit some of them clearly belong to the Scrolls already known. It appears likely that the bedouin who first came across the cache broke open all the jars and removed the manuscripts, disregarding the fragments which happened to break and fall on to the floor. In the later and unauthorised excavations, these fragments were mixed up with the debris on the ground.

According to Dr. Sellers, the old material which was brought out from the excavation at 'Ain Feshkha can be divided into three categories. The first is a good deal of cloth, wonderfully spun and woven, some of it with rolling and whipping. So well made was this cloth that Dr. Sellers tells how a few ladies who saw it thought it was modern. Its antiquity was clear to the excavators, however, since pieces of the manuscripts were found stuck to the cloth, showing that it was a wrapping in which the scrolls had been originally encased and sealed. The second category is the pottery. It is claimed by Dr. Sellers that it is uniformly late-Hellenistic, with the exception of a lamp and a cooking-pot which he assigns to the Roman period. These last items he considers to have found their way into the cave through the visit of a casual traveller who once sought refuge in the cave, or alternatively, a visitor who was interested in the deposit. Dr. Sellers thinks that perhaps this visitor in Roman days entered the cave and removed some manuscripts. The evidence for this he would find in the fact that the breaks in the jars found in this cave were old. The pottery consisted almost entirely of broken jars and bowls. The bowls appear to have been used for the purpose of covering the jars. These potsherds are being put together in the Palestine Museum and call for the work of experts, since the jars have been severely shattered and the fragmentation is great. The third category is

the fragments of scrolls, all of which appear to have been part of the early deposit. Dr.Sellers raises the question as to the identity of the Roman visitor whom he thinks entered the cave in former times. With a passage from Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History in mind, where it is related of Origen in connexion with his work on the Hexapla that one of the manuscripts he used in his translation of the Psalms "he found in a jar in Jericho in the time of Antoninus, the son of Severus", Dr.Sellers makes the startling suggestion that perhaps it was Origen!

In connexion with the jars, Mr.Harding made an attempt to compute from the number of potsherds the number of manuscripts which could have been contained in the cave, estimating that as five or six scrolls could easily be accomodated in one jar there could have been at least 200 scrolls in all!

B) Description of the Scrolls

Those who first saw the Scrolls from the Dead Sea Cave found them to be in such a dirty condition that they did not at first show any particular interest in them. When they were brought to St. Mark's by bedouin, the Father who received them, seeing the scrolls wrapped in filthy cloth and covered with some foul, black substance, was not impressed and sent the visitors away. Three of the scrolls which were later purchased by the Syrian Archbishop were written on a coarse, yellow parchment; the largest one seemed to be more worn than the others and was written on a thinner material. This was the Isaiah Scroll. The two less worn manuscripts were written on leather of a deep brown hue and there was evidence of much deterioration.

In Dr. Susenik's publication 'Megillot Genuzot' it is stated that up to the date of publication (1948) the number of the scrolls which had been discovered was eleven. As it is known that the Americans in Jerusalem obtained possession of five of these, it may be assumed that the Hebrew University had purchased the remaining six. Of these six it was found that three were different parts of the one document. They were in fact really sheets of a single scroll, though they were not sewn together. This scroll has been named 'The Scroll of Thanksgiving Songs'. The other two Jewish-owned scrolls had not been unrolled at the time of Dr. Susenik's writing. The remaining scroll which had been unrolled has been named by Prof. Susenik 'The Scroll of the War of the Children of Light with the Children of Darkness'.

Dr. Ginsberg states that of the eight scrolls unrolled up to December 1948, the four belonging to the Hebrew University are less well preserved than the four belonging to the Syrian Convent.

As regards the material on which the Hebrew University's scrolls were written, we learn from Dr. Cross that the two which Dr. Susenik has examined in his volume were made of coarse parchment or leather (rather than fine split parchment), as is also the case with the Syrian-owned scrolls. The writing is on the hairy side of the pieces of leather. These sheets were ruled

very carefully so as to act as a guide for the writer. They have horizontal rulings for the lines of script and vertical rulings to denote the margins. These vertical rulings can still be seen clearly on the documents. In the case of the horizontal, it is of interest to note that the characters of the script are suspended from the lines and not written above them.

Dr. Cross gives some particulars of 'The Scroll of the War of the Children of Light with the Children of Darkness'. This scroll was intact at the time of its discovery and measured approximately $9\frac{1}{2}$ feet long and $6\frac{1}{2}$ inches high. It contained 19 columns of script which occupied 3 full sheets of leather together with some fractional sections. This made up the complete scroll. The top edge of the scroll was in a very good state of preservation but unfortunately the lower edge had been worn and eaten away.

Dr. Cross has also given some comments on the 'Hymns of Thanksgiving', which are in the possession of the Hebrew University. He mentions that the total collection came into Prof. Susenik's hands in three separate sheets of parchment, comprising twelve columns of writing. When he first obtained them, the sheets were crushed together into a bundle of fragments and were in a poor state of preservation. A considerable portion of the text was covered over by a layer of black wax. This had apparently been used to seal the documents for the purpose of preservation when they were placed in storage. The columns of writing are rather larger than those found in 'The Scroll of the War' and this is so even in the damaged condition of this scroll, the height of the document being as much as 13 ins. approximately and containing as many as 39 lines of script. As is the case with the other documents in this find, the script is frequently written with ligatures between the letters. Dr. Cross regards this tendency to write with ligatures as one of the more striking features of these scrolls and one which indicates their antiquity.

One of the scrolls which came into the possession of the American Schools of Oriental Research through the Metropolitan of St. Mark's was found to be written not in Hebrew but in Aramaic.

On examining this document Dr. Trever found that the softer side was becoming loose and so he removed a small section of it. He later removed a much larger portion; placing the new fragment with the earlier, the part now measured about $4\frac{3}{4}$ x $8\frac{1}{2}$ ins. and this gave substantial parts of 26 lines. Unfortunately the copyist who wrote out this scroll used very fine writing but employed a broad pen, with the result that the letters of the scroll are very badly blurred and therefore difficult to decipher. Moreover, the leather is in a tattered state and there are many lacunae in the text. It is thought that this manuscript must have been a very beautiful one in ancient times, for the scribe was a skilful one with a neat, fine script. He wrote 37 lines to the column, the total height of the scroll being $13\frac{1}{2}$ inches. The width it is impossible to determine from the fragments obtained by Dr. Trever.

Probably the most important of the scrolls which came into the possession of the Americans is the Scroll of the Book of Isaiah. This has been photographed completely and published for the use of scholars. The Scroll consists of 17 sheets of a rather coarse parchment or carefully prepared skins of the quality of parchment. These sheets are not all of equal size; in width they do not vary much, the average width of a sheet being .262m ($10\frac{5}{16}$ ins.), but the length varies from .252m (approx. 10 ins.) for the shortest which has two columns of writing, to .628m (approx. 25 ins.) for the longest which has four columns of writing. These 17 sheets are stitched together with linen thread and there is reason to think that besides being sewn with thread the sheets were glued together with some bituminous substance. The first 13 columns were in pieces when the Americans, Drs. Trever, Burrows and Brownlee, first handled it. The whole scroll contains 54 columns of writing, each column having between 29 and 32 lines. The length overall in its present state of preservation is 7.34m ($24\text{ft.}\frac{5}{16}$ ins.); allowing 15 to 20 cm. (6-8 ins.) cover at the beginning, the scroll was probably more than 7.5m. ($24\frac{1}{2}$ ft.) long. Each sheet of the scroll is ruled and the ruling is thought to have been done with a semi-sharp instrument of some sort. The ruling was done on the hair side of the sheet and tended to make a slight crease in the material

which is sometimes discernible on the reverse side of the scroll. In some places the manuscript has been torn and two bad tears in ancient times have been carefully repaired. One of these, a tear from the bottom of column 12 to within an inch of the top of the sheet has been sewn together with skill and has in no way impaired the reading of the text. A tear from the top of the scroll runs diagonally partly across column 18. This tear has been repaired by fastening a piece of thin, dark leather behind it, measuring about 3 x 1 in. There are five other smaller tears and several holes have been made in the sheets, or they may have been originally in the skin.

The first dozen or so columns of the Isaiah Scroll seem to have been handled more than the rest, for they show more evidence of wear than any other part of the scroll. It looks as if this scroll fared rather badly before it was deposited in the cave. Strips of dark leather have had to be put along some of the edges at an earlier period and the back has a much darkened area in the centre where the hands of readers have held it. The manuscript does not reveal the work of a very careful scribe, for there are many corrections in the text. Some of these are indicated by a dot above the text; at other times the scribe has inserted a missing word above the line. Once he has crowded two lines into the space normally allowed for one line; a few times he has crossed out a word or written the correct letter over the incorrect one; at least twice he has erased the word he has written. Sometimes it appears that a different pen has been used, for the strokes can hardly all have been produced by one pen. The large number of slips made by the scribe may be gauged by the remark of Dr. Burrows that in seven columns he had discovered 49 errors of various kinds which were corrected by the original scribe. Added to this there are many indications that the manuscript has been worked over by one or two correctors. Several large omissions were supplied by a later corrector or correctors. In places a few single words have been inserted by a later hand. One of the interesting things about this scroll is the series of marginal markings perhaps inserted at a later time to mark off sections for reading. Such marks have been

found also in the 'Manual of Discipline' which comes from the same cache.

The other important scroll which reached the Americans is called the Habakkuk Commentary, since it appears to be the Book of Habakkuk with a sort of running commentary on various verses from that prophet. The scroll was made of two strips of soft leather sewn end to end. As in the Scroll of Isaiah the writing has been done on the hair side of the skin, and must have been prepared by careful rubbing and is smooth to the touch. The reverse side is apparently left untreated and has a softer feel. The leather is about half a millimetre in thickness. The lines, as in the Isaiah Scroll, are ruled with some instrument, and lines are drawn to contain the columns which have ruled margins in between them. These lines have left a slight indent on the scroll.

It is unfortunate that the scroll at present is in a mutilated state. The whole length of the bottom edge shows signs of deterioration, so that at the bottom of each column there are some lines of text missing, while uneven surfaces extend from the edges of the breaks into the other lines of the columns. A part of the scroll at the beginning has become detached. This contains portions of two columns and means that most of column 1 is missing. Besides this, there are lacunae in several columns and flaking has taken place in some places. Owing to the mutilation of the scroll it is impossible to say what exactly were its original measurements. Apart from the broken portion at the commencement of the scroll, its maximum length is 141.9 cm. The probable length of the original scroll, if the damaged columns were of average size, must have been about 160 cm. long. The greatest height is about 13.7 cm., but to this there must be added the height of the missing lines above-mentioned. The severed portion at the beginning measures about 10 cm. The first of the two strips of leather making up the scroll measures about 62.75 cm, and the second is about 79.15 cm. in length. On the first strip there are at least seven columns of writing; on the second there are but six. The second strip extends beyond the text about 75.5 cm., but signs of crumbling at the edge

indicate that this may have been slightly longer. There do not seem to be any good grounds for thinking that this scroll was ever attached to a roller. The script is very clear and appears to have been written with more care than that of the Isaiah Scroll.

Among the other scrolls purchased by the Syrians, which later came into the hands of the Americans, was one at first named 'The Sectarian Document' but afterwards 'The Manual of Discipline', or alternatively 'The Sectarian Manual of Discipline'. This is made up of five pieces of leather whose total length is estimated to be about 1.86 metres and its height 24 cm. In the scroll which has come to us in two fragments there are 11 columns of writing, each column having on an average 26 lines. It has been thought that possibly the beginning of the scroll has disappeared and thus one or two columns are missing. Père de Vaux states that the Palestine Museum has acquired a fragment of manuscript in which 'the two initial columns of the Sectarian Document' are shown, and also several other fragments of the same document. It is too early to say whether this portion is from the scroll the Americans obtained or whether it is from a second copy of the scroll.

Reference has already been made to the fact that a second scroll of the Book of Isaiah had been purchased by the Hebrew University, Jerusalem. Little is known yet concerning this scroll apart from the fact that Dr. Susenik had published several columns of this document. It is sometimes referred to as the Isaiah 'B' Scroll. When it first came in to the hands of the Hebrew University authorities, it was in a bad condition, for its leather pages were so desiccated that it was almost impossible to unroll it. The leather was covered with an opaque deposit apparently caused by the disintegration of the substance of the document itself. Its text has had to be recovered by the use of infra-red photography. This has been successful and the most illegible lines can now be read. It has thus been possible to identify chapters 41-66. The script of this scroll is very fine and the writing shows signs of having been carefully done. Portions from Isaiah xlvi.17 to xlix.7 and 1.7 to 11.8 have been transcribed and, from further fragments in the Hebrew University, chps.xvi., xix., xx1-xxiii.,

xxviii, xxxviii-xxxix, have been identified. It thus appears that the Scroll of Isaiah 'B' contained the whole of our canonical Book, as also did the Scroll of Isaiah 'A'.

After the official excavation of the cave under Mr. Harding, a large number of manuscript fragments were recovered from the floor of the cave. Some of these have been identified, while others are too minute to be assigned to any text. Among these fragments, unlike the scrolls which are all written in the Square Hebrew character, even the Aramaic being so written, there are some written in the earlier Phoenician type of script. The scrolls of which these must at some time have formed part are said to be part of a collection of Biblical Books, among which the following have been identified:- a text of the Book of Leviticus written in the Phoenician script and texts of the Books of Genesis, Deuteronomy, Judges and Daniel.

In connexion with the Book of Daniel, texts of which have been recovered among the manuscript fragments found in the cave, it may be noted that the Americans say that, among the scrolls they have, texts of this Book have been identified. In the matted mass of leather fragments were three sections from the Book of Daniel, in addition to several fragments from some other piece of Hebrew religious literature. It is interesting to find that the three fragments of Daniel are said to be from two different scrolls. The script of these pieces is similar palaeographically to the Isaiah 'A' Scroll, while the other is close to the Habakkuk Scroll script. Two of these pieces are from the same column and contain portions of Dan.iii.23-30 in Aramaic, while the third fragment contains portions of two columns: Dan.i.10-16 and ii.2-6 (including the point where the Aramaic part begins). One of the pieces of the passage from Dan.iii.23-30 measures $4 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ ins., and the other from the same column is $2\frac{1}{2}$ ins. square. Together they show that the column must have been about 6 in. wide originally. The other fragment measures about $5\frac{1}{2} \times 3$ ins., and the columns were probably about 4 ins. wide. It is interesting to notice that the names Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego are found on this portion.

In closing this description of the Dead Sea Scrolls, reference may be made to the fact that there is the possibility that many more manuscripts from this area will come to light. In February, 1953, news came that manuscripts had been found in another cave in the vicinity of the Dead Sea. Dr. Tushingham reports that 'the new manuscripts coming out - to judge by pieces already acquired by the Palestine Archeological Museum - are most important. They are absolutely unique and they make the initial discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls seem rather "tame" in comparison'. It is said that 75% of the Books of the Old Testament are now reported to be represented in the finds. According to the New York Times, January, 1953, Père de Vaux says that one of the new scrolls, dating from the 1st century A.D., contains the original Aramaic text of the 'Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs'.

C) Description of The Containers.

When the first official investigation of the Manuscript Cave was made under the direction of the Chief Curator of Antiquities, Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, the floor was found littered with some hundreds of potsherds which evidently belonged to the cache of documents and was mixed up with over 600 fragments of manuscripts together with pieces of cloth wrappings. Most of these jars in which the manuscripts had been concealed in early times were taken to the Palestine Archeological Museum in Jerusalem and have been restored by technicians to their original shape. It is possible to state now that all the jars are of the same general type, and it has been computed by Mr. Harding that the number of jars must have been more than 50. Each jar measures about 60 cms. high and 25 cms. wide. It has been estimated by the excavators that a single jar could have held easily five or six scrolls similar to those found, so that it is probable that the cave originally may have held as many as 200 such manuscripts. Each jar had a peculiar type of lid as cover and it is thought that the scrolls were first wrapped up in the linen cloth found and then impregnated with pitch, and then, after having been placed inside the jar containers, the lids were also sealed to prevent any deterioration of the scrolls during their concealment.

When the jars were first discovered, it was agreed by competent archeologists that they were of a type hitherto unknown, and Père de Vaux and others who examined them thought that they were of the Hellenistic period. In 1951 excavations were conducted by the Ecole Biblique et Archeologique Francaise, the Palestine Archeological Museum, and the American Schools of Oriental Research, at Kirbet Qumran. Among other things brought to light was a jar identical in shape and type to those found in the Cave of the Scrolls, and with the jar they found coins dating as late as the 1st revolt (67 A.D.). This find appears to alter the estimate previously made concerning the jars and suggests that they are to be placed in a period ranging from the 1st century B.C. to the 1st century A.D.

A further expedition took the field in 1953 under the supervision of the same team to explore the caves near the northwest shore of the Dead Sea in the neighbourhood of Kirbet Qumran and at times only 100 yards from the site where the first Scrolls were found. The expedition succeeded in locating and excavating 39 caves and crevices which contained pottery. Of this number, 25 were found to contain complete and broken storage jars, lids and other vessels similar to those discovered at Kirbet Qumran and in the cave of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Two caves contained fragments of parchments inscribed with Hebrew characters. These are thought to come from both canonical and non-canonical manuscripts. In one cave two sheets of oxidized copper, about 8 ft. long when joined together as they were originally, were found. The condition of these is so brittle that they will need great care in unrolling them. These copper scrolls are engraved with many lines of Hebrew characters. It is obvious that all this new material will have to be reckoned with in future descriptions of the materials from the cave of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

D) Nomenclature and Abbreviations.

As so many scholars have applied their own designations to the Dead Sea Scrolls, it has been suggested by Dr. M. Burrows that some standard form of designation should be adopted and the one below seems to be finding favour in academic circles, following on the publication of 'The Dead Sea Scrolls' Volume I by the American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950. It is therefore used throughout.

DS	The Dead Sea Scrolls
DSD	The Sectarian Manual of Discipline
DSH	The Habakkuk Commentary
DSIa	The St. Mark's Isaiah Manuscript (Isaiah 'A')
DSIb	The Hebrew University Isaiah Manuscript (Isaiah 'B')
DSL	The Aramaic 'Lamech Apocalypse'
DST	The Thanksgiving Psalms
DSW	The War of the Sons of Light with the Sons of Darkness.

In cases where fragments of manuscripts have been used from those bought from bedouin or recovered in the excavation, it has further been suggested that these should be indicated by a similar abbreviation. For example, a fragment of Genesis might be denoted thus: DSfGEN. (Dead Sea Fragment of Genesis), and fragments too small to be identified properly should be numbered.

CONTENTS OF THE DOCUMENTS

THE ISAIAH SCROLL 'A'

THE ISAIAH SCROLL 'B'

THE HABAKKUK COMMENTARY SCROLL

THE LAMECH APOCALYPSE

THE MANUAL OF DISCIPLINE

THE HYMNS OF THANKSGIVING

THE SCROLL OF WAR BETWEEN LIGHT & DARKNESS

I. CONTENTS OF THE DOCUMENTS.

DSIa.

This scroll of 54 columns contains the complete text of the biblical Book of Isaiah with the exception of a very few lacunae, which, apart from a dozen small holes, number about ten and according to Dr. Burrows the missing text can in all but one case be restored from the Massoretic Text without any question. The Text of this scroll, apart from significant differences in spelling and grammar and many variant readings, is substantially that of the canonical Massoretic Text of our Book of Isaiah.

DSIb.

Very little is yet known about this scroll, but from what has already been published by Dr. Susenik it can be safely assumed that it contained at one time the whole of the Book of Isaiah. Yet this scroll is not a replica of the 'A' Scroll, for each of the two scrolls shows its own characteristics. This is specially the case in the matter of orthography, where 'A' differs considerably from 'B'. If 'B' presents, so far as the matres lectionis are concerned, a text broadly speaking like the Massoretic Text, 'A', on the other hand, presents a text in which there is an abundance of matres lectionis. In this matter it can be said that the 'A' text reveals to us a pronunciation of Hebrew which is richer in vowels than that fixed by the Massoretes. For instance, we find that the pronoun hu was, according to this text, pronounced as hu'a: so also the pronoun hi was pronounced hi'a: the pronominal suffix -hem as -hems, and so on. In the matter of grammar both in 'A' and 'B' there are important variants to be discerned. The variants from the traditional text gain perhaps in importance from the fact that both these scrolls are substantially the same in their contents as the Massoretic Text. In 15 verses Dr. Dupont-Sommer has found the 'A' text of Isaiah 52-53 to have as many as 34 variants. Undoubtedly the 'B' text does not show so much variation, but it must be stated that there are no such things as 'insignificant variations' in texts on which so much scholastic effort has been spent as has been spent on this Book of Isaiah.

DSH.

The contents of this scroll may be set out as follows:

- I. The Religious Situation (col.1, line 1 to ii.10a; commentary on Hab.1.1-5).
The Wicked Priest, the Righteous Teacher and the Man of the Lie; The New Covenant which God has made known through the Righteous Teacher to the men of the last generation.
- II. The National (or International) Situation (col.ii.10b to vi.12a; commentary on Hab.1.6-17).
The subjection of the Holy Land to the Kittim, i.e. the Kassim (Chaldeans) of Hab.1.6.
- III. The Righteous Teacher and His Party (col.iv.12b to viii.3a; commentary on Hab.ii.1-4)
 - a) The rôle of the prophet Habakkuk (Hab.ii.1-2a).
 - b) The rôle of the Righteous Teacher (Hab.ii.2b).
 - c) The righteous who will be saved by their labour and their faith in the Righteous Teacher (Hab.ii.3-4).
- IV. The Wicked Priest and his Party (col.viii.3b to xii.10a; commentary on Hab.ii.5-17).
Their character and doom; their greed and persecution of the Righteous Teacher; condemnation of the Oracle of Lies (x.9ff).
- V. The Doom of Idolatrous Nations (col.xii.10b to xiii.4; commentary on Hab.ii.18-20).
Their destruction on the Day of Judgment.

The Hebrew of this Scroll in the Commentary is said to be largely biblical in vocabulary and usage, though some words are introduced which are used in a post-biblical sense. Sometimes in the Commentary the text which is presupposed is not based on the reading from Habakkuk which is cited; per contra the interpretation of Hab.ii.16 is based on the traditional reading and not on the one quoted in this text. The textual value of this document must be treated with caution, for it appears that when a text is quoted a second time the variants which occur may be due to errors of memory.

It can be seen from the analysis of the contents of DSH that the text of that prophetic Book is quoted piecemeal, each citation being followed by the short interpretation, which in most cases was introduced by the expression 'this means' or 'this refers to'. Dr. Burrows is of the opinion that the purpose of these explanatory phrases was to apply the statements of the Book of Habakkuk to a historical situation which had arisen in the commentator's own day, or at least to a situation which was of recent memory in the writer's day. It has been much discussed whether this scroll should be regarded as a 'Commentary' in the strict sense or rather

as in the nature of a 'midrash' on the text. As Dr. Roberts has remarked, the exegesis depends primarily on the meaning which is attached to the word peshar which occurs in the text. Whether the word should be rendered 'commentary', 'interpretation' or 'midrash' is still a matter of debate. An examination of its usage suggests that any one convenient English concept fails to indicate its function properly. On the surface it appears to correspond with the general type of interpretation common to apocalyptic literature, where an 'oracle' or revealed 'word' is supplied with an allegorical interpretation.

As regards the language of this scroll it is said by Dr. Burrows to be written in a Hebrew more nearly related to that of the Old Testament than to that of the Mishna.

It will have been noticed that in the analysis of this scroll the third chapter of the canonical prophet is absent. DSH ends its quotation of Habakkuk with the words: 'Keep silence before him all the earth'. This is clearly the last phrase from that Book to be used, for after the comment on these words a blank space of ten clear lines follows. It has often been suggested by critics that the last chapter of Habakkuk (called 'A Prayer of Habakkuk') is a late addition made to the Book.¹ The absence in DSH of this chapter seems to lend support to this, although it would be rash to assume this, since this chapter has found support as being an original part of the Book of Habakkuk by Dr. Albright in a recent study² and Dr. Delcor has written³: 'It is much simpler to suppose that the commentator did not use the Psalm since it did not favour his spiritual interpretation'.

¹ 'Some Observations on the Damascus Document & Dead Sea Scroll' - Bledlyn Roberts, p.368 (John Rylands Bulletin Vol.34, No.2, March, 1952).

² 'Studies in O.T. Prophecy' - Albright, Edin.1950.

³ 'Il est beaucoup plus simple de penser que le commentateur n'a pas utilisé un psaume qui ne favorisait pas son interprétation spirituelle' - 'Le Midrash D'Habacuc', Delcor, p.22 (Les Editions du Cerf, 1951).

DSL.

Owing to the difficulties of unrolling, this scroll has not yet been published, but photographs of portions detached from it by Dr. Trever were sent to Dr. Albright who made the suggestion that from certain key-words which he had noted on it his opinion was that the text came from the Book of Enoch, but he had not been able to discover any parallels close enough to identify it with certainty. After DSL arrived in America, Dr. Trever, as has been mentioned, removed a further portion of the scroll and, placing it with the previous one, he employed several techniques on the fragments in order to obtain good photographs of them. With the photographs he obtained and with constant reference to the original scroll, he managed to copy and transcribe something like 26 lines of the script, but there still remained many lacunae. He found one combination of letters in this scroll which eventually afforded him a clue to its identity. This group of letters was bt'nws. He found that according to the Ethiopic Book of Jubilees iv.28 the wife of Lamech was there named 'Betenos'. The name of Lamech was also identified in the scroll, for it came twice in Dr. Trever's fragment, in lines 3 and 19. The name 'Bit'enos' occurs in lines 3 and 8. One line of the text Dr. Trever was able to translate as follows: 'Then I, Lamech, hastened to go in unto Bit'enos.....'. From this phrase he concluded that this must be the Apocryphal Book of Lamech which is mentioned once in a Greek list of apocryphal books.

Following on from this, he prepared a large, clear copy of his previous transliteration of the text and sent this to Dr. C. C. Torrey of Yale, for his consideration. In his reply Professor Torrey observed:

The consistent use of the first person in the Fragment, shows that it was truly a Lamech apocalypse, quite distinct from the Book of Enoch. In my judgment, this framework was given up when this portion of the work was made a part of the Book of Enoch and adapted to it; for there, as you see, Lamech is spoken of only in the third person, while the one who speaks in the first person is Enoch! My guess, then, would be that your Fragment represents the original form of the apocalypse.....

 The important thing, after all, is that the Fragment has been identified, positively and certainly, and that its principal content can be seen.

Dr. Torrey made the suggestion that in line 19 of DSL, Lamech speaks to Methuselah and that in line 22 he speaks to Enoch. Dr. Trever has made a careful check of the photographs and the originals at these places and he is convinced that these readings are correct. He notes that he has discovered the name Enoch again in line 24. Further, he observes that the word 'my father' evidently follows the name Methuselah and the term 'his father' follows Enoch in both instances. With this may be compared the passages in Genesis v.21,25 and 29, where the genealogy is given. Dr. Trever has not come across the name Noah in these texts, even though Noah is the real hero of the story. The context of the readings makes it quite plain that he is the centre of the discussion.

The condition of this scroll, according to Dr. Trever, is such that it will require most careful scientific investigation if it is to be made available for scholarly study. The fine writing of the original text will render it difficult to produce a readable facsimile. Even a good transliteration will call for close study and patience in identifying the uncertain words. Little more can be said on the contents of DSL until the scroll is successfully unrolled. One of its interests for scholars lies in the fact that unlike most of the scrolls it is written in Aramaic.

SD.

This scroll is undoubtedly one of the most interesting of the S. It may be described, according to Dr. Burrows, as the Manual of Discipline of some community or sect of Judaism. The document begins with a series of infinitives, in the form 'to keep the commandments of the Lord', etc. These may be regarded as part of an exhortation or a promise. If an exhortation, then Dr. Burrows thinks they may belong to a series, the beginning of which, in the portion of the document which is now missing, perhaps began something like the passage in Deut.viii.6: 'Therefore thou shalt keep the commandments of the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, and to fear him', or else like the passage in Deut.x.12,13: 'and now, Israel, what doth the Lord thy God require of thee, but to fear the Lord.....?'. Dr. Burrows draws attention to the fact that there are many reminiscences of the language of Deuteronomy

in this scroll. He wonders, however, if the long series of infinitives may not rather be a series of promises than a series of exhortations. This leads him to suggest that they are part of an oath of initiation which was required to be taken by those who, to use the words of the text itself, 'enter into the Covenant'. This could mean that such an oath was regularly taken by the members of the sect to which this work belonged, on their being initiated into it, or perhaps Israel as a religious group is thought of as a body into which the individual Israelite must enter voluntarily, rather than by right of birth. The hypothesis that this is to be regarded as an oath of initiation finds some support in the fact that the document goes on to give what looks like a ritual of initiation. First the priests recount the blessings which will follow obedience to the laws, whereupon those who are entering into the Covenant respond with 'Amen'; then the Levites recount the curses which disobedience will bring, and again the initiates respond with 'Amen', just as in Deut.xxvii.

The contents of DSD have been analyzed by Dr.Brownlee in his translation as follows:-

The Covenant of the Community (col.1.1 to iii.12)
The Instruction of the Community (col.iii.13 to iv.26)
The Practice of the Community (col.v.1 to vi.23)
The Discipline of the Community (col.vi.24 to ix.11)
The Seasons of the Community (col.ix.12 to xi.22)

Dr.Dupont-Sommer states that 'This book is none other than the "customary law" or the "rule" (serek) of the Community of the New Covenant founded by "the Master of Justice"'. It apparently was composed of priests, since DSD speaks of 'the priests who keep the covenant'; but it also included the laity, for it speaks of 'the members of the Community who have bound themselves to the covenant following the example of these (priests)'. Thus the society is a combination of these two elements.

DST.

This scroll has come to us in four sheets of leather. Three could be unrolled without much difficulty, but the fourth was in such bad condition that it could not easily be unrolled. There are in these scrolls a series of Psalms after the biblical pattern. These are said to number about 20 in all, but so far only about 5

have been published. They are composed in verse with the usual method of parallelisms with which we are familiar in the Psalter. In style these Psalms greatly resemble the ones in the Psalter and other parts of the poetical sections of the Old Testament. Dr. Susenik in 'Megillot Genuzot' has reproduced parts of these Psalms in extenso, together with photographs. From these Dr. Ginsberg points out that the Hebrew script resembles that found in DSH. In fact, it is closer to the type of script found in DSH than that in DSD, according to Dr. Ginsberg, and he thinks it has even less resemblance to DSJa. The k, p and s, as well as the m and n, have distinctive final forms. As regards the orthography of DST and DSW, Dr. Ginsberg notes that the word kol (all) is always written scriptio plene as it is in the Syrian-owned documents; and again as in the Syrian-owned manuscripts, vowel-letters are generally abundant otherwise: for instance, the suffix of the 2nd pers. sing. masc. is written as a rule, not as -k but -kah, and the particle ki usually ki'. On the other hand, while there are no examples of the suffix of the 2nd pers. plur. masc., the suffix of the 3rd pers. plur. masc. ends in -m, not in -hm.

Dr. Cross has also given us some comments on DST. He mentions that the columns of writing are rather larger than those used in DSW. The hymns in this collection, according to Dr. Cross, are allied to the later psalms in the canonical Psalter and in style are very reminiscent of them. It would seem that there are direct borrowings of phrases and poetical clichés from the Bible. At times an entire line in the Psalter can be paralleled in these Hymns of Thanksgiving. Nevertheless, Dr. Cross states that even a summary survey of the fragments which Prof. Susenik has edited shows a marked change in the mood of these Psalms from those in the canonical Psalter. He thinks that their language as well as their interest reveals a later development of thought.

Dr. Cross gives one complete thanksgiving hymn from the publication of Dr. Susenik's volume. The tentative translation of it

is sufficient to bring out the nature of this scroll:-

I shall praise thee, my Lord;
For thou hast set my soul in the "bundle of life"
And didst protect me from all the snares of the Pit.
And violent men sought my life while I firmly held to
thy covenant,
But they are an assembly of vanity and a congregation
of Belial,
They knew not that my position was from thee,
And through thy faithful deeds thou dost save my life.
For my steps are guided by thee,
And they also were directed by thee to stir up
strife against my life,
In order that thou mightest glorify thyself through
the judgment of the wicked,
And do mighty deeds through me before the children
of men.....
And I said: Warriors camped against me,
They surrounded me with all their battle weapons,
And they shot arrows until there was no cure,
And the blade of the spear was like a fire
consuming trees.
And the uproar of their voices was like the tumult
of many waters,
A driving storm to destroy many.
.....
When their waves lifted themselves up -
And as for me, when my heart melted like water -
Then thou didst strengthen my soul by thy covenant.
As for them, they spread a net for me;
It catches their own feet.
They hid snares for my life;
They fall into them.
And my foot standeth on level ground.
In the assemblies I shall bless thy name.

It is clear from this extract that these texts approximate very closely to the biblical type. A further passage is here quoted which, in the view of Dr. Cross, would seem to deal with a great crisis and is couched partly in poetic style and partly in apocalyptic. The poetic part looks as if extravagant poetic phrases from the Old Testament have been used for the composition. It is much to be regretted that in this text given by Dr. Susenik there are several obscurities and that the text breaks off before we are able to identify the precise significance of the passage. Dr. Cross gives the portion which is particularly full of biblical allusions:-

When all the snares of the Pit are opened,
And all the nets of wickedness spread,
And the net of the miserable(?) is on the waters,
When all the arrows of the Pit fly till there is no recovery,
And are shot until there is no hope,
When the line falls for judgment,
And the lot of wrath is on the abandoned ones,
And the outpouring of anger is on the treacherous (?)
And all Belial has a season of wrath,
And the cords of death surround until there is no escape
And the torrents of Belial flow over all the banks
of the waters.....

It will be possible from these extracts to see that an intense spiritual atmosphere animates these psalms. There is no author's name attached and perhaps they are from several hands.

DSW.

This scroll has been the subject of much debate because of the obscurity of its contents. It is very hard to decide the character of its writing. Apparently it is not an apocalypse in which the Battle of the Ages is seen in vision. Dr. Dupont-Sommer has called it a 'Rule of Battle for the Sons of Light'. This is because the term 'Sons of Light' is found in it and it seems to deal with a War about to take place. It treats of the manner in which the war is to be conducted and it appears that the war mentioned in this manuscript is in the nature of a 'Holy War'.

Dr. Cross shows, as Dr. Ginsberg has also done, that the war between 'the Children of Light and the Children of Darkness' suggests a conflict between Jews and Gentiles, in which 'the Children of Light' are the Jews of Levitical, Judahite and Benjaminite ancestry and the opposition is composed of 'the troops of Elom and Moab, and the children of Ammon....Philistia, and the troops of the Kittites of Assyria', which may possibly be a reference to the Seleucid Greeks.

Dr. Cross draws attention to the way in which the prescribed battle formation is described in detail. The Jewish host with the banner of the army and its troops, the trumpet (or clarion) calls used as a means of communication to direct battle, and the weapons of war, are all described in detail in the document. Various types of soldiery are described. The necessary ages for these are set down; cavalymen are to be between 30 and 45 years of age, officers are to be between 40 and 50, army commanders from 50 to 60, and the common soldier is to be between 25 and 30. The divisions of the army are given in detail too: the armies are divided into groups of 1000, 100, 50 and 10 with captains over each detachment; all this has its parallel in the descriptions of warfare in the Old Testament.

A further peculiarity of DSW is brought out by Dr. Cross, who draws attention to the fact that considerable energy is spent on a description of the battle flags. In one phrase we are told that 'on the great banner which goes before all the people, they shall write "People of God"(El) and the name Israel and Aaron and the names of the twelve tribes of Israel'. On another banner which went before a regiment were the words 'the wrath of God will burn against Belial and against the men whose lot is with him until none survives'. On the company standards there was to be inscribed this motto: 'from God comes the force of battle against all the wicked flesh'. On the platoon standards there was to be written the words 'the position of power (literally 'standing place') of evil men shall come to an end through the might of God', and on the battle flags of squads there was to be these words: 'Joyful praise with the harp (be to) God'. Also during certain stages of the battle were to be displayed various banners: 'when they go to battle, let them write on their banners, "truth of God, righteousness of God, glory of God, judgment of God": when the army closed with the foe, in the first onslaught of fighting, banners were to be displayed bearing these words, "the right hand of God, the appointed time of God, the tumult of God, the slain of God". When the army of Israel retired from the battle, it had to unfurl banners on which the following words were set forth: "the adoration of God, the greatness of God, the glory of God".

Details are also given of the series of trumpet calls to be used in the direction of the troops in battle. These trumpet calls were to be blown by the priests and Levites. Among the special calls there are included calls of 'assembly', calls of 'pursuit' and such like. The trumpets with which these calls were to be given were to be decorated with special slogans. On the trumpets to be used to give the signal for pursuit, for example, the words to be inscribed were: 'God smiteth all the children of darkness: let not his anger subside until they are annihilated'.

Dr. Cross further points out that DSW prescribes certain words of exhortation and certain prayers which the 'head priest' is to address to the people when the troops go out to battle or during a lull between attacks. Prof. Susenik has included in his volume the greater part of this prayer of the 'head priest' on behalf of the people. It runs as follows:-

Arise, O Warrior,
Take thy captives, O Glorious Man,
And gather thy spoil, Doer of Mighty Deeds.
Put forth thy hand on the neck of thy enemies,
And thy standard on the heaps of the slain.
Smite the nations by adversaries,
And may thy sword devour guilty flesh.
Fill thy land with glory
And thy inheritance with blessing,
A multitude of cattle in thy fields,
Silver and gold and precious stones in thy palaces.

O Zion, rejoice greatly,
And break forth with joyful song, O Jerusalem,
And let the cities of Judah exult.
Open thy gates for ever
That (men) may bring in to thee the might of nations,
And their kings serve thee.
All thy oppressors will do obeisance to thee,
And the dust of thy feet they shall lick.

O daughters of my people,
Shout aloud with a voice of rejoicing,
Deck yourselves with glorious ornaments.....

It seems clear, as Dr. Cross says, that the above is very largely a patchwork of biblical expressions. For instance, some of the phrases would appear to have been taken over verbatim into this prayer from the later portion of Isaiah, particularly ch. ix.

Following this quotation from Dr. Susenik's publication, Dr. Cross gives a translation of a hymn of thanksgiving which was to be used on the occasion of Israel's victory over her foes:

Blessed be the God of Israel
Who is faithful to his covenant
And to the testimonies of salvation for the
people redeemed by him.
.....
For we are thy people.
For thy deeds of faithfulness we praise thy name,
And for thy mighty acts we exalt (thee).
.....
Be highly exalted, O God of gods
And be lifted up in thy strength.

Dr. Cross informs us that Prof. Susenik has reproduced the whole of the 7th column of DSW and that it contains instructions for an attack on the enemy by shock troops. This column breaks into a description of battle strategy and procedure, towards the end of a description of a preparatory 'artillery' barrage by some stone-slingers. After the slingers have cast their stones 7 times against the enemy, trumpets of 'withdrawal' are to be sounded by the police and the slingers are to drop back into line. Then the trumpets are to sound the signal 'assembly' and thereupon the three formations of shock troops are to march forth from the city (Jerusalem?) and take up their positions over against the enemy. They are to be flanked on either side by the cavalymen. After this there are to be two more signals from the trumpets. These are calls to the troops to direct them to their battle stations and to prepare them to make themselves ready for the attack. A description of the attack is given thus:

And the priests shall sound a blast on the six clarions of the slain.....to direct the battle, and the Levites and all those with horns shall blow a single note, the great blast of battle to melt the heart of the enemy; and with the note of the clarion blast the missiles of war (perhaps a type of spear?) shall be hurled to fell the slain. They shall increase the noise of the horns and the priests shall be blowing on the clarions..
.....to direct procedures (?) of battle until they have cast (their missiles) seven times against the battle line of the enemy.

At this point the trumpets were to sound the signal to retreat.

Dr. Cross directs attention to the 12th column of DSW, where A DESCRIPTION IS GIVEN OF THE CEREMONIES attending the celebration of VICTORY. This is as follows:

And after they have departed from the slain to return to camp, they shall all joyfully sing the Hymn of Returning, and the next morning they shall wash their clothes and cleanse themselves of the blood of the guilty corpses and return to the site of their (battle) stand where they had drawn up (their) army before the dead of the enemy fell. And there all of them shall bless the God of Israel and exalt his name in joyful unison. And they shall take up speech and say, "Blessed be the God of Israel who is faithful to his covenant and the testimonies of salvation for the people redeemed by him.....".

II. DATING OF DOCUMENTS & VIEWS OF SCHOLARS.

E.L.SUSENIE

F.M.CROSS

O.R.SELLERS

R.DE VAUX

A.BENTZEN

M. DELCOR

L.HARDING

R.P.R.TOURNAY

O.H.LEHMANN

P.KAHLE

B.J.ROBERTS

G.R. DRIVER

S.ZEITLIN

E.R. LACHEMAN

S.A.BIRNBAUM

W.F.ALBRIGHT

J. MAUHLIN

H.H.ROWLEY

SUMMARY AND CONSPECTUS OF VIEWS ON DATING OF DOCUMENTS

SEQUENCE AND DATES OF THE EXTRA-BIBLICAL DS AND THE ZADOKITE WORK

II. DATING OF DOCUMENTS AND VIEWS OF SCHOLARS.

It must be pointed out that in stating the views of certain scholars in connexion with the above and in making comparisons between their views, a certain amount of overlapping and repetition is unavoidable, since the facts upon which the judgments of scholars rest remain constant, but the interpretations of those facts greatly vary.

E.L.Susenik.

Dr.Susenik has been rightly cautious in his published statements concerning the supposed dates of the DS, yet he has estimated that some, if not all, of them go back at least to the beginnings of the Christian era, the period before the destruction of the Jewish Temple by the Romans in 70 A.D. It is unfortunate that the preliminary survey of the DS in possession of the Hebrew University was published in modern Hebrew. Thus it was only possible to obtain his views from scholars like Dr.Ginsberg to whom modern Hebrew presents no obstacle. It is to him and to Dr.Cross that this account of his views is due.

Dr.Susenik holds that the cave in which the DS were concealed was in the nature of a genizah, i.e. a storage place for old rolls and fragments of rolls no longer of any use. Dr.Cross does not think that this view of the contents would account for the fact that the scrolls were evidently carefully laid aside and stored for futurity. The condition of DS1a and DS2 does not support such a view in his opinion, as it seems unlikely that scrolls laid on one side as useless would have been sealed in jars. He is more inclined to regard them as portions of an ancient library which was placed in the cave for safety, perhaps in a time of crisis. That such storage of manuscripts was not unusual Dr.Cross shows from the fact that similar discoveries were made in the region

of the Jordan Valley in early Christian times. He refers to Origen's mention of the discovery of Greek and Hebrew manuscripts found stored in jars in the region of Jericho. This happened in the reign of Antoninus, the son of Severus, called Caracalla (198-217 A.D.). One of these very manuscripts was used by Origen in the preparation of his famous Hexapla; apparently it was a Greek copy of the Psalms.

Dr. Cross mentions Prof. Susenik's section in 'Megillot Genuzot' in which an attempt is made to evaluate the DS by comparison with a few of the more important contemporary Hebrew manuscripts. The most important, according to Dr. Susenik, is the Nash Papyrus, the pre-Christian dating of which he accepts. He also deals with the funerary inscription of Uzziah which Dr. Susenik discovered in the Russian Archeological Museum on the Mount of Olives in 1931. This letter is written in Aramaic and had been lying unnoticed in the Museum since before 1894. Other ossuary inscriptions are introduced into the discussion in Dr. Susenik's 'Megillot Genuzot'. He is well able to speak in the matter of the ossuary inscriptions, for, as Dr. Cross notes, it is in this field that the Professor is our leading and most experienced authority, having been actively engaged in the archeological research of ossuary inscriptions of the first century. Dr. Cross shows how Dr. Susenik's conclusions are, in the main, in close accord with other first-rank palaeographers who have compared the script and spelling of the DS with the relevant inscriptional material.

F. M. Cross.

Dr. Cross thinks that the early date and authenticity of DS is corroborated 'beyond cavil' by this palaeographical evidence. He assumes that the Hebrew University scrolls are linked as regards script and orthography with the latest of the Syrian-owned manuscripts, i.e. with DSH and also with the unrolled DSL. He argues from this that these copies date from the latter part of the 1st century B.C. or perhaps a little later. DS is he regards as the earliest document of the whole cache and this/

this he would place in the 2nd century B.C.

As regards DSW, Dr. Cross points out that there is no indication of any title or name of an author to whom it can be assigned, and no direct evidence within the text which would enable any precise date to be fixed for its composition. Nevertheless, he feels that the mentions of the 'Kittites of Assyria' and the 'Kittites of Egypt' are good evidence for placing the date of D.S.W.'s composition after the break-up of Alexander's Empire which followed Alexander's death in 323 B.C. He believes it is quite possible that DSW may have been composed before the fall of the Antiochid Empire, i.e. before 64 B.C., and almost certainly before the end of the Hasmonean line in 37 B.C. Naturally he is not in a position to suggest just whereabouts within this wide range of years the work ought to be placed. Dr. Cross is conscious that the fact that the Hebrew of the scroll appears to be intermediate between the late biblical Hebrew and the later dialect of the Hebrew of the Mishna does not lead to any conclusion regarding the date of the scroll which could be considered as final. He inclines, however, to the opinion of Prof. Susenik who seems to favour a date for DSW sometime before the rise of the Maccabean priest-kings.

O.R. Sellers.

Dr. Sellers, who was present at certain stages of the excavation of the cave where the DS were found, is influenced very much by the script of the fragments recovered at that time. These he is convinced are all pre-Christian. Some of them Dr. Sellers would place before the 2nd century B.C. He has no doubt about the authenticity and the antiquity of the DS and regards the archeological evidence as strongly in favour of the views pronounced by others that a pre-Christian date is to be deduced from the epigraphical and the literary evidence. In 1949 he held that the DS were deposited in the cave not later than the 1st century B.C. and that some of them must have been considerably older than the jars in which they were placed.

E. de Vaux.

Père de Vaux was with Mr. L. Harding when the cave was excavated and he maintained that the jars were a good indication of the age of the manuscripts. De Vaux placed these jars, at first, as Hellenistic and coming from the end of the 2nd century B.C., or the beginning of the 1st century. The jars were given first place in his dating of the DS.¹ They constituted an essential element of the problem. But after he had conducted the excavations at Kirbet-Qumran the finding of this same type of jar made him modify his dating.² It is stated in the Manchester Guardian; April 7, 1952, that according to a letter received from Père de Vaux, the jars of the type found in the cave of the DS were in use in the second half of the 1st century A.D. for domestic purposes, within a mile of the cave, down to the Jewish rising of A.D. 66-70. De Vaux formally withdraws his previous conclusions that the jars were Hellenistic (say, 100 B.C.) and therefore dated from the Roman occupation. He also formally withdraws his conclusion that they had been specially made to contain the DS. On the contrary, he concludes that they were jars in normal domestic use during the 1st century of the Roman occupation. Finally, he also formally withdraws his conclusion that a small jug, lamps and other objects found in the cave indicate traces of persons who found their way into the manuscript cave at a later date. He considers that these objects may have been left by those who originally hid the jars containing the DS.

A. Bentzen.

The late Dr. Bentzen reviewed the matter of the DS in his last edition of his 'Introduction to the Old Testament'. After consideration of the pros and cons of the question, he states that 'while the scepticism concerning the genuineness of

¹ 'qui...apporte à ce problème un élément essentiel' - de Vaux, RB. p. 236.

² 'Aucun des manuscrits n'est donc postérieur au début du Ier. siècle av. J.-C. et certains peuvent être beaucoup plus vieux' - ibid. p. 236.

the scrolls now seems to have vanished, the discussion of their age is still going on, and it does not seem advisable to be too emphatic on this matter'. He notices that Père de Vaux's withdrawals concerning the dating of the jars have made a very early date more uncertain on archeological grounds. He is disinclined to try to date either the Nash Papyrus or the DS too precisely, but states as regards the latter that a vague indication such as 'about the beginning of our era' would best express his own feelings in the matter.

At the same time he feels that Form-critical investigations will help to decide the point in debate. Attention is drawn to the prose of the DS which, according to Dr. Bentzen, exhibits a variety of styles. The DSH has a type not found in the canonical literature, whereas the DSD should be regarded as a sort of law-book, yet it uses several styles. Its introductory formulae he finds to have affinity with parts of Deuteronomy and P sections of Gen-Num. The liturgy of the Covenant in DSD has a likeness to the later strata of the Law. Some of its parts are like the sections in the New Testament. Others again are similar to the writings of the Stoics and this seems to him to suggest the influence of Hellenistic style on Wisdom literature, especially from the Diatribe. This leads him to think that the prose of the DSD is most related to late Wisdom literature in prose, where the sentential style disappears. So that we have a 'fusion' of the parenetic style of Deuteronomy and the Law of Holiness and the late Hellenistic prose of Wisdom. In other parts of DSD he finds the Legal style is preserved in a sort of 'categorical, apodeictic commandments'; there is also a 'hypothetical, casuistic legal style'. From all this he arrives at the conclusion that DSD shows a typical example of the mixture of styles of later and latest ages.

It should be noted that the attempt to date the DSD on the grounds of Form-critical investigation would primarily lead to a dating of the text and not the dating of the copy, but these

indications that the style is later than Sirach and similar to Sapientia and the New Testament would, if true, be a warning against too early dating of the DS.

M. Delcor.

In his 'L'Essai sur Le Midrash D'Habacuc', Dr. Delcor is impressed with the evidence of the jars in which, it seems, the DS were once contained. His quotation from Père de Vaux shows that this has affected his view, for after mentioning that Dr. Susenik had purchased two of the jars for the Hebrew University Museum he goes on to say that, after having seen these jars for himself, in the judgment also of P. de Vaux, P. Vincent, Mr. Harding, Prof. Sellers, Albright, Susenik and Dumand, 'these jars are to be dated at the end of the Hellenistic period. P. de Vaux says explicitly: "This pottery is from the 2nd century of our epoch, strictly at the beginning of the 1st century, certainly before the Roman era".....dated from the end of the Hellenistic period, these jars constitute the terminus ad quem for the dating of the most recent manuscripts.¹

As has been shown above, Père de Vaux has formally withdrawn this early dating of the jars and with it must go the views of all who have based their arguments mainly on the evidence of the pottery; but this does not mean that these jars found to be in use in the Roman period cannot be found in the Hellenistic period. It would rather indicate that they were still in use then. The Abbé T. Milik claims to have found a parallel to the jars in the Museum of Turin. These were brought from Deir el-Medineh in Egypt by Ernesto Schiaparelli at the beginning of this century and resemble the 'Ain Feshkha jars in type. Moreover, they are dated from the fact that they contained papyri bearing dates from 171 to 104 B.C.

¹ 'Datées de la fin de l'époque hellénistique ces jarres constituent le "terminus ad quem" pour la datation des plus récents manuscrits': Le Midrash d'Habacuc, M. Delcor, p.16.

Dr. Delcor has also raised the point that if, as some scholars suggest, the deposit in the cave was not made until well into the Roman period, then why should there be a lamp of Hellenistic type with the deposit? Lamps were common enough in the Roman period. Again he notes that some would link the deposit of the DS with the ruin of Kirbet-Qumran nearby, which some hold was a Roman fort of the 3rd or 4th century A.D. But, he asks, why should the deposit be thought to have been made when Kirbet-Qumran was in ruins? Could the deposit not have been made long before that happened? The building may not have been a Roman fortress then. It should be noted here that Mr. Harding is convinced that it was not a Roman fort, but the home of a community to whom the DS belonged.

Dr. Delcor also raises the point that some scholars have concluded that because there was found a number of manuscript fragments in the cave with writing on both sides that this indicates a time when the 'codex' form came into use, i.e. in the Christian period. But, he remarks, these are not codices which have been found, but only manuscript fragments. It has been said that the writing on these is not the same on both sides and it is not yet established whether they are the same texts. In any case, the custom of writing on the back of old manuscripts is older than the Christian period.

Linchester Harding.

As Chief Curator of Antiquities, Kingdom of Jordan, Mr. Harding had much to do with the excavation of the cave of the DS and also with the excavations at Kirbet-Qumran. He draws attention in his article in the Times, Aug. 9, 1949, to the controversy which has sprung up among scholars on the dating of the DS, 'some claiming the scrolls to be forgeries, some that they could not be earlier than the 12th century A.D., others admitting an early date, but uncertain whether the scrolls could be B.C. or A.D.'. After due consideration of all the data, he himself decides that DS1a can be dated 'from the second century B.C.' and the fragments which are written in the ancient type of

script he would place 'about the fourth or third century B.C.'. In 1953, in the light of his further study of the problem and the excavations of Kirbet-Quran on a more thorough basis, he claims that the DS were probably deposited in the cave just prior to the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D.70. This provided us with his terminus ad quem.

R.P.R.Tournay.

Writing in *Revue Biblique* on 'Les Anciens Manuscrits Hébreux récemment Découverts', Dr.Tournay makes a close study of the contents of the DS, more particularly of the non-canonical scrolls, and after a full examination he states¹ that 'it is yet impossible to declare in a firm way the probable date of our manuscripts'. Nevertheless, from their contents he inclines to place them in the Herodian period. He thinks that the linguistic evidence reveals a certain number of words which belong to the time of the Mishna and that the approximation of the DSIa to the Massoretic Text ill agrees with the time of the Maccabees, and that the relation of the DSW with the Zadokite Work all lead in this direction.

O.H.Lehmann.

This Oxford scholar has tried in the *Jewish Chronicle* to state briefly the evidence for the DS up to 1951. He thinks that more study of the contents will have to be made and the palaeography investigated further before any firm conclusions can be made. The points which he stresses can be summed up under several heads:-

The Method:

Until the Ancient Versions, the ancient scripts and the contents of DS have been related to documents of early and medieval texts, it is unsafe to state that the DS are all pre-Christian or to assign them all to a time after the emergence of the Karaites.

The Material:

The DS are not written on vellum or parchment like most of

¹ 'Il est encore impossible de se prononcer d'une façon ferme sur la date probable de nos manuscrits': Tournay, Revue Biblique, Avril 1949, p.232.

the genizah fragments. The occurrence of non-biblical manuscripts on leather after the 5th century becomes unlikely.

The jars:

Although there are similar jars in the Turin Museum of Hellenistic date there is no proof that the DS were in the jars. The pottery from Kirbet Qumran is significant for this problem.

The wrappers:

The carbon-isotope analysis made of the wrappers shows they may belong to the 1st century B.C. The scrolls may be assumed to have been wrapped in them by the evidence of particles of manuscript which were found adhering to them. But the margin of error allowed by the test stretches from the 2nd century B.C. to the 3rd century A.D.

Relation to the fragments.

If the DS were never in the cave, as some have suggested, then the fragments must have been brought in at a later date. This is a conclusion which most scholars hesitate to make.

The pre-Christian Origin.

Fragments with Greek script which have been found should be dateable within narrow limits. The omission of final letters in the scroll of Severus which the Romans took away in 70 A.D. should be examined in relation to the DSia together with Massoretic material.

DS and present Bible texts.

If it could be shown that the DSia and DSH yield evidence of having been corrected to accord with the present Bible text, that might indicate a 2nd or 3rd century A.D. dating. These two DS show signs of having been so corrected and therefore were deposited after that time. The dates of deposit for DS probably vary among themselves. This suggests they were not part of a Jewish auto-da-fé of non-canonical literature, as some have thought.

As to the more careful dating he is not prepared to do more than think a Roman date a possibility.

F.Kahle.

Dr.Kahle rejects the idea that the cave of the DS was a genizah and, as is well known, he is well-versed in such matters, as may be seen in his book 'The Cairo Genizah'. The absence of a synagogue near the cave is, in his opinion, against this view. He can find no true parallel between this cave and the Cairo Genizah. He is also of the opinion that the DS were not all introduced into the cave at the same time. 'I have the impression that the interval of time between the date of the oldest and latest manuscripts deposited there was greater than first assumed and that we have to reckon with an interval of several centuries.' On the other hand, he thinks that the DS, even the latest deposited in the cave, are 'centuries before the oldest manuscripts coming from the Genizah'. That is, they are centuries older than the 5th century A.D (which is the date he has given for the Aquila

palimpsest). Among other reasons for this statement is the fact that the Cairo Genizah fragments are all vocalised but the DS are not.

Dr. Kahle rejects the very early dating of Harding on the strength of two facts which he regards as significant. First, fragments were found in the cave written on both sides. That is taken to indicate a date when the Codex form was in being, i.e. after the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D. This is not conclusive of course, since some scholars say the writing is from different hands on both sides and if so, they may not be from codices. We must await publication of both sides of these fragments before use can be made of this argument. Secondly, Dr. Kahle has noted in DS1a that at Isaiah xxxiv.17 - xxxv.1 two complete lines have been added by what looks like the hand of a later corrector, and in this addition there is found the sign for final p which does not occur anywhere else in the DS1a. This is very important and Dr. Kahle notes that the insertion is in accord with the Massoretic Text at this point. If this is so, the addition cannot have been made before the rise of the Massoretic Text, i.e. before the 2nd century A.D. But the final p which is said to be found is by no means certain on inspection of the scroll itself, for it could just as easily be an ordinary p like the one two lines above it (line 16), of which the horizontal stroke had been obliterated.

As Dr. Kahle has placed stress on the fact that the cave contained codices and that 'manuscripts in codex form in the East can hardly be shown to have existed before the 2nd century A.D.'. It may be mentioned that Dr. Birnbaum has stated that 'there are 580 skin fragments from the cave and not one of them has writing on both sides. There are about 30 papyrus fragments, six of which have writing on both sides: three are indistinct: the writing of the fourth is not identical on both sides: one side is Greek, the other indistinct: the writing of the fifth is not identical on both sides, its script being indeterminate... The sixth fragment is definitely not from a codex because the writing runs in opposite direction on the two sides'.

A further point made by Dr. Kahle is that the building at Kirbet-Qumran is not, as Harding first thought, a Roman fortress. This was from the 3rd or 4th century A.D., but was a building connected with the DS and was in existence when the deposit of scrolls was made. He says of this: 'It may well be that an excavation of the site may throw some light on the deposit of the Cave'. Now Mr. Harding did conduct further excavations on this site, as is related above, and the result was to confirm Dr. Kahle's view that it was not a Roman fortress but also to date it circa A.D. 67 on the strength of the dated coins found there.

Dr. Kahle made the suggestion that the Roman-type cooking-pot found in the cave was used for the purpose of melting the pitch and sealing up the cache when it was deposited. This is an interesting suggestion, but can, in the nature of the case, only be a conjecture.

He does not hold that the manuscripts are only as old as his suggested date for the deposit of them in the cave. 'We have to reckon', he says, 'that some of the manuscripts were already several centuries old when they were deposited in the Cave. Such an old manuscript was - beside the scroll in ancient Hebrew script to which DS1ev. belonged - in the first instance DS1a'.

Strangely, he regards the fact of the scriptio plena as evidence for an early dating of DS1a, since this is the ground upon which other scholars would place it later. The second half of DS1a shows more influence of the scriptio plena than the first. Dr. Kahle thinks that this style of writing was adopted at a time when the Hebrew language was not familiar to many Jews and was used as an aid to reading. Such a time he seems to regard as the post-Maccabaeon period, i.e. the Hasmonean. He sees in the modern revival of Hebrew in Israel under the Zionist influence an interesting parallel, with its profusion of vowel letters as aids.

As regards DS1a, he states that the script shows it to be older than the other DS as the script of DS1a is still in a process of development. 'This we can see from the final letters'. He tells us that nun is the only final letter used regularly in this scroll. Very rarely is a final kaf found, and more often a final mem; but an ordinary mem occurs as often as final mem at the end of a word. 'Never do we find a final 'P' or 'sade'. This same unsettled nature of the final letters is also found by Dr. Kahle in the DSD, whereas in the other DS all the five final letters are used as in later manuscripts. This indicates for Dr. Kahle that the biblical manuscripts are considerably older than the non-canonical ones. He thinks that the scriptio plene did not continue after the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, when the official Hebrew Text took its rise. As a terminus ad quem, then, for DS1a, he seems to incline to 70 A.D. For DS1b, with its absence of this scriptio plene, he fastens on the 2nd century A.D. as a terminus a quo. This he also regards as a fixed point for DS1Deut., published by Mr. Harding. When he speaks of the dating of DSH he appears to be under the influence of Dupont-Sommer's theory of its origin, and thinks it can have been composed about 41 B.C., but he does not think that DSH is the original autography and it may have been copied before 70 A.D. : 'Perhaps at the beginning of our era'.

B.J. Roberts.

Dr. Roberts, writing in the Expository Times on a review of publications in connexion with the DS, has little new to offer, and, in the main, re-iterates the views of Dr. Kahle. He thinks that the finding of the non-canonical books among the canonical 'shows, however, that the present limits of the Hebrew canon of the Old Testament had not been defined at the time'. This definition (usually thought of as formally declared around 90 A.D. at the Synod of Jamnia) could easily have been much earlier and cannot be used to date the DS. The existence of non-canonical books is found in all periods.

Dr. Roberts mentions that Kahle suggests that the hiding of the DS was perhaps connected with the attempt of orthodox

Judaism to annihilate all sectarian literature and divergent textual recensions from the Massoretic Text and took place at the end of the 1st century A.D., but he does not think this is a correct view, as the presence of two divergent texts for Isaiah and other fragments in the cache would seem to contradict it. On the other hand, he thinks that the tradition for the authorization of the Massoretic Text, sometime in the 2nd century A.D., is strong and if it is historical would provide a terminus a quo for dating the DS. Thus it would be after the 1st century A.D.

G.R.Driver.

Writing in the Hibbert Journal and his publication 'The Hebrew Scrolls' and in several different articles, Dr. Driver has sought to establish a later date for the DS than had at first been claimed. He notes that the excessive scriptio plene of the DSIs and some peculiarities in the pronouns are important for the dating. He applies to DSIs the term used by Kahle for it, namely 'Vulgärtexzte' to which other scholars take exception on the grounds that it suggests that this text was inferior to the one in general use, and this is to beg the question.

Of the cache as a whole he thinks it must be connected 'or somehow be derived from a common source. They stand together in script and orthography, even though the manuscripts are hardly all of the same date'. When he comes to the date of the DS, he is careful to distinguish between the date of composition and the time when these particular copies were made. 'The Scrolls must obviously be later than the texts written on them'. He is conscious of the difficulty of deciding this point. He refers to the early dating of Susenik in the Maccabean period, and to Ginsberg's in the Herodian, and indicates that there is uncertainty about both.

The Jars.

If the jars are unique, then how can they be used as evidence for dating? This is, of course, no longer valid, since other jars of the same type have been found.

He is on firmer ground when he says, 'New scrolls could have been put in old jars and old manuscripts could have been put in new jars'. Actually this statement is a quotation from a scholar who upholds the early date. He shows how the DS could easily have been deposited when the Roman pottery found its way into the cave, and he draws attention to the fact that Origen is not said to have found his manuscripts in a cave, but in a jar in (en) or near (peri) Jericho.

Dr. Driver is very interested in the Syriac letter of Timotheus, Patriarch of Seleucia, to the Metropolitan of Elam, written before 805 A.D. and telling of how ten years earlier some Jews had found 'in a cave', 'in the rock', 'near Jericho', 'books of the Old Testament and others in Hebrew script'. This, he thinks, may refer to the cave at 'Ain Feshka, and if so, the DS may be all that is left of the original cache and must be dated before the 8th century A.D. This is a very attractive piece of evidence which would give a terminus ad quem for the DS, but still leaves in doubt the terminus a quo. Moreover, it is difficult to explain why, since we are told in the letter of Timotheus that a certain Hebrew 'said to me, "We have found 200 Psalms of David among our books"', the few scrolls which we have from the cave should have been left. Why should more than 200 scrolls be removed and less than a dozen be left behind intact? The fact that since Dr. Driver wrote his articles other caves, which once contained manuscripts, have been discovered in the vicinity of Jericho, greatly alters the value of his suggestion.

The wrappings.

Concerning the cloth in which the DS were said to have been wrapped, Dr. Driver does not think that this throws any light on the question of date, but admits that the Mishna (c.200 A.D.) often mentions that scrolls were thus covered for safety. Such a passage is found in the Mishna, Megillah iii.1, where it is laid down that if a town sells its synagogue, it must spend part of the proceeds to buy 'wrappings' for scrolls: 'If an Ark, they must buy (scroll) wrappings..'.
Materials.

The material of DS is said to be not parchment, which is claimed by some scholars to have come into use about 190 B.C. and to have been used by the Jews in a general way about the 5th century A.D., but leather and skins, and the writing is found to be on the rough side in accordance with Talmudical rule. 'No stress

however, can be laid on these facts in fixing the date of the Scrolls; for it is not known how long leather may have remained in use beside parchment'.

The Ink.

This too, according to Dr. Driver, is indecisive. Ink of a non-metallic nature is said to have been used by the Jews until the end of the 2nd century A.D. When Rabbi Meir tried to introduce a metallic ink some time after A.D. 100, Rabbi Ishmael prohibited its use. By the time of the Babylonian Talmud, a metallic ink (ferrous sulphate) was in use, i.e. about the 5th century A.D., but non-metallic ink was also used for the Torah Scrolls until the Middle Ages. After tests on the ink used on the DS, it has been proved that non-metallic ink was employed. There is obviously no true criterion here, as Dr. Driver says.

The Rulings.

He remarks on the fact that the DS have horizontal and vertical rulings on some of them. This, he believes, may offer a clue to their age. No ruled Aramaic or Hebrew papyri, he tells us, are earlier than the Christian era. The Ptolemaic papyrus of the Book of the Dead has both horizontal and vertical rulings, but this he does not regard as relevant. There is in the Talmud a reference to the rulings of the Book of Esther that it, too, like the Torah Scrolls, must have horizontal rulings, and as this is c. 500 A.D., Dr. Driver thinks this will give a terminus ad quem for those DS which are ruled. Rabbi Jechanan bar Nappacha, who died c. 279 A.D., is said to have declared that ruling could be traced back to the Mosaic period. This is apparently not relevant either, according to Dr. Driver, who thinks that it means that the origin of ruling was forgotten in the days of the Talmud. This is possible, but it does seem to indicate that the art of ruling was very old by c. 500 A.D. Actually the DSIa does not appear to show any signs of ruling, but the DSH has rulings which are very plain. The early method of ruling, according to Dr. Driver, was to scratch the lines with an instrument on the scroll, and it was only in the 9th century that a lead-plummet was used, and by the 13th century that ink rulings were employed. This would then make the DS earlier than the 9th century A.D., but 'like other ruled texts, therefore the Scrolls are likely to have been post-Christian, but this test throws no light on the question whether they belong before or after the Talmud'.

The Script.

Attention is drawn here to the 'especial importance' of the Eifu papyrus in ascertaining the date of the script of DS, since this papyrus displays a script which is 'beginning to approach the so-called "square" or modern script in which the Scrolls are written'. 'But the papyri of the fifth or fourth centuries B.C. are not nearly so far from them as they evidently are from the Scrolls'. He remarks that 'the corner-stone of the whole palaeographical argument, however, is the Nash Papyrus'. 'Here he is cautious and states that 'no one knows its exact, even its approximate date'. Finally, he refers to the Dura-Europos tile in Aramaic; all he is prepared to say on this is that it must have been written 'before c. A.D. 250 when Dura-Europos was abandoned'. The script, he states, is 'neither remarkably like nor remarkably unlike those on the Scrolls'.

To DSfLev., written in the Old Hebrew script, Dr. Driver is not inclined to attach much weight, but thinks of the use of the old Hebrew script on coins from the days of the Maccabean Revolt and the Revolt of Bar-Cochba. This is not quite the same, however, since the numismatic practice is so different from the documentary. So he finds that 'the archaic script, then, obviously does not necessitate a pre-Christian date for the Scrolls'.

The Orthography and Linguistics.

This is for Dr. Driver the most decisive evidence for the dating of DS. Here, after a very exhaustive examination of the peculiarities of DS in a field in which he is undoubtedly an authority, he concludes that on grammatical and linguistic

evidence the DS cannot be placed in the pre-Christian period.
The Text Division.

Dr. Driver holds that the division of the DS into paragraphs is important evidence for the dating. He refers to the mention in the Mishna of 'verses' and 'paragraphs' of the Law and the Prophets, but he regards the definition of these paragraphs as 'open' or 'closed', as not decided until the time of the Talmud. The Chester Beatty papyri, which are biblical and are dated in the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D., 'progressively increase the marking of verses and paragraphs'. 'The papyri of Deuteronomy indicate hardly any verses or paragraphs, while nothing but arbitrarily placed dots are used in those of Jeremiah (late 2nd or early 3rd century A.D.)....but that of Ezekiel marks some paragraphs and all the surviving chapters'. In the great uncials, as is well known, the paragraphs are complete and these are, broadly speaking, from the 4th and 5th centuries A.D. For this reason Dr. Driver would place DS not long before this development of the paragraph began 'and indeed not so much near the beginning as the end of the period'.
The Carbon-Isotope Analysis.

He remarks that this is precarious as a test, 'for the margin of error is amply wide and only the wrappings, not the scrolls themselves, have been subjected to this process, since it requires the combustion of a large part, if not all, of the objects submitted to it'. It is not so much a method of dating the scrolls, in the opinion of Dr. Driver, as the dating of the wrappings; for it would show how long the wrappings had been put away. Actually this would, in the view of many scholars, give a clue to the date of the deposit of the cache and thus is not as irrelevant as Dr. Driver leads us to think.

Dr. Driver rejects the idea of Susenik that the cave was a genizah, but thinks that the deposit was made in what Père de Vaux calls 'dans un moment critique'. When was this critical time?, asks Driver. It might not be in the stirring days of Antiochus Epiphanes, nor the days of Pompey, nor the Persians, nor the Arabs, but perhaps from some local tumult.

He does not settle on any date for the manuscripts, but in a letter to the Times in 1949 he writes: 'Even, however, if these new manuscripts belong not to the second century B.C. but (for the sake of argument) to the third or fourth century A.D. or afterwards...'. It is clear that a date in the 3rd or 4th century A.D. is thought by him to be likely.

S. Zeitlin.

From the first Dr. Zeitlin has strongly opposed the early dating of the DS. In an early article he suggested that 'It seems that the entire find is not an important discovery but possibly a hoax'. He tries to show from a number of facts that the DS really belong to the Middle Ages. He is sure that

There is much of the fact that in the DS the word 'et' is used in place of 'etiam' or 'adque', when these appear in the biblical text. This cannot be very significant since the Rabbinic Talmud shows that this practice was at least as early as the Hecceban period.

the contention of Dr. Susenik that the expression 'Priest, the Head' found in DSW indicates that that scroll 'is not later than the Hasmonean period', because the term was not in use after the Hasmonean period, rests on a false assumption that the term 'the Head Priest' was used in the Hasmonean period and that the term 'the Great Priest' came to be used later. The facts as given by Dr. Zeitlin are that the term 'the Great Priest' was used before the Hellenistic period, as is seen in Zech. iii. 1 where Joshua is called 'the Great Priest'. It is claimed by Dr. Zeitlin, who is an authority on medieval Hebrew, that the term 'the Head Priest' was used in the literature of the Middle Ages. No references are, however, given for this usage.

The Zadokite Work.

Dr. Zeitlin is impressed with the correspondence between the non-canonical DS and the Zadokite Work. Of the latter he remarks that 'scholars of great erudition and renown accepted it, but differed as to the exact date'. Some scholars, as he is aware, claimed it to 'have belonged to a sect existing during the Second Commonwealth'. But they were mistaken, and 'thus the history of the Jews during the Second Commonwealth was distorted'. They should have placed it in the Middle Ages.

The Jars.

In his earliest article entitled 'Scholarship and the Hoax of the Recent Discoveries', Dr. Zeitlin could not believe that the DS could have been stored away so carefully in a cave. 'There is no reason whatsoever for a Jew to place the Book of Isaiah and the Commentary of Habakkuk in jars, seal these and place them in a cave'. The explanation must therefore be that these DS 'came from the genizah storehouse and that is the hoax'.

The Kittim of Assyria.

One of the points which Dr. Zeitlin makes is that the term 'Kittim of Assyria' and the 'Kittim of Egypt' cannot apply to the Ptolemies and the Seleucids, as Dr. Susenik has suggested, since 'at no time during the Second Commonwealth were the Seleucids mistaken for the Kings of Assyria. In the entire literature of the period there is not found a single instance of such juxtaposition The word Assyria is not found in either Maccabees I or II. Josephus, who relates the entire Jewish history from Antiochus up to the later days of the Seleucids, also never mentions Assyria in relation to the Seleucids'. This is said to have been in vogue in the Middle Ages, because the Oracle of Balaam was understood to apply at one time to the Greeks and at another to the Romans in the Targumim and Ibn Ezra and Abravanel. No instance of our term being so used is given, and in any case this is purely argumentum e silentio. No one would expect Josephus writing sober history to use these terms in a cryptic manner, but if they could be so used in the Middle Ages, why not in the time of the Second Commonwealth? A good illustration from the Middle Ages would have been more convincing.

The Name 'El'.

Much is made of the fact that in the DSH the name 'El' is used in place of 'Yahweh' or 'Adonai', when these appear in the biblical text. This cannot be very significant since the Elohistic Psalter shows that this practice was at least as early as the Maccabean period.

The Name Israel.

This is said to indicate a late date, since the common term during the Second Commonwealth was 'Judaean', not 'Israel'. 'This is contrary to the terminology of all Second Commonwealth literature known to us'. A reference to the first chapter of Maccabees I will show that the term 'Israel' is used several times there in reference to the people of the Jews.

Palaeography.

The evidence here is thought to be weak and the Zadokite Work is claimed to be 'proved' to be of the Middle Ages. The Nash Papyrus is taken, as Cook took it, to be 'some time during the third or fourth century A.D.'. No account of any earlier date is allowed. Serious attention is not given to the argument from palaeography by Dr. Zeitlin, because he feels 'we know the literary styles and expressions used at that time as well as the changes that followed later. Against such certainty the meager Hebrew palaeography of that period cannot be considered serious testimony'.

Dr. Zeitlin sums up by saying that commentaries were not written among the Jews until the time of the Targum of Jonathan.

'This was the very first attempt at a commentary. Thus it is absolutely certain that the DSH, found in the earthenware jars in the cave, could not have been written during the Second Commonwealth. The finding of this Commentary with the other Scrolls.. negates beyond any doubt the theory that they belong to the pre-Christian period'. Writing later Dr. Zeitlin has said, 'The resemblance of the characters employed in these documents (sc. the Zadokite Fragments) to those in the above Scrolls (sc. DS) is so striking as to indicate that they are of the same locality and the same period, i.e. the Middle Ages'.

E.R. Lacheman.

Dr. Lacheman, writing in the Jewish Quarterly Review, called his article 'A Matter of Method in Hebrew Palaeography'. In it he has called in question the early dating of the DS on the evidence of palaeography.

The Nash Papyrus: Its Date Uncertain.

This document has been the king-pin of the argument of Dr. Albright in arriving at an early Maccabean date for the DS. Now Dr. Lacheman has criticised the appeal to this document on the grounds that the date of it is itself uncertain. This document, he states, was re-touched by Professor Burkitt when it was published by him and he did this because it was very indistinct in parts. Dr. Lacheman has used in his own studies a print taken from the new infra-red photograph of this document published by the Cambridge University Library.

In 1902, Cook first published the Nash Papyrus and in this publication he placed the date of it as 'in the second Christian century'. In 1903, Burkitt produced a study on it and in it he suggested it should be considered as 'a document of the first century A.D. at the latest'. His reason for differing from Cook was partly on a difference of reading the papyrus.

Dr. Lacheman points out that Drs. Cook & Burkitt both used the known palaeography of their time. As a terminus post quem the Egyptian Aramaic papyri were used, and the Nabataean & Palmyrene inscriptions were used as a terminus ante quem. In the year 1904, an unsigned article in the *Revue Biblique* advocated a return to the earlier dating of Cook. In 1937, Prof. Albright wrote an article in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* and revised the data offered by Cook & Burkitt. For this purpose he used an untouched photograph of the Nash Papyrus and, as auxiliary aids, the Nabataean, Palmyrene, Ossuaries and other types of inscriptions of various natures and origins. On the basis of this material, Dr. Albright proposed the Maccabean dating for the Nash Papyrus. His opinion of the Professor's tracing of the photograph is that it is 'in general dependable... he virtually always erred in the direction of conservatism', but he came to the conclusion that 'relatively archaic forms were more dominant than Burkitt realised'. Dr. Lacheman does not agree and thinks that Dr. Albright has greatly exaggerated these forms.

A Table of Signs.

In order to check Dr. Albright's dating, Dr. Lacheman drew up a Table of Signs in five columns. In the first he placed the signs from the Nash Papyrus; in the second those of the Dura Palmyrene inscriptions; in the third those of the Aramaic Tile from the Dura-Europos synagogue; in the fourth those of the graffiti and dipinti from the same synagogue; in the fifth those of a Hebrew parchment found in a house near the same synagogue.

The result of this comparative study was to call in question the findings of Dr. Albright on the epigraphic evidence. The 'Looped' Alephs.

Dr. Lacheman rejects the similarity between the 'alephs' of the Nash Papyrus and the 'alephs' of the Egyptian Aramaic Papyri of the 3rd century B.C. He states that there are twice as many unlooped 'alephs' as looped ones in the Nash Papyrus. So he goes through the various letters in his table.

The Late 'Hê'.

He finds two forms for this letter. One he traces to the Egyptian Aramaic; the other he traces to the Hebrew MSS of the later Medieval period.

Many of the forms he would link with the development of the cursive type of writing, and under his investigations there appears to be a conviction that the Nash Papyrus is a cursive document.

Variety of Forms in Nash Papyrus.

Dr. Lacheman draws attention to the large variety of forms of letters found in this document - more than any other document known. It is difficult, therefore, he thinks, to date the Nash Papyrus, for the question arises whether it should be dated from 'its most archaic characters or its most recent forms'.

Criticism of Albright's Method.

He regards Dr. Albright's method of dating as faulty. It seems to him that first a group of documents of known date and of a known geographical origin is chosen: this provides him with a terminus post quem: next, comparison is made with the characteristic palaeography of this period and with what he regards as the most archaic forms in the Nash Papyrus. That is to say, he takes the latest form of letter of the earliest possible documents known to him and compares them with the earliest forms of letter of the unknown document. He does not question this as a faulty method, but he criticises Dr. Albright for lack of consistency in its application and for not taking his measurements all from the same source. Dr. Lacheman will not allow that a terminus ante quem can be safely set by the methods of Dr. Albright. The most that he thinks can be done is to establish a terminus post quem for a certain letter. Working along his own lines, Dr. Lacheman would suggest as a terminus post quem for most of the 'archaisms' discovered by Dr. Albright, a date in the Middle Ages.



Dating of DS.

Dr. Lacheman thinks that the dating of the DS by the Nash Papyrus is to pass from one undated document to another undated document. For this reason he considers it unwise to use vague criteria. In his view the Square script of Hebrew Scrolls is the result of a long adaptation of the Square script first used possibly on ossuaries or other lapidary inscriptions. To date a Vellum immediately after the appearance of a certain form of letter on a stone inscription is to disregard completely the traditions of the various scribal schools and their regulations. He insists that to generalise on the basis of one document alone is highly dangerous.

The Edfu Papyrus.

If Dr. Lacheman's arguments about the slow development of the 4th and 5th century papyri are correct, then the Edfu papyri should be much later than Dr. Albright surmised and the Nash Papyrus should be much later than the Edfu papyrus. Dr. Lacheman lays great stress on this point of the slow development of the script, and at times it seems he is anxious to prolong the development well beyond the early Christian period into the Middle Ages.

The Ruling.

The fact that the DS are in some cases ruled with horizontal and vertical lines has been interpreted differently by scholars. These lines, which are very clearly marked on DS^B but not so clearly on DS^{1a}, have been taken by Dr. Trever to be similar to the ruled lines on the Elephantine Papyri and the Nash Papyrus. This is an important point as regards the dating of the DS and if Dr. Trever is right, the ruling of the DS cannot be used in support of a very late date. But Dr. Lacheman does not agree on the similarity in the ruling of these documents. He thinks the difference is that the Nash Papyrus rulings are irregular and were not ruled beforehand, but the scribe followed the horizontal fibre of the papyrus. He does not consider the ruling of papyrus was necessary, and doubts if it was ever the custom to do so. No case of ruling has been found among the 60 Oxyrrhynchus papyri, which he checked for this point. The fact that all the letters in the Aramaic papyri are suspended from the line he puts down to the nature of the script itself. He holds that the ruling of manuscripts became a custom in the Middle Ages for the sacred Scriptures and for such a work as the Kaufman Mishna Codex. It has been pointed out elsewhere that the ruling of MSS was well-known to scribes of the first half of the 3rd century A.D.

Summary

Summing up all these palaeographical arguments, Dr. Lacheman considers as a whole the four different types of document which he has studied on this question, namely the Edfu Papyrus, the Nash Papyrus, the Dura Hebrew parchment and the DS, and has no hesitation in concluding that the last group can in no circumstances be earlier than the preceding three, least of all the Nash Papyrus. This we are told is a crowded document in small script, in a cursive hand and with a great range of forms of letters. At this stage the Hebrew MSS are already following a canon of copying the Holy Scriptures. Archaisms abound, he states, but most of their letters are far beyond the Dura MS in development. It would be a fault of method in palaeography if one were to judge them only by their archaisms. As a more satisfactory method of arriving at their date, Dr. Lacheman recommends that their relationship to the Massoretic Text and the various Ancient Versions should be taken into account together with the morphology and other internal evidence, rather than palaeography alone. His final conclusion seems to be that the DS 'might be dated at several points in history on palaeography alone'.

S.A. Birnbaum.

Dr. Birnbaum, writing as an acknowledged authority on palaeography, has sought to answer the objections of Dr. Lacheman to the early dating of the DS. In his publication, 'The Qumran Scrolls and Palaeography', he states that his opinions on the early date differ from those of Drs. Albright and Trever in so far that he has not, as they have done, based his estimates on the Nash Papyrus, but has reached his conclusions from other lines of evidence.

Independence of Palaeographical Evidence.

The central problem of the DS is still the question of their date. Dr. Birnbaum turns his attention to the palaeographical evidence to find a solution. In doing so, he claims that this line of research is free from the dangers of historical or textual theories, since it matters not to the palaeographer whether the Wicked Priest of the DS is King Jannaeus, King Aristobulus II, Paul or a medieval allegory; or whether the Kittim are Macedonians or Romans; or whether the Massoretic Text was fixed in the 2nd century B.C. or the 1st century A.D.; whether the DS came from the Essenes or some other sect of the Middle Ages. In other words, the interest here is on the age of the script rather than the support of theories.

Lacheman's Criticism of Albright.

Dr. Birnbaum states emphatically that as his own arguments are not based on the Nash Papyrus they do not stand or fall with Dr. Lacheman's criticisms. Yet he thinks that while attacking the dating of the DS by Dr. Albright, Dr. Lacheman has failed to give his own views a sound footing.

The Nash Papyrus.

Dr. Lacheman had criticised the dating of this Papyrus by Dr. Albright in the pre-Christian period and assigns it to the 2nd century A.D. Dr. Birnbaum thinks this is untenable, for there is palaeographical material from the first century B.C. and also the first century A.D. which conflicts with this verdict. This comprises boundary stones from Gezer and ossuaries from Jerusalem, and comparison of the script of these with the Nash Papyrus shows, according to Dr. Birnbaum, that the signs of the latter are far less developed in their forms, and therefore must be earlier than either of the two former. Per contra if Dr. Lacheman were correct, these two former groups would have to be placed in the 3rd century A.D., but they are of the 1st century B.C. to the 1st century A.D. The Nash Papyrus, he tells us, must therefore be placed before the 1st century B.C. and, on the view of Dr. Lacheman that the script developed with considerable slowness, two centuries between the Nash Papyrus and the Jerusalem ossuaries should be assumed. This would give a date in the early 2nd century B.C. for the Nash Papyrus, and this is the date which seems likely to Dr. Birnbaum.

The Edfu Papyri.

Here Dr. Birnbaum rejects Dr. Lacheman's attempt to lower the date of the papyri of the 3rd century B.C. Dr. Lacheman has written: 'If therefore we judge by the slow development of the 5th and 4th centuries papyri, then the Edfu should be much later than the Edfu'. But to accept this would seem to Dr. Birnbaum to lead to impossible consequences; for, on the basis of a 2nd century A.D. date for the Nash Papyrus, one would be forced to infer from the differences between the scripts that the Edfu papyri should have to be placed in or

near the first century B.C. Yet the Boundary stones and the ossuaries from this period are not identical as they should be and therefore cannot be contemporaneous. This gives Dr. Birnbaum good grounds for rejecting Dr. Lacheman's dating of the Edfu documents, since on the latter's showing these must be considerably earlier than the Boundary stones.

After a comparison of the forms of the Edfu papyri with the forms of the same letters found on a Contract for a Loan from about 400 B.C. and on Ostraca from about the 3rd century B.C. and on the Nash Papyrus and on the Boundary Stones from the first third of the 1st century B.C. and on the Ossuaries from between the late 1st century B.C. and A.D. 70, it will be seen that this gives him a period which roughly covers from 400 B.C. to somewhere around 70 A.D., and enables a good view of the development of the forms of the letters to be gained.

The result is that he finds the forms of the letters in the Edfu papyri are much closer to the latest of the dated Elephantine documents, namely the Contract for a Loan dated 400 B.C. than they are to any of the others. He thinks the Edfu papyri should be placed much closer to 400 B.C. than to a date around the late 1st century B.C., which is the beginning of the Ossuaries period. He thus places the Edfu papyri somewhere in the 3rd century B.C., and probably about the early part of that century. He regards a date about the middle as improbable since that brings them already halfway to the Ossuary period.

The 'Looped' Alephs.

Dr. Birnbaum deplores Dr. Lacheman's crude tracings of these from the infra-red photograph of the Nash Papyrus as unsuitable for the purposes of comparison. After a thorough examination of the evidence brought forward by Dr. Lacheman, he rejects it as unsound. It is clear from these criticisms that the palaeographic evidence adduced by Dr. Lacheman as decisive against Dr. Albright's early dating of the DS is by no means so soundly based as it appears at first sight.

Dating to One Point in History.

Dr. Lacheman in reference to the DS remarks: 'Archaisms abound, but most of their letters are far beyond the Dura manuscript in evolution'. Dr. Birnbaum regards this statement as absurd in the light of the palaeographical evidence which he has brought to bear on it. He takes exception to the remark of Dr. Lacheman that the DS 'might be dated at several points in history on palaeographical grounds alone'. He cannot see how this can be done and wonders just what points in history Dr. Lacheman has in mind. Dr. Birnbaum, who is an authority in palaeographical matters, tells us that from his knowledge a document can be dated to one point in history only. In the event where there is scantiness of material, he allows that this point may be a rather extended period, but that he holds is not the same as several different periods.

The Ruling.

Dr. Birnbaum notes that according to Dr. Lacheman what finally decided him in assigning DS to the Middle Ages was the fact that these documents were ruled. Dr. Birnbaum thinks that this looks as if Dr. Lacheman had taken it for granted that ruling could not possibly be ancient. He has dealt with this point in an article in *Vetus Testamentum*, entitled 'How Old are the Dead Sea Scrolls?'. He refers to the mention in the Talmud that the ruling of MSS was part of the Oral Law given to Moses and adduces this as proof that ruling must have been very ancient at that time. This would indicate that the practice went back to a time earlier than that of the Amoraim; perhaps as Dr. Birnbaum suggests it goes back a few centuries before their time, which is about the 3rd century A.D.

Moreover, Dr. Birnbaum has pointed out that this is not the first reference to ruling, for in the *Genesis Rabba*, which may be dated in the 2nd century A.D., there is another, earlier reference to ruling: 'Rabbi said, "Even the ruling of the Book

(goes back) to Adam's teaching". This means that at the time of the great Abba, generally called Rabh, ruling was so old a custom that it was considered to be 'as old as the hills', i.e. to date far back beyond living memory. This justifies Dr. Birnbaum in claiming that the practice of ruling goes back at least to pre-Christian times. As he shows, ruling is found in the Samaritan scrolls and thus may be thought of as derived from a time before the Great Schism. It is unlikely that the Samaritans would take over the custom from their rivals, the Jews, after the Schism, and this would look as if it was in vogue as early as the 5th century B.C. Even if it is placed one or two centuries later, ruling would still be five or six centuries earlier than the 3rd century A.D. Dr. Birnbaum refers, as others have done, to the examination by Dr. Plenderleith of a Ptolemaic papyrus which he found to be ruled. This was recently examined (1951). If it did not seem to involve a petitio principii, appeal could be made to the DS Lev. as a case of ruling in the 5th century B.C.

The Ink.

Among those who seek to date the DS in the Middle Ages the question of the ink has been a subject of enquiry. It has been stated in the Jewish Quarterly Review that if on examination the ink of the DS proved to be metallic, then that would be good evidence that they could not possibly be early in date, because such ink had not come into use before the time of the Talmud. This opinion is apparently based on certain statements in the Mishna and the Gemara. But Dr. Birnbaum will not allow that they can be interpreted in this way; he holds that metallic inks were in fact widely used in antiquity. Qangantum (copperas) is repeatedly mentioned as a writing material in the Mishna. The proof of this is to be found in Gittin 11.3 where we read, 'It may be written with anything - ink, caustic, red dye, gum, copperas, or with whatsoever is everlasting...'; and also in Sota 11.4: 'he did not write on a tablet, or on a papyrus, or on unprepared skin, but only on a (parchment) scroll, as it is written, "in a book". And he may not write with gum or copperas or saught that leaves a lasting stain, but only with ink ...'. This latter passage, it should be noted, is a reference to writing which was to be washed out, as the context makes plain, by going on to say, 'for it is written, "And he shall blot them out" (he must write with) what can be blotted out'. This passage in the Mishna means that in the Trial by Ordeal the priest must write out the prescribed curse on a parchment scroll, but not in indelible ink, which could not be washed out with water and given to the accused woman to drink.

It is clear that from the above quotations in the Mishna it cannot be claimed, as it is by some, that the use of metallic ink was unknown at that time. Moreover, going back to the 6th century B.C. to the Lachish Ostraka, it has been found that they have been written with a mixed iron and carbon ink. It cannot, as Dr. Birnbaum shows, be claimed that the use of metallic ink would indicate that the DS were to be dated very late. As a matter of fact, it has been found that they are not written in metallic ink, but in carbon ink. This point was decided by Dr. Plenderleith of the British Museum.

Summary.

Dr. Birnbaum, after his close investigation of the palaeography of the DS and before fuller excavations of the cave had been made or the pottery had come to light, came to an independent conclusion that the DS could be dated thus:-

DS Ia	written about the 2nd cent. B.C. c. 2nd quarter.
DS D	written about the 2nd cent. B.C. c. last quarter
DS H	written about the middle of the 1st century B.C.
DS W	written before the Herodian and Roman period.
DS T	written before the Herodian and Roman period.
DS Lev.	written before the 3rd century B.C.

After the excavation at Kirbet Qumran and the DS Cave and the caves at Wadi Murabbat, Dr. Birnbaum noted that the settlement had been in existence, according to the archeologists, since the 'beginning of the first century A.D. to 70 A.D.' and this made it appear that the cache had been deposited during the time of the settlement. 'Thus those archeologists who had formerly given the end of the second century B.C. or in the early first century A.D. as their terminus ad quem for the depositing of the cache are now in full accord with the results arrived at on purely palaeographical grounds, for the script of some of the Scrolls (DSIb, DSW, DST) dates from the Ossuaries period (late first century B.C. to 70 A.D.)'.

W.F. Albright.

Dr. Albright, more than any other scholar, has been responsible for the early dating of the DS, since it was he who first suggested it.

The Nash Papyrus.

He has answered the objections which Drs. Zeitlin and Lacheman have made of his dating of the DS. He in turn has raised objections to the unscientific tracings which Dr. Lacheman made of the forms of the various documents which he used in his investigations. At the same time he has welcomed the infra-red photograph which was used to correct some of his own findings in connexion with the Nash Papyrus. These errors Dr. Albright admits it would have been difficult for him to avoid with the photograph he was forced to employ, but he denies that any of these errors are of such importance as to invalidate his main thesis and the dating of the document.

He draws attention to the fact that since 1937 his own view of the dating of the Nash Papyrus has undergone slight revision, but Dr. Zeitlin was unaware of this. He has changed his preference for the Maccabaeen dating to 'one well before Herod's accession in 37 B.C.'.

He draws attention to the similarity between some of the forms of letter found in the Fouad collection of manuscripts. The eminent papyrological specialist, Professor Youtie, in a letter to Dr. Albright in 1945 says of the Fouad Papyrus: 'I think that the middle of the century, or to give it a broader basis, 75-25 B.C. ... is a better date'. This Papyrus Dr. Albright claims has forms of letters which in the Tetragrammaton are relatively later than the forms which are dominant in the Nash Papyrus. From this and other evidence he would claim support for a date not later than the first half of the 1st century B.C. for the Nash Papyrus. Dr. Albright is strongly convinced that the new data since 1937 definitely support the general view presented at that time and accepted by distinguished authorities, such as Drs. S.A. Birnbaum and F. Rosenthal. Dr. Susenik, who in 1948 was inclined to date the Nash Papyrus in the first century A.D., since he dated the latest of the DS just before 70 B.C., and in the light of the different orthography of the Nash Papyrus, returned in 1949 to the earlier date for the Nash Papyrus.

In the matter of material for comparison, Dr. Albright states that we are far better off now than previously and can arrange/

arrange its chronology with more precision through the work of Drs. S. Klein and E. L. Susenik. It is now possible to say that the ossuaries of the Jerusalem area all antedate the year A.D. 70 and that the earliest of these are not later than the time of Herod the Great. Some may go back much earlier. It can be stated, according to Dr. Albright, that the earliest known ossuary script is that represented by the Bethphage ossuary lid. This ossuary shares with the ossuaries belonging to the family of Simon the Elder the archaic form of two characters which dominate the Nash Papyrus.

The Edfu Papyri.

It is on evidence such as that above that Dr. Albright insists that the forms in the DS are to be dated between the Edfu papyri of the 3rd century B.C. and the graffiti of the Herodian period. He thinks that it is impossible in the light of our modern knowledge to date the Edfu papyri later than the early decades of the 2nd century at the latest, and he regards a 3rd century dating as virtually certain. In this it may be noted that Dr. Cowley in 'Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.' (1923) gives 'a date about 300 B.C.' for these documents, or at the latest 'early in the third century B.C.'.

Palaeographical Evidence.

Dr. Albright lays stress on the fact that in the DS^{1a} and in the Nash Papyrus the medial and the final form of mem were relatively much larger and longer than in the more recent DS, and that these other DS display a form which is as a rule larger and longer than the form of mem found on the ossuaries and related Judaeo-Aramaic inscriptions from the late 1st century B.C. This he considers to be a significant fact. He stresses that the same tendency is observable in the oldest Nabataean and Palmyrene inscriptions from the 1st century B.C.

The Jars.

Dr. Albright, speaking in London in 1949, stated that he wished to make it clear that he did not accept quite such high dates for the pottery found in the cave as proposed by Mr. Harding, Père de Vaux¹ and Dr. Sellers. Dr. Albright says that the fact that this ware was undoubtedly in regular use through the 2nd century B.C. and the early 1st century does not preclude a date well down in the 1st century B.C., as long as we keep out of the Herodian period. On the dating of the pottery he strongly emphasises that the bulk of it (excepting the Roman pieces) consists of homogeneous jars, bowls to cover the jars, and lamps whose pre-Herodian date is beyond dispute. It is, he states, the same type of pottery which he excavated with Dr. Sellers at Beth-zur in 1931 and which they found lying in the latest stratum, the stratum itself being dated from its coins. The same type was also dug up by Dr. Kelso and himself at Bethel in 1934, being then in the Maccabaeen stratum which was indicated too by the coins. This Hellenistic pottery was replaced by Early Roman wares and types somewhere between 75 and 25 B.C., and then was followed during the Herodian period by pottery well known from ossuary tombs around Jerusalem and similar pottery in contemporary sites elsewhere in the country. In the 2nd century A.D. this Early Roman pottery was replaced by late Roman wares, characteristic of the 3rd century A.D. Dr. Albright stresses the point that the jars and covering bowls cannot be appreciably older than the latest DS.

¹ Père de Vaux, as has been mentioned above, has changed his mind on this point.

The Ink.

When Dr. Albright was in London in 1949 he visited the British Museum and the London University Institute of Archeology. There Mr. Harding, Drs. Plenderleith & Leveen showed him many hundreds of fragments of sheep skins from the cave at 'Ain Feshka. Dr. Plenderleith told him that there could be no doubt concerning the Graeco-Roman date of the carbon ink. It was not iron ink as had been supposed. Dr. Plenderleith pointed out that the black, viscous substance which had been thought to be pitch was found to be really decomposed leather from the scrolls themselves and was soluble in water.

Archaism and Archaic.

Dr. Albright examined the DS Lev., which are said to be written in archaic Hebrew characters. He thinks that the character is rather an archaizing one than an archaic. This fragment he would date about the first century B.C.

The Radiocarbon Test.

He still held to the early dating of the DS in 1952. Writing in the 'Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament' in the article entitled 'The Language of the Old Testament', he states that concerning the DS there has been a storm of controversy, but 'it has been settled by the agreement of script, archeological dating of the jars in which the scrolls were deposited, and radiocarbon dating of the linen in which they were wrapped'. 'Here we have at last Biblical texts actually dating from the last two centuries B.C., especially the first Isaiah Scroll from not later than about 100 B.C.'.

Summary.

To sum up, Dr. Albright, after careful examination of the archeological and palaeographical data and taking into account the counter arguments of those scholars who have dissented from his early dating of the Nash Papyrus and the DS, is still of the opinion that as regards the DS 'nothing could be later than the Herodian period'.

J. Mauchline.

Writing in the Journal of the Royal Philosophical Society, in an article entitled 'The Dead Sea Scrolls', Dr. Mauchline mentions that Dr. Albright confirms the early dating of Trever, Birnbaum and others in placing the DS in the pre-Christian period. He thinks the DS Ia and DSD are related in style and the others he would place in a separate group.

Palaeography.

It is necessary, he tells us, to compare the script of DS with that of the Edfu Papyri, the Nash Papyrus and the Hebrew Ossuary Inscriptions of the 1st century A.D. Such a comparison, he suggests, might give support to the view that the DS are to be dated between the Edfu Papyri and the Nash Papyrus, i.e. between the 3rd century B.C. and 50 B.C. But he warns that materials such as leather, stone and papyrus all cause differences in styles of writing, and the difference of matter will also cause differences in style, one being formal, one cursive, another archaizing, one being everyday. Thus we are largely dating one unknown by another unknown.

The Nash Papyrus.

Here, he remarks, we have only a few verses from Deuteronomy/

Deuteronomy. It is difficult to date, but it may perhaps be placed between 50 B.C. and the second half of the 2nd century A.D. Religious texts may archaize, he states, and this must be kept in mind.

Linguistic Evidence.

The Aramaic Targums suggest that at that period the Hebrew language was in a process of decay.

Vowel Letters.

These were little used in the period of the Septuagint and this would suggest that the DS are after 250-100 B.C., perhaps in the Early Christian era.

Final Letters.

These are not much used in the DS and hence it can be argued that the DS date from the time when these were coming into use. Zeitlin thinks that they came into use after the second half of the 2nd century A.D. If so, then the DS would be earlier than the time when they were in full use, but probably about the time when they were coming in. According to Zeitlin, this would be after the time of Rabbi Akiba (c.150). On the other hand, it must be noted that they are used in full in the Nash Papyrus.

The Ligatures.

These are found in the DS. The practice seems to have ceased for sacred writing and formal writing in general during the early centuries of the Christian era. Thus a date before the 3rd century A.D. is indicated.

Linguistic Forms.

In general the DS are nearer to the Hebrew of the Old Testament than that of the Mishna (c.200 A.D.).

The Contents of DSD & DSW.

These appear to indicate a terminus a quo of 200 B.C. and a terminus ad quem of 200 A.D.

The Wrappings.

These afford no clue since the weave is plain.

The Ink.

This is carbon ink, but it was in use over a long period and therefore does not offer much evidence for dating.

The Cave.

This was neither a library nor a storeroom, but a safe-deposit. The Roman lamp found in it seems to indicate that it was entered in the Roman period and some contents were removed.

Summary.

The paleographical evidence indicates the 2nd century B.C. to the 1st century B.C. for the DS; but DS1a and DSD may be half a century to one century earlier. The orthographic variants seem to indicate a date in the 1st century A.D. to the 2nd century A.D., but this does not affect the DS1a.

H.H.Rowley.

Dr.Rowley has made a very complete study of the relevant literature of the DS. He appears to have read all the important writings on the subject and has himself written several articles on the subject and at least one book which he published in 1952. He is cautious in setting out his view and warns that until further study has been made of all the materials, especially the new material from the more recent excavations, we are not/

not in a position to reach a view which we may claim as final.

The Palaeographical Evidence.

Dr. Rowley notes that many scholars had dated all the DS from the 2nd century B.C. on palaeographical grounds, but he regards the evidence as insufficient to establish this dating. He refers to the remark of Dr. Baumgartner in this connexion: 'Anyone who is not quite at home in Hebrew palaeography finds himself faced with the fact that even the experts differ so much among themselves and contradict each other so much that he is embarrassed'.¹

The Nash Papyrus.

After reviewing the different dates proposed, he remarks: 'It is clear that no one alleged date for the Nash Papyrus can be taken as a fixed point in relation to which the DS can be dated palaeographically. Nor is there any agreement as to whether the Nash Papyrus is older or younger than some of the newly-found texts'.

The Final Letters.

He notes that Dr. Kahle has claimed to find a final p in the text of DS^{1a}, but he does not think that we can place much weight on this. Dr. Trever has shown that this final letter is also found in the text of DS^H and DS^L. It must be remembered that in any case historically the final letters are older than the medial letters, as can be seen in the early Phoenician script. 'Nevertheless, it is doubtful how far we are justified in pressing this consideration'. Dr. Rowley reminds us that the non-usage of the final letters in the DS is thought by Dr. Lehmann to be perhaps a sign of archaizing. On the other hand, Dr. Kahle has put great stress on this final form of p appearing in what is obviously an addition to the DS^{1a}. Yet Dr. Barthélemy says of this: 'I am at pains to understand how Kahle...pretends to base his proof on so small a detail...'.²

The Jars.

He points out that a margin of several decades must be allowed in the dating of these. Artisans in out-of-the-way places may have continued to use old styles for a long time. He holds that precision dating is not possible and archeologists differ in the dating.

The Rulings.

Here again Dr. Rowley feels the evidence is inadequate and quotes the Spanish scholar Macho who says: 'As regards the ruling one cannot say that the Scrolls are modern'.³

The Ink.

'The ink has been tested', says Dr. Rowley, 'and it has proved to be a vegetable composition, so that it affords little help in the dating of the copyist'.

The Wrappings.

'The radio-carbon test has yielded a wide margin of dates within which the deposit in the cave may be located. This method is not able to provide a precise date, but can only give guidance within the broad limits of four hundred years'. The average date given by the test, according to Dr. G. E. Wright, was A.D. 33. Dr. Rowley notes that E. S. Deevey, Jr, writing of the radio-carbon method of dating in the Scientific American, has said: 'In detail, however, there are puzzles, contradictions and weaknesses'.

Summary

Dr. Rowley is far more inclined to attempt the dating of the DS on the grounds of the historical situation. He thinks it

¹ 'Wer selber in der hebräischen Paläographie nicht zuhause ist, befindet sich angesichts der Tatsache, dass auch die Fachleute hier Urteil so weit auseinandergehen und sich so scharf widersprechen, in einiger Verlegenheit'. Baumgartner in Th.R. 19, p. 131.

² 'J'ai de la peine à concevoir comment Kahle...prétend baser sa démonstration sur un détail si minime...'. Barthélemy in Revue Biblique 59, 1952, p. 189.

³ 'atendiendo al rayado, no puede decir que sean modernos'. Díez Macho in Razón y Fe.

is important to investigate the contents of the non-biblical scrolls in order to find out who used these scrolls and when, and thus to create a background for dating them. He has with this in mind made a study entitled 'The Covenanters of Damascus and the Dead Sea Scrolls'. As a result of this, he has arrived at the following conclusions: 'The non-biblical texts from the 'Ain Feshka Cave and also the Zadokite Work were probably composed at various dates in the second century B.C....The manuscripts Biblical and non-Biblical... were probably copied at various dates ranging over a long period. Some, such as the DSflev, are probably older than the foundation of the sect. Others including copies of the non-Biblical works which were only composed in the second century B.C. are probably of later origin, and may have been written at any time down to the date of the deposit in the cave. Some, and especially the DS1a, may have been copied during the second century B.C. for the use of the sect'.

.....

Summary and Conspectus of Views on Dating of Documents.

It is apparent that the dating of the DS is not one of those matters of which it may be said that 'all scholars are agreed'. A glance at the huge literature which has arisen around the DS and which is still being produced gives an almost bewildering variety of views.

The table overleaf shows the dates which have been suggested by some scholars for the dating of DS1a.

.....

DSIa.

L.Harding	-	200 - 100	B.C.
F.M.Cross	-	200 - 100	B.C.
H.H.Rowley	-	200 - 100	B.C.
O.R.Sellers	-	200 - 100	B.C.
S.A.Birnbaum	-	175 - 150	B.C.
W.F.Albright	-	175 - 75	B.C.
J.C.Trever	-	125 - 100	B.C.
M.H.Segal	-	Ante 90	B.C.
W.Baumgartner	-	Ante 70	A.D.
B.J.Roberts	-	Post 100	A.D.
P.Kahle	-	100 - 200	A.D.
M.H.Tur-Sinai	-	Post 200	A.D.
J.Reifer	-	200 - 400	A.D.
O.H.Lehmann	-	200 - 400	A.D.
G.R.Driver	-	200 - 450	A.D.
S.Zeitlin	-	Middle Ages	
E.R.Lacheman	-	At Several Points in History.	

The date of the DS may be attempted on the grounds of the age of the script, in which case the Nash Papyrus plays a prominent part in the evidence. But here again there is variety of dating as can be seen from just a few examples below:-

NASH PAPYRUS.

S.A.Birnbaum	-	Beginning of 2nd century B.C.
S.Nowinkel	-	Second half of 1st century B.C.
W.F.Albright	-	Not later than first half of 1st B.C.
M.H.Segal	-	First half of 1st century B.C.
J.C.Trever	-	50-25 B.C.

Again, much depends on whether the DS are to be regarded as earlier or later than the Nash Papyrus. Both views are held:-

NASH PAPYRUS & DS.

G.R.Driver	-	Nash older than the DS
W.F.Albright	-	Nash younger than DSIa but older than DSH.

Clearly no final dating can be given for the DS with the present data, but there is good hope that, when further study has been made and the new finds are all incorporated into the survey, a better idea will be formed. In the meantime, while refraining from any dogmatism, it may be suggested that there is much to be said for a date somewhere between the Second Century B.C. and the Second Century A.D. Dates in the Middle Ages would seem most improbable in the light of the evidence.

Sequence and Dates of the Extra-Biblical DS and the Zadokite Work.

An interesting article has appeared in *Vetus Testamentum* under the name of Isaac Rabinowitz, in which an attempt has been made to place in chronological order of composition the non-canonical DS on the grounds of internal evidence alone. These non-canonical DS are related to the Zadokite Work, and it is suggested by the writer that though they share a common motif yet they each treat it in a different manner and that there is a development to be observed in this difference. Within the group-unity the writer deals with the eschatological consummation which occurs in no fewer than 9 of the 12 texts. He believes that this theme runs a definite course in a succession of several well-defined stages:- the proclamation of the eschaton: the certainty that the time is present for it: disappointment that it has not materialized: and the revision of the idea of the eschaton. The writer then attempts to trace these developments in much detail through the texts. It is not possible to go into the details here, but the resulting sequence dating of the documents is summarised below:

<u>Sequence-Group</u>	<u>Text</u>	<u>Date.</u>
1	DSD	175-167 B.C.
2	a. DSf do Vaux	167-165 B.C.
2	b. DFa	ditto
2	c. DST 1	ditto
2	d. DST 2	ditto
3	a. DSW	164-162 B.C.
3	b. DST 3	ditto
3	c. DST 5	ditto
4	DST 4	162-160 B.C.
5	DSH	159-157 B.C.
	a. DFc	157-152 B.C.
	b. DFh	ditto

If the results of the investigation are valid, then these nine newly-discovered non-canonical texts and the three Zadokite Fragments were all composed during the second quarter of the second century B.C.

III. ORIGIN OF THE DOCUMENTS.

A. WHO USED THE SCROLLS?

a) THE ZADOKITE WORK

b) LINKS BETWEEN DS & ZADOKITE WORK

c) HISTORICAL CONNEXION BETWEEN SECT OF DS & ZADOKITE WORK

B. WERE THE USERS OF THE SCROLLS ESSENES?

a) THE EXCAVATIONS AT KIRBET QUMRAN

b) WAS IT AN ESSENE RETREAT?

C. AN ATTEMPTED ANSWER TO THE QUESTION OF ORIGIN.

III. ORIGIN OF THE DOCUMENTS.

A. WHO USED THE SCROLLS?

The ZADOKITE WORK

Since the first finding of the DS, their affinity with another work has been pointed out. This work was first published early in the present century by Solomon Schechter under the title 'Fragments of a Zadokite Work'. The fragments which were reproduced in this publication came from a Genizah in Cairo and are made up of portions which are believed to belong to two manuscripts originally. The first of these is thought to come from the 10th century A.D. and the second from the 11th or 12th century A.D. To a certain extent these two manuscripts overlap, but when this is the case they do not present exactly the same text. It is clear that the copyist or copyists of these two documents felt at liberty to modify the text if they wished. The document which comes from the 11th or 12th century is obviously not the author's autograph and it is equally plain that the 10th century document is not the autograph either. But how much earlier the work must be placed is a matter of dispute among modern scholars.

Date of Zadokite Work.

Some scholars would place the original composition as early as the 2nd century B.C. So Ed. Meyer, Gressmann, P. Kahle, G.F. Moore, B.D. Erdmans; Volz suggested a date before the Maccabean Age; I. Levi dated it after 165 B.C., but thought it reflected the Maccabean Age; H.H. Rowley dated it somewhere in the last century and a Half before the Christian era; J. Jeremias and N. A. Dahl would place it between the 1st century B.C. and the 1st century A.D.; R.H. Pfeiffer dates it between 100 B.C. and 70 A.D.; R. Eisler thinks between 70 A.D. and 135 A.D.; R.J. Tournay places it at the end of the 2nd century A.D.; S. Landauer assigns it to the period of the Mishna; W. Bousset to about the 7th century A.D.; S. Zeitlin to the 7th or 8th century A.D.; D.S. Margoliouth/

Margoliouth as far down as the 10th century A.D. It will be seen that the dates range from the 2nd century before the Christian era to the 10th century of the Christian era.

Contents of Zadokite Work.

This work is sometimes called by the German scholars the Damaskusschrift, because it seems to have belonged to a sect whose headquarters were at Damascus, after its withdrawal from Jerusalem. The text of this work tells how 390 years after Nebuchadnezzar's destruction of the Temple there was a sprouting of a root from Aaron and Israel and this reference is thought by scholars to be an indication of how the sect which used this document came into being. There follows on a description of the disloyalty of the nation of Israel to the Law of God, and this sect is said to have sought to re-establish its loyalty and obedience to God. Then after a further period of 10 years a figure appears who is called in the text the Teacher of Righteousness. This figure is apparently to be identified with the leader of the sect to whom the documents belonged. Notices are found in the text of the death of this leader which is called 'his gathering in'. The term which is often used of the death of sons of Israel in the Old Testament has the idiom, 'gathered unto his fathers'. On the death of this leader another leader is found leading the sect. The name of the new leader is The Star. It should be noted, however, that some scholars would not regard this person as distinct from the Teacher of Righteousness, but they are in a minority. Further from the text we learn that the sect migrates to Damascus with its new leader, The Star. Again it is learned that 40 years after 'the gathering in' of the Teacher of Righteousness the Messiah will arise from Aaron and Israel. It is usually agreed that this period of 40 years had not expired when the document came to be written, but probably it was regarded as very near completion. This messianic reference has not been found acceptable to all scholars, as might have been expected. Schecter, who first

published the Fragments, thought that the Teacher of Righteousness and the Messiah were one and the same person. A. Dupont-Sommer accepts the view as it is stated above and so does H.H. Rowley, but G.F. Moore does not. G. Margoliouth, on the other hand, was of the opinion that the sect expected two Messiahs, both of whom were dead and were expected to rise again. L. Ginzberg holds that some of the passages in the text favour the identification of the Teacher of Righteousness and the Messiah but others do not.

Date of Sect of Zadokite Work.

If the messianic reference has been correctly stated by Dupont-Sommer and Rowley, then, allowing that the figures of the text offer a reliable chronology, it would be possible to locate the period of the sect which is brought to our notice in the document. It would be a matter of counting 390 years, as stated, after the destruction of the Temple by Nebuchadnezzar; this would then give a date around 196 B.C. R.H. Pfeiffer, on the other hand, rejects the chronology and so do many scholars who are inclined to regard it as schematic rather than scientific.

Nature of Sect of Zadokite Work.

Leaving the date on one side, it is of interest to note that the text speaks of the foes of the sect and among these there is a person named the Man of Scorn and the Prophet of Untruth. It is thought by most scholars that these are two designations of one person. Also there is a reference to the chief of the Kings of Javan; these seem to be allies of the enemies of the sect.

Again, from the text, something of the organisation of the sect can be ascertained, but it is not clear whether this organisation is to be attributed to the Star and called into being when the sect migrated to Damascus, or whether it is to be traced back to the time of the Teacher of Righteousness or even earlier. Four categories of members of the sect are named in the documents: priests, Levites, Israelites and proselytes. But the Gentiles do not necessarily supply these proselytes, for this

sect did not have any dealings with the Gentiles and it is thought that more probably the proselytes were drawn from the ranks of Israel itself. They would be converts to this sect which regarded itself as the true Israel. Perhaps they were not fully admitted to the sect as members. The members were grouped in camps; at the head of each was an Inspector not unlike the Christian Bishop. The Sabbath was strictly observed in the sect and there was disagreement with their fellow countrymen about the matter of the calendar. The calendar favoured by this sect was that advocated in the extra-canonical book of Jubilees, and this book is referred to in the Zadokite Work. The members of this sect called themselves by the name Sons of Zadok, i.e. a group loyal to the House of Zadok, the high-priestly house. An interesting reference is found in the text to the fact that David was a polygamist and this is regarded as acceptable on the ground that the Law was unknown to him, because it was before the restoration of the Law by Zadok. It may be that H.J.Schoeps is right in thinking that Zadok was the name of the Teacher of Righteousness. This sect condemned polygamy and was against the marriage made with a second wife when the first was yet alive. It opposed also marriage with a niece though this is unknown to the Pentateuch and is derived by the sect on analogy that, if a marriage with an aunt was condemned in the Law, then marriage with an uncle by a woman is also prohibited.

Another peculiarity of the text is the rather cryptic reference to a book called the 'Book of Hagu'. This book is unknown to scholars.

Identification of Sect of Zadokite Work.

From 1910 onwards, much attention has been given by scholars to the identification of the sect which appears in the Zadokite Work. Many suggestions have been made in the attempt to identify them. Some have thought they were the Pharisees, others the Sadducees, others again the Zealots, or the Dositheans, or even perhaps the followers of John the Baptist, or the sect of

Ebionite Christians. The last two seem to many scholars outside the question, but the others which have been suggested have all had some measure of support. Connexion was thought to exist between this sect and the Essenes, but it was not claimed that this Zadokite Work was derived from them. Yet it must be admitted that none of these attempts were wholly satisfactory, for the sect in the Zadokite Fragments does not agree sufficiently with any of them. They have therefore been called the Zadokites to distinguish them from all the foregoing. It is true that in Hebrew this name is parallel in meaning with the word Sadducees, but there does not seem to be any further reason for equating them with the Sadducees of the New Testament. It is best to retain the term Zadokites, since by so doing their identification is not confused with any of the other sects, even though it can be admitted that there are certainly affinities with some, if not all of the sects above-mentioned.

Those scholars who advocate a very late date for the Zadokite Worksought to establish an affinity between the Zadokite Work and the sect of the Karaites. They were able to point out that the name which can be represented by Sadducees or by Zadokites was used in connexion with the Karaites in their early history, but it can be shown that in their later history the Karaites were opposed to any connexion with such groups. The result was that some confusion has arisen between these terms and sometimes it seems that the mention of Sadducees is in reality a reference to the sect which comes before us in the Zadokite Work. It must be noted that the Zadokite Work was found in a Genizah in which there was found a considerable amount of Karaite material.

Links between DS and Zadokite Work.

Now it has become evident to several scholars that in some of the DS there is a definite link between the sect mentioned in the Zadokite Work and the group to which these scrolls once belonged. In DSD it is claimed we have the Manual of Discipline of the same sect from which the Zadokite Work had its origin.

For in DSD there is mention of the conditions of membership of the sect and it relates in col.vi.line 14ff. how 'everyone from Israel who dedicates himself to join the Council of the Community....But when he draws near the Council of the Community, he must not touch the purity of the Many until they investigate him....until the completion of a full year'. It is plain from this passage and from others in DSD that a long initiation was required of the persons who joined the sect. Moreover, it is also clear from DSD that among the membership of the sect there were three classes. Thus in DSD col.ii.line 20ff. it reads: 'the priests shall enter the covenant first in the order pertaining to their spirits...after them the Levites shall enter, then thirdly all the people shall enter..'. This recalls the classes of the Zadokite Work where four classes are given - priests, Levites, Israelites and proselytes. The last, as has been remarked, were probably Israelites in fact. It may then be that the fourth class mentioned in the Zadokite Work is to be equated with those in DSD who are referred to as entering into the Community and undergoing the long noviciate.

The opening column of the DSD was missing from the document when it came into the hands of the Americans, but Père de Vaux states that the opening fragments which he has inspected at the Rockefeller Museum, Jerusalem, mention a Book of Hagu which is also referred to in the Zadokite Work as of special importance. It has been conjectured that in DSD we have this Book of Hagu hitherto unknown. This is the suggestion of Dr.Brownlee, but naturally it is open to question, and Dr.Zeitlin is sceptical of the existence at any time of the Book of Hagu, regarding it as a figment of the mind of the writer of the Zadokite Work. It is too soon to say definitely whether DSD is the lost Book of Hagu or not, but the fact that this reference to it appears in the opening passage of DSD is not without great significance in establishing a link. A further link is provided by the fact that in DSD there is mention of the officer who may be called the Inspector; his authority over the Community and its members was

very great, as we can see from DSD col.vi.line 10ff: 'And in the session of the Many, no one shall speak any word which is not according to the pleasure of the Many AND THE REQUEST of the man who is Inspector of the Many..'. This officer, as has been shown above, is well known in the Zadokite Work. It appears that the community practiced a form of community-sharing in the manner of the Early Church and all their goods were transferred to the sect, and they shared a common table. In DSD col.ii.line 24 we read that this sect was to live in true unity. The word for unity in this passage (Yahad) implies a fellowship or koinônia, such as is found in the New Testament. The term is found several times in DSD and also in DSH and these terms are found again in the literature of the sect of the Karaites. Dr. Zeitlin, whose testimony here is valuable, admits this link, for he writes: 'Thus we may conclude that the term (unity) in the DSD and DSH refers to the Karaites'. In an article on the DSD by Dr. Millar Burrows, reference is made to the passage in DSD where it says, 'And these are the judgments by which they shall judge in the community's investigation'. These words in DSD col.vi.line 24 may be translated as 'midrash of the community' rather than 'the community's investigation' and, according to Dr. Zeitlin, they are equivalent to the phrase 'the Book of the Community'. In support of this he mentions that it is well known that the Karaites claimed to have such a 'Book of the Community' (Sepher Hayyahad). The members of the sect in DSD entered into it by taking a solemn oath and were under the discipline of tribunals. They are called the Sons of Zadok just as the members of the sect of the Zadokite Work are.

The Teacher of Righteousness.

In DSH the Teacher of Righteousness plays a prominent part even as he does in the Zadokite Work. In DSH he is described as a priest, although the name 'priest' is not given to him in the text of DSH as we now have it. It is quite clear that a priestly function is ascribed to him. It seems, too, that the Teacher of Righteousness is the subject of DSH col.ii.line 8,

which reads thus: '...the last generation (will hear) from the mouth of the priest whom he has given unto the Ch.....er to give the meaning of all the words of His servants the prophets..'. It is thought that the last word of the lacuna is 'Teacher': so it is conjectured by Dr. Brownlee; Dr. Delcor in 'Essai sur le Midrash D'Habacuc' wisely leaves the lacuna, noting that Rabinowitz conjectured 'in his heart wisdom', i.e. 'in whose heart God has put wisdom'; Dupont-Sommer reads 'house of Israel', but Dr. Delcor says, 'La porte est ouverte à toutes les hypothèses'.

The Wicked Priest.

Over against this Teacher of Righteousness or Priest there is set a Wicked Priest in DSH col.viii.line9: 'Its meaning concerns the Wicked Priest who was summoned against the name of the truth in the beginning of his assumption of power..'. There is also mention of the Prophet of Untruth, otherwise called the Man of Untruth, and it is reasonable conjecture to equate this character with the Man of Scorn mentioned in the Zadokite Work.

The Kittim.

References can be given for what appears to be some act of sacrilege against the Temple, which is spoken of as defiling the sanctuary of God. Thus in DSH col.xii.line 9: '...the Wicked Priest wrought works of abomination and defiled the sanctuary of God..'. Foreign foes are spoken of under the term 'the Kittim'. This term is used in I Maccabees i.1 for 'the son of Philip, who came out of the land of Kittim..', and also in I Macc.viii.5: '..and Philip and Perseus, king of Kittim..'. In both the references it is clear that the Greek and Macedonian kingdoms are referred to. It can also be a reference to the Romans, as it came to be used to indicate them at a later stage. This can be seen in Numbers xxiv.24, where the passage reads (RV trans.): 'But ships shall come from the coasts of Kittim..', and in the Latin Vulgate, 'And they shall come in Triremes of Italy'. Again in Daniel xi.30 where the RV.reads: 'For ships of Kittim shall come against him'. The Vulgate reads: 'For triremes shall come against him, and the Romans..'. Here the Septuagint

too reads: 'For the Romans shall come...'

The House of Absalom.

These Kittim are apparently supported by the Wicked Priest, and retribution is promised with a judgment which will be brought upon him by the Elect of God. There is a strong rebuke of 'the House of Absalom' for not coming to the aid of the Teacher of Righteousness when in need. DSH col.v.3-10: 'The meaning of the passage is that God will not destroy His people by the hand of the nations; but by the hand of His elect... Its meaning concerns the House of Absalom and the men of their counsel who were silent at the reproof of the Teacher of Righteousness and did not help him against the Man of the Lie..'

Nature of War in DSW.

In DSW we find the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness set over against one another. Now, it is possible to regard this war as apocalyptic war, and some scholars take this to be the case; others regard it as in the nature of a ritual war; but others still take it to refer to actual war and there is good ground for this. The references in DSW to the 'Kittim of Assyria' and the 'Kittim of Egypt' certainly suggest a historical background. It need not be denied that it was regarded in an apocalyptic light as about to lead up to an apocalyptic End.

A Rule of War in DSW.

It is the view of Dr. Dupont-Sommer that in DSW we have a 'Rule' for such a war which faced the sect to whom the DS belonged. The two sides were the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness. These two groups are mentioned in DSD and also in the Zadokite Work, although they are not given these names in the latter.

A Twofold Division of Sect.

The members of this sect were regarded as the Faithful and they are linked in the text as derived from Aaron and Israel; their foes were linked with the Kittim of Assyria, the Edomites, the Philistines and the Ammonites, the traditional foes of Israel. The members were derived from Aaron and Israel in

several of the texts and also in the Zadokite Work, and it may be that this is the twofold division of the sect into priests and laity.

A Messianic Hope.

A further link between the sect of the Zadokite Work and the sect of the DS is found in the Messiah who, it is said in the Zadokite Work, should arise to deliver Aaron and Israel. In the DSD there is mention of the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel in the plural. DSD col.ix. line 11: '..until the coming of a Prophet and the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel..'.
A Link between DSW and DST.

In DSW there is instruction for the singing of Hymns after the victory of the army and one of these Hymns has been quoted above. It is very similar to those quoted from DST, except that the latter are not specially battle songs. This would indicate a nexus between the sect of DSW and DST. The sect would naturally require Psalms for other occasions than war. The Psalms are built up from biblical phrases and some scholars think that at least one of them has been composed by the Teacher of Righteousness. Opinion varies on the literary merits of these Psalms; one scholar states that they are full of deep, religious feeling; and beauty of expression: others regard them as of little literary merit. Perhaps the significant point is that they do seem to provide a relationship with the DSW and themselves.

A Covenant Relationship.

From what has been said it should be plain that there is an unmistakable relationship between the Zadokite sect and the people to whom the DS belonged. It is not possible here to enter into all the links that can be found between these documents of the Zadokite sect and the non-biblical scrolls from the Dead Sea Cave. One of the important links, which has not yet been mentioned, is the characteristic word 'Covenant'. This occurs 35 times in the Zadokite Work and this is actually more frequent than in any Book of the Old Testament. This community we find/

we find was bound together by the New Covenant which its members entered into by common consent. Now it is very significant that in DSD and in DSH there is this same condition.

Summary of Links between DS and Zadokite Work.

It may thus be said that in the DS and the Zadokite Work there are these links to be found: The Teacher of Righteousness; The Community; The Covenant; The Rule of the Community; The Book of Hagu; The Wicked Priest; the Sons of Zadok. These are by no means the only links, but they are sufficient to establish the relationship.

Historical Connexion between Sect of DS and Zadokite Work.

It may be pointed out in connexion with the question as to which people used the DS, that the link with the Zadokite Work does not necessarily imply that the sameness of religious outlook leads to the conclusion that the groups were related in time. Dr. Rowley thinks that the situation, as it is presented in the Zadokite Work, is one in which there is no background of war and is that which would arise after the sect had migrated to Damascus. It is still gathered in camps, but there is a different military situation, although the terms used by the sect are derived from a previous military situation.

Origin of Sect of DS.

In the DS there are the Kittim of Assyria and the Kittim of Egypt, and here Dr. Rowley sees the background as pre-Roman and that which would suit the Seleucids and Ptolemies. The mottoes on the banners are reminiscent of the watchwords of Judas Maccab^{as}ous, also does the singing of hymns on the return from victory. It may be that since the Wicked Priest is connected with the Kittim of Assyria (Seleucids) the historical background of the DS can be placed in the 2nd century B.C., when the land of Palestine came under the Seleucid rule. This is not conclusive, of course, but the time of the Maccabean wars seems congenial to the descriptions in the non-biblical text of DS. It was then that the question of the Zadokite priesthood was prominent, through the deposition of the High Priest Onias, who was replaced

by Jason and later by Menelaus, as is related in II Maccabees iv.7: 'But when Seleucus was deceased and Antiochus, who was called Epiphanes, succeeded to the kingdom, Jason the brother of Onias supplanted (uperotheusen) his brother in the high-priesthood'. The word suggests disreputable dealings on the part of Jason and may have been a cause of scandal among the faithful in Israel. This has been thought to be the time when the sect of the Zadokites arose in Judaism, according to some scholars such as Dr. Rowley. It has been pointed out that when the Hasmonaeans took over the high-priesthood, a similar situation might arise, but against this is the fact that no historical notice of any uprising can be found which would answer to the requirements of the DS. Some scholars, such as M.N. Segal, M. Delcor, have thought of the period when the struggle between Pharisee and Sadducee was in progress, i.e. at the end of the century, but there is no foreign power involved in this struggle which would answer to the term 'Kittim' in the DS. Others, such as Dupont-Sommer, have moved the scene down to the middle of the 1st century B.C., when the Romans were engaged in the struggle of Judaism and could be related to the term 'Kittim'; as we saw they were identified with the 'Kittim' in the interpretation of the Book of Daniel by the Vulgate. Dr. Dupont-Sommer, who holds this view, has laid great stress on the passage in DSH col. ii. line 4ff. which says: 'Its meaning concerns the Wicked Priest who persecuted the Teacher of Righteousness in order to swallow him up in his wrath, intending him to go into Exile. So at the end of the "festival", on the resting of the Day of Atonement, he appeared in splendour unto them for the purpose of swallowing them up and that they might stumble on the fast day, the sabbath of their resting'.

Dupont-Sommer's View of the Historical Origin of the Sect.

This passage seems to Dr. Dupont-Sommer to be a reference to the capture of the city of Jerusalem by Pompey on the Day of Atonement. The difficulty here is that it is not clear

that Pompey did take Jerusalem on the Day of Atonement and that the passage does not actually mention the 'Kittim' in connexion with this incident. Further, this interpretation requires a different interpretation of the term 'Kittim' in DSH and DSW and puts the Teacher of Righteousness long after the rise of the sect, whereas in the Zadokite Work the Teacher arises 20 years after the formation of the sect.

View of Maccabaeen Origin of Sect.

If in seeking to find out the origin of the sect which used the DS we return to the time of the Maccabees, Osias may be identified with the Teacher of Righteousness, for he was of the line of Zadok; he was deposed by the chief of the kings of Javan, i.e. the Seleucid monarch, and later was killed at the instigation of Menelaus. In this way the Kittim of the DS and the Wicked Priest are identified as in close historical relation, just as in those texts. The objection which has been made to this by Dr. Dupont-Sommer is that in DSH we find the Kittim sacrificing to their signa and this he would refer to the Roman cult of the Signa. Actually it is known that this cult did not arise until after the Roman Empire was established, so that if this is to be the interpretation, then Dr. Dupont-Sommer's view of the historical situation is too early, as well as the Maccabaeen.

The House of Absalom.

The House of Absalom may be identified perhaps with the Tobiad House, for it is thought that Joseph of the Tobiad House had obtained tax-farming rights from the Egyptians, and when the Seleucids came to power it is probable that the tax-farming rights which strictly belonged to the high-priesthood may have reverted to Onias to the disgust of Joseph, a relative of the high priest. If the change of the high-priesthood to Jason was not opposed by Joseph, it would be easy for the House of Tobias to be called the House of Absalom.

Death of Onias the Teacher of Righteousness.

The death of the High Priest Onias by the treacherous hand

of Andronicus is mentioned in II Maccabees iv.34: 'And coming to Onias, and being persuaded to use treachery... he despatched him without regard of justice'. This must have caused great distress to the Jews and many think that this event is referred to in the Book of Daniel (ix.26): 'An anointed one shall be cut off with all that belongs to him'. Onias was highly regarded by the Jews and appears to have been held in the same esteem that the Teacher of Righteousness was held.

Menelaus the Wicked Priest.

The Wicked Priest is said to have defiled the Sanctuary and here again perhaps the reference is to Menelaus. In II Maccabees iv.36 we read: 'Now when many sacrileges had been committed in the city by Lysimachus with the consent of Menelaus ...after many vessels of gold had been dispersed'. This may refer to the vessels of the Sanctuary which we know were always the object of covetous eyes.

Antiochus the Man of Scorn.

The Man of Scorn or Prophet of Untruth could then be equated with Antiochus Epiphanes. In the Zadokite Work it is not clear whether he is a Jew or a Gentile, but in DSH the reference seems to be to a Gentile, since he is said to have 'rejected the Law among all nations'. In I Maccabees i.41 we read, 'And King Antiochus wrote to his whole kingdom that all should be one people and that each should forsake his own laws..'. Dr. Dupont-Sommer, on the other hand, would identify the Prophet of Untruth in DSH with the Wicked Priest, but this does not seem to be correct. He thinks that sometimes it referred to Aristobulus and sometimes to Hyrcanus. The difficulty here is to see how either of these persons could be regarded as 'rejecting the Law among all peoples'. It seems better to take the Man of Scorn as a different person from the Wicked Priest.

The Sect's Marriage Laws.

The sect of the DS condemned marriage with a niece, as has been shown above, and in the Antiquities of Josephus we read concerning Joseph of the Tobiad House that he 'being disordered

with drink, knew not who she was, and so lay with his brother's daughter, and this did he many times... but his brother bid him be in no concern about that matter... so Joseph commended him for his brotherly love and married his daughter..' (Jos. Antiq.xiii.4:6). It does not appear impossible to imagine that such scandalous acts caused a prohibition in the teaching of the sect of the DS and Zadokite Work.

Ptolemaic Origin of Sect of DS.

Now if Onias is made to be the Teacher of Righteousness, the beginnings of the sect of the DS would reach back before the Seleucid rule into that of the Ptolemaic rule. This, as we can see from the Book of Maccabees, was a time when the challenge of Hellenism was felt by Judaism and it was a time when the Hasidim arose to insist on a firmer adherence to the Law. It would be easy for such a group to regard Onias as a hero and his deposition and subsequent martyrdom would bring strong feelings to the surface. Thus the revolt under Judas Maccabeus provides us with the correct setting for the background of DSW, where the Teacher does not share in the war and perhaps for the reason that he was dead.

The Sect's Migration to Damascus.

Forty years after the death of the Teacher of Righteousness the sect migrated to Damascus. This gives a date around 131 B.C. The Zadokite Work would have been composed before this 40 years had expired and, as it is not clear just when the move to Damascus took place, it may have been after the removal to Damascus and towards the expiry of the 40 years period which was expected to be a time of crisis. This would bring us to the time of the Hasmonaeans who usurped the high-priesthood. Here, then, may be found the reason for the sect's removal to Damascus. In the flux of affairs at this period it would be quite possible for the two districts of Jerusalem and Damascus to find themselves in rival camps, since both Jonathan and Simon were involved in intrigues between the rival Seleucid rulers, as one after another they arose to

compete for supremacy.

The Star, Leader of the Sect.

The man who is called the Star in this literature must have come into prominence after the death of Onias and before the migration to Damascus. It is possible that it was he who gave the sect the DSD and helped to organise the community.

Summary.

To sum up, it may be stated that as far as the evidence will allow we can assume that the DS were used by a sect within Judaism, which may have had its rise in a definite historical situation in pre-Christian times, when apostasy and Hellenisation threatened the nation of Israel within and foreign foes from without, and when it was felt that a more rigorous adherence to the Law was required.

B. Were the Users of the Scrolls Essenes?

The Excavations at Kirbet Qumran. (1952)

Excavations at Kirbet Qumran in the desert of Judea, less than a mile from the cave in which the DS were found, appear to have thrown light on the question of the origin of the Scrolls. According to Père de Vaux, in the principal building of Kirbet Qumran a jar identical to those found in the cave was discovered sunk in the floor and used for household purposes. This building was not occupied for a very long period, since there is no stratification. Eleven coins in it range from the procurators of the reign of Augustus to the period of the first Jewish war. The building was destroyed by violence and there is evidence of its having been abandoned in a great hurry.

Was it an Essene Retreat?

Père de Vaux concludes that what he found at Kirbet Qumran strongly suggests the identity of this site with the place in the Wilderness of Judea 'above Engaddi' described by Pliny the Elder as the centre of a sect of pious Jews living in celibate isolation. The proximity of Kirbet Qumran to the Manuscript Cave, the character of the building excavated, and the passage in Pliny, all seem to de Vaux to suggest the hypothesis that the DS were part of the library of Kirbet Qumran, itself an Essene retreat. The size of the cemetery, compared to the size of the building, further suggests to de Vaux that this was a sacred spot to which pilgrims might come and where members of the sect might wish to be buried.

Dupont-Sommer's View.

Dr. Dupont-Sommer has proposed a similar view to that of de Vaux. He has equated the Essenes with the Hasidim, finding that the name Essene, in his opinion, means 'pious' and thus is the same in significance as 'hasid'. Anyone who has read Dr. Lightfoot's dissertation on the 'Essenes' in his 'Colossians' will be aware of the great difficulty in explaining the meaning

of the word 'Essene'. Dr. Lightfoot examines at least 12 possible derivations for the name. Yet Dr. Dupont-Sommer says: 'I am persuaded that Essenes and Hasidim are in fact identical. They are the 'pious', the Jews who were fanatically attached to the Law and the Covenant...It can only be, therefore, that the sect of the New Covenant is to be identified with that of the Essenes...But I am convinced that the sect of 'Ain Feshka is an Essene sect and not one that existed alongside the Essenes'.

Bleddyn Roberts' View.

Dr. B. Roberts states that the view that there is an affinity between the New Covenanters and the Essenes is becoming increasingly emphasised by many scholars, and the arguments, in his opinion, are strong in favour of establishing at least a connexion between them; but he warns us that there are many difficulties still in the way of making this connexion. One which he mentions is that it is still an unsolved puzzle as to whether the Essenes made sacrificial offerings in the Temple at Jerusalem. This is important because there is a definite reference to such action in the Zadokite Work.

A second point he makes is that there does seem to be affinity in the method of treatment of Scripture which the Essenes favoured and the type of exegesis found in DSH. But here again he warns that this allegorical method of Scripture exegesis is not the monopoly of one sect only. There is no evidence that the pesher of DSH and the Zadokite Work had anything in common with that of the Essenes. Some scholars have found a nexus in the part played by the term 'mystery' in both communities, but this could also be found in common with many other parties. Josephus does in fact make a connexion between the Pythagoreans and the Essenes on the very same grounds. Dr. Roberts has rightly said: 'The Essenes are still too little known to be adopted as the people responsible for the Dead Sea cache and its related literature'.

P.Kahle's View.

Dr.Kahle follows the view of Dr.Dupont-Sommer that the DS probably belonged to the sect of the Essenes. In his work 'Die Hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle', he remarks that 'the oath which the novice had to take, and which is preserved for us in DSD, shows great similarity to that of the Essenes as depicted in Josephus. Dupont-Sommer is inclined to equate the members of the New Covenant with the Essenes, of whom we have notice from much later times through the descriptions of Philo and Josephus'.¹ He quotes Dupont-Sommer as stating that the Cave contained a deposit of MSS which was derived from Essene circles or from circles in which their works were read. Writing in *Vetus Testamentum*, Dr.Kahle says of the DS: 'We have here a considerable deposit....It appears to have been the library of a certain community and there are good reasons for identifying it with the Essenes'.²

L.Harding's View.

Mr.Harding, as Director of Antiquities, took part with de Vaux in the excavations at Kirbet Qumran. At first he seemed to think that the building might have been a Roman fort, but after the later and prolonged excavation this view was apparently given up. As has already been noted, the excavators found a jar similar to those in which the DS were concealed and alongside this jar coins dated from A.D.10 to A.D.67. There was no evidence of anything later. Also at the site there are more than 1000 graves laid out in parallel rows. Mr.Harding stated that the evidence is clear that during the period of the building at Qumran every cave and rock shelter in the area was used. His view is that Qumran

¹ 'Der Eid der bei der Aufnahme zu schwören sei weise grosse Ähnlichkeit mit dem Eide der Essener, wie er von Josephus geschildert werde. Dupont-Sommer ist geneigt die Mitglieder des Neuen Bundes mit den Essenern gleichzusetzen...u.s.w.'. P.Kahle, 'Die heb.Handschriften aus der Höhle', p.71.
² 'Die Höhle habe nach ihm ein Depot von Schriften enthalten, die aus essenischen Kreisen stammten oder in ihnen gelesen wurden..'. ibid. p.72.

was the headquarters and cemetery of a settlement of people living there. He mentions Pliny 'the Elder's' account of the Essenes who are said to have had a settlement 'above Engeddi' and he says that 'the ruin itself, with its peculiar cemetery which is without parallel in other ancient sites in Jordan, is clearly not an ordinary defensive or agricultural post'. He thinks that the evidence points to the conclusion that the DS cave is the place where the group hid its library when it fled the Roman destruction and slaughter in A.D.70.

R.J.Tournay's View.

Dr.Tournay does not think that the sect who owned the DS is the same as the Essenes. One reason he gives which must be considered is that the Essenes were a non-military and pacifist group. Writing in Revue Biblique he says: 'The non-canonical (apocryphe) document of the "War" (DSW) would reflect then the military ideas at that time, which were so opposed to the pacifism of the Essenes'.¹ This party he thinks of as a part of the Zealots. He thinks the 'halakhoth' which are so like that of the Maccabean period may be conscious imitation of the attitude of the Hasidim, as it is reflected in I Maccabees 11.50: 'And now, my children, be ye zealous for the Law and give your lives for the Covenant'. Further, he regards the DST as allied more in spirit to the doctrine of the Pharisees as reflected in the similar Psalms of Solomon. The sect, he suggests, would treasure the Holy Books perhaps during the persecution of Varus, whose legionaries slew Judas and scattered his followers, as related in Acts v.37: 'Judas the Galilean arose in the days of the census and drew away some of the people after him; he also perished, and all who followed him were scattered'. Or it may have been at the time of the Great

¹ ' L'apocryphe de la "Guerre" refléterait alors les conceptions militaires, si opposées au pacifisme essénien' - Tournay in Rev.Biblique.Avril.1949, p.233.

Revolt in 66 A.D. which was fomented by the party of the Zealots, who seized the fortress of Gypros near Jericho, Machera and Masada on the coast of the Dead Sea. As Tournay points out, it was in this last stronghold that Eleazar, a descendant of Judas, committed suicide in A.D.73, together with his comrades. The Zadokite Work, he believes, reflects the state of this sect at the end of the 2nd century A.D. and he remarks that some have found in that document reference to the time of Bar Kochba. Be that as it may, it is to the DSD that we should look for clues for the identification of the sect of DS.¹

G.R.Driver's View.

Dr.Driver raises the question as to what source the DS should be referred and to what body they belonged. He regrets that there is so little known of the groups of Judaism. He prefers to use the name 'group' rather than 'sect' since he does not think they are sects in the sense that they were heretical divisions within Judaism. In the absence of sufficient knowledge of the groups within Judaism in the period covering the last centuries B.C. and the early centuries A.D., he regards any view which may be held concerning the 'group' to which the DS belonged as in the nature of the case only provisional.

Dr.Driver takes note of the identification by Dr.Susenik of the sect of DS with the Essenes, although it should be said that Dr.Susenik did not express his view as more than a tentative one and subject to revision. It was on the obvious grounds that the Essenes were known to possess their own literature and to have had a settlement in the Jordan Valley, as we have seen above, that Dr.Susenik made this possible identification of the DS with them. But Dr.Driver points out that all such groups had their own books and, further, the sect or group of

¹ ' L'identification de la secte .. le Manuel de discipline nous apportera peut-être sur ce point la lumière décisive - Tournay in Rev.Biblique.Avril.1949, p.233.

the Essenes was not confined to the Jordan Valley. Moreover, though he admits that much in the DS seems to fit such a group, there is an absence of direct mention of some of their characteristic doctrines, such as their rejection of animal sacrifices, their rejection of slavery, their insistence on celibacy (at least in some of their groups), their community of possessions (here Driver has overlooked DSD v.2: 'to become a community of Torah and in property'), their stress on bathing, etc. Dr. Driver also draws attention to the matter of the Teacher of Righteousness and the Covenant in DS and states that among the known writings of the Essenes there is no indication of these terms. He rightly admits the link between these scrolls and the Zadokite Work, where these terms are found and where the same halakhic character is found, which is common to DSW & DSD, but which he cannot trace to any body of Essenes. He doubts whether the identification of the community of the DS with the sect of the Zadokite Work can be established.

A. Parrot's View.

Dr. Parrot of the Oriental Antiquities Department of the Louvre Museum finds a definite affinity between the sect of DS and the Essenes, but does not go so far as to exclude the possibility that some other identification is preferable. He rejects the view of Susenik that the cave was really a Genizah, since it is unthinkable that the DS would have been wrapped up and sealed with such care if they were rejected copies. This care suggests to him that those who deposited the DS took this care to preserve them from the ravages of time, because they believed they would return to recover them at a future date, and wished to keep them intact till then. 'Did they', he asks¹, 'belong to a sect (one thinks of the Essenes) or to Jewish followers who were a little heterodox? It is not impossible.'

¹ 'Ont-ils appartenu à une secte (on a pensé aux Esséniens) ou à des Juifs sympathisants et quelque peu hétérodoxes? Ce n'est pas impossible. Nous avons soutenu l'hypothèse que toute cette documentation aurait été mise à l'abri au moment de l'Insurrection (entre 67 et 70 ap.J.C.) - A. Parrot in Iods' 'Hist. de la Littérature Hébraïque et Juive', p.1031.

We have upheld the hypothesis that all these documents could have been concealed at the time of the Rebellion (between 67 A.D. and 70 A.D.) and just in a district completely controlled by Jewish forces and where they would hope for certain that the Romans would never come'.

C.H. Lehmann's View.

Mr. Lehmann, who is in charge of the Hebrew Collection of Manuscripts of Oxford University, has commented on the supposed pre-Christian origin of DS in the Jewish Chronicle. He first of all states that the pre-Christian origin of the DS is based on the evidence of the Hellenistic pottery and the epigraphical material of the scrolls themselves, and claims that both of these factors are capable of different interpretations. He feels that much depends on whether the dating of the taking of Jerusalem on the Day of Atonement by Pompey can be substantiated, and the sacrificing of the Romans to their standards at this early period, and also on the correctness of the linking of the DS with the Zadokite Work. He claims that there is evidence in DS that the writers knew of and used some of the sources that occur in Tannaitic literature and in ancient Aramaic translations, and this together with the points of contact with the early Hebrew literature makes him hesitate to reject the DS having belonged to an early group, but he would rather place this group in the beginning of the present era than before it.

He is fully aware of the connexion that seems to exist with Karaite literature and mentions the points of contact between the DS and this literature of the Karaites. Anan, founder of Karaism, belongs to the 8th century A.D., but, though he admits this connexion, he thinks 'the proper conclusion from that would, however, not seem to be that the DS are later than the beginnings of the Karaite literature, but that the Karaites used older documents. In that direction also points the testimony of the Nestorian patriarch Timotheus I, who reports the discovery of Hebrew Scrolls near Jericho in the 8th century. A Karaite such as the ninth-century Persian theologian, Benjamin

of Nahawend, it has been suggested, may have used texts from that cave'. It is important to note that Lehmann would place the Zadokite teachings prior to the Karaites and thus he leaves room for the sect of the DS being prototypes of the Karaites and not the other way round.

B.Reicke's View.

Dr.Reicke of Palestine, in an article 'Die Ta'amire-Schriften und die Damaakus-Fragmente', discussed the Damascus Document in relation to the DS. In an early study entitled, 'The Damascus Document and the New Testament', he had dated the former in the Hasmonean period at the latest, because of the anti-Hellenistic trend in it and from its links with the Book of Jubilees. This first study he had made in 1946. Now in this later study of the DS Dr.Reicke has stressed the importance of the fact that the opponents of the sect of the DS are called Kittim as many as 9 times in DSH. The Kittim, he is sure, are the Seleucids and the Ptolemies. Even before the discovery of the DS, Dr.Reicke maintains, the identification was made between Antiochus Epiphanes and the 'head' of the kings of Javan (Greece). As others have done, he would see in the Wicked Priest a reference to Joseph of the Tobiad House who collected taxes for the Ptolemies c.200 B.C. The value of this view lies in the fact that, quite apart from the DS, Dr.Reicke had dated the Zadokite Work in the period of the Hasmoneans and had found there a congenial historical situation. He does not mention the Essenes.

S.Zeitlin's View.

Dr.Zeitlin thinks that the group to which the DS belonged was one from the Middle Ages. It should be remembered that he is sceptical about the authenticity of the DS and inclined to regard them as a 'hoax'. He points out that the dating by Schechter of the Zadokite Work in the period of the Second Jewish Commonwealth is erroneous. To use his own words 'actually the Zadokite Work is a karaitic work written during the Middle Ages'.

On the question whether the DS belonged to a sect like the Essenes, he refers to Dr. Brownlee's comparison of the similarity of the doctrine of the DSD and the doctrine of the Essenes and shows that he is dubious of the correctness of Dr. Brownlee's version of DSD. He thinks it will need to be corrected by a knowledge of medieval Hebrew. From the summary of the contents of DSD given by Dr. Brownlee he thinks the doctrine of DSD should not be compared with the teaching of the Essenes, but that of the rabbinic and karaitic literature of the Middle Ages.

On the Maccabaeen origin of the Karaite Work, he states, that it is impossible, since the law about Sabbath journeys which it contains was not formulated until the time of Rabban Gamaliel the Elder, i.e. in the second half of the 1st century A.D., but is in full accord with the law of Sabbath which obtained among the Karaites.

Dr. Zeitlin also refers to the article of Dr. Millar Burrows, 'The Manual of the Judaeen Covenanters' in which the DSD is described and the doctrines in it are paralleled with those held by the Essenes according to Philo and Josephus. He mentions in particular the note Dr. Burrows has made on the prohibition of spitting which is given in DSD and was also mentioned by Josephus¹ as one of the points in which the Essenes were very strict. To quote Dr. Burrows: 'in what Josephus says of the Essenes and what we find in DSD is a slight and even amusing item, significant only because one cannot believe that Josephus could have invented it. The Essenes, he says, avoided spitting in the middle (eis mesous) or to the right. According to DSD, among the offenses punished by suspension from the group is spitting in the midst of the assembly'. Dr. Zeitlin counters this by saying: 'I do not know what the Hebrew words in the scroll (DSD) are for "in the midst of the assembly". But Professor Burrows should rather have examined the Talmud where he would have found that

¹ 'They are careful not to spit into the midst of the company or to the right' - Josephus, Jewish Wars II.147.

Rabbi Joshua ben Levi prohibited spitting in the synagogue. As a matter of fact, the actual words in DSD are not in the synagogue, but in the session (moshab). It is probably true that the rabbis and the Karaites laid great stress on the prohibition of spitting in the synagogues, but that is not the point, nor would Josephus have remarked on the strangeness of it if it had been commonplace.

According to Dr. Zeitlin, the DSD could not have belonged to the Essenes, for, he tells us, 'it was written by a mediocre Jew, or more likely by a mediocre Karaite'. If it has any historical background at all, it may be that it refers to the incident in connexion with Menachem ben Saruk when he was attacked on the Sabbath day (most likely the Day of Atonement) by the great Jewish leader of Spain, Hasdai ibn Shaprut. Dr. Zeitlin thinks this attack on Menachem was due to the accusation that he was a Karaite. DSH, we are told, was probably written by a disciple of Menachem ibn Saruk who was probably a Karaite. He called his teacher 'Teacher of Righteousness' and his enemies and his masters 'Men of Lies'.

P.R. Weis' View.

Dr. Weis of Manchester thinks that he has found Arabic influence in the DS. An instance of this, he claims, is found in DSH where the comments in the text are introduced by the term peshar. This can, as we have seen, be translated by 'the meaning is' or 'the meaning'. According to Dr. Weis, this mode of introducing comment was unknown in the Talmudic times and arose in the post-Talmudic period under the influence of Judaeo-Arabic writers who were in turn influenced by the Arabic method of separating quotation from the comment. The Arabic terms he uses to illustrate the point, however, are not equivalents of the Hebrew terms, which he suggests correspond. One of the terms he uses he admits has no exact equivalent in Hebrew; he finds it appears in Karaite writings in Hebraised form. The argument here seems to break down when consideration is given to the use

of the term pesher in Ecclesiastes viii.1: 'the interpretation of a thing', for this expression pesher dabar is an exact equivalent to the term used so often in DSH to introduce the comment.

Dr.Weis also thinks that the term Teacher of Righteousness is not found in Talmudic midrashic literature, but is a term which occurs several times in Karaitic literature. This is naturally an argumentum e silentio and thus not of great value by itself. What is more difficult to accept, in the view of Dr.Weis, is the suggestion that by the term Teacher of Righteousness not one but four different personalities are to be understood. Certainly this is not a natural way of interpreting the use of this term in DSH however it may fit into the Zadokite Work. He regards the Righteous Teacher in the Zadokite Work as meaning: 1) The Messiah; 2) The Bud; 3) The Moreh Zedek at the end of days; 4) The Moreh Zedek of early times. This Teacher of Righteousness Dr.Weis would identify with Abu 'Issa, the founder of the 'Isawite sect, mainly on the strength of the variation in the DSH of the canonical reading of Hab.ii.2: 'that he who reads may run'. The DSH has 'that the Reader may run'. Here he thinks a person is spoken of, and finds that Sharastani says that Abu 'Issa 'exalted the calling of the caller and he maintained that the caller is also Messiah'. Pinsker thinks that the name of the Karaites is derived from kôre, i.e. 'those who read and run' like the persons mentioned in Habakkuk. This may be so, and if it is then Dr.Weis' argument is invalid.

Having decided that Abu 'Issa is the Teacher of Righteousness Dr.Weis then concludes that his opponent Muskah is the Man of the Lie of DSH. In order to reach Abu 'Issa as the fourth Teacher of Righteousness, in accord with this scheme, Dr.Weis has to include JESUS, Muhammad, the Rabbanite Hillel, together with Abu 'Issa. The first Teacher of Righteousness, who in the Zadokite Work is expected to arise 20 years after the era of righteousness, is Jesus, according to Weis. His dating actually brings him to B.C.10, but he is rescued from this contretemps by the

aid of Tertullian who seems to point to B.C.6-9 for the birth of our Lord. It cannot be said that this is very convincing.

It will not surprise anyone to find that the Kittim in this scheme are the Crusaders. There are good grounds for identifying the Kittim with Cyprus, but none at all for making them to be the Crusaders, except it be a strong desire to bring the sect of vDS down to the Middle Ages. When Dr.Weis comes to explain the Kittim of DSW, he again seeks a Middle Ages setting, but this time the Kittim are no longer the Crusaders, but the Seljuks and Fatimids who fought over Palestine. There is no suggestion in his argument that the sect of the 'Isawites ever fought against the Seljuks in connexion with their faith, nor is it easy to see where the Temple of the Jews would fit into this picture, during such an age.

'To sum up', says Dr.Weis, 'the examination of the Scroll (DSH) suggests it was written about the year 1096 (A.D.) by an 'Isawite or Judganite who chose the first two chapters of Habakkuk as a suitable text for giving expression to the expectations of his sect, as to the arrival of the Crusaders, subjugation of the Seljuks and finally the advent of the Teacher of Righteousness'.

Summary of Views.

It is quite obvious that the question of the sect or group to which the DS belonged is one that allows of a great variety of views. It has been seen that there are some scholars who look for the origin of the sect in the Ptolemaic era and others who are inclined to look to the Maccabaeen era, while others are convinced that the sect is to be found in the Hasmonean era, or in the Christian era, or in the Middle Ages. Are we then to think of the sect which possessed the DS as being Hasidim, or Essenes, or Ebionites, or Zadokites, or Karaites? Or are we unable to identify them?

C. An Attempted Answer to the Question of Origin of DS.

There can be no doubt that there are some very strong resemblances between the practices of the sect or group of the DS and that of the Essenes, ones which cannot be overlooked. It is true they were not celibate as were those Essenes who lived in the 1st century A.D., and whom we know from our texts. But Josephus is clear that 'there is another order of Essenes, who agree with the rest as to their way of living, and customs, and laws, but differ from them in point of marriage, as thinking that by not marrying they cut off the principal part of life, which is the prospect of succession.... However, they try their spouses for three years..'. It must also be admitted that there are differences between the group in the DS and the Essenes as they are usually known.

It must be remembered, as Dr. Rowley has said, that there is evidence that the Essenes went back as far as the 2nd century B.C. Bishop Lightfoot, whose studies in Essenism are profound, thinks it reasonable to seek their origin in the pre-Christian period. Actually Essenism was not so much a sect as a manner of life. As with the Pythagoreans in Magnia Graecia, the Buddhists in India and the Christian monks in Egypt, they sought to establish a brotherhood rather than a sect. This they did by fencing themselves about with rigid rules and seeking to avoid contamination from foreigners. It is reasonable to suppose with Dr. Rowley that the Essenes go back to a common beginning with the Pharisees and both may have arisen in the stirring days of the Maccabees. The Maccabean era was a time when more than one group arose in Judaism. Dr. Rowley has said, 'The beginnings of Pharisaism are to be sought there, and probably the beginnings of Essenism and of other groups'.

If we suppose that the Teacher of Righteousness is Onias, the High Priest in the days of the Ptolemies, and that he was slain in the time of Antiochus, within 40 years the group, whose sympathies were very strongly with him, may have fled to the safety of Damascus, and if this was near the end of the time of

expectation of the Messiah who was to arise, we are brought to about 131 B.C. The Star who arose to take charge of the group would be placed after the death of Onias and before the migration to Damascus and he could have given the group the Manual of Discipline (DSD) and would have been responsible for its organisation. As the group was organised on a basis of common sharing of goods, any books they brought together would be formed into a library for the common use. That some possessed copies of Scriptures of their own in the time of Antiochus seems to be shown by the fact that he made it an offence worthy of death for individuals to be in possession of them.

Now it is believed that the cache at 'Ain Feshka at one time contained as many as 200 scrolls, so that it may be that the members of the group brought with them old copies such as the Leviticus fragment seems to indicate from its archaic characters. Books would be copied out by members: this group in any case must have composed its own particular writings and therefore were not without such skill in literary matters. The jars would be used to hold the scrolls. Dr. Kahle says the practice of using jars in this manner is well-known, but de Vaux says it was not usual to keep libraries in jars. Be that as it may, we know from the Book of Jeremiah that deeds were stored in jars and it does not seem so different to keep scrolls in them for reference purposes.

From the text of the DSIa it would seem that this MS may have been written to help readers who were not perfectly familiar with Hebrew. If this is so, the copy may have been made before the Maccabean period, since it is believed by good scholars that at that time there was a revival of Hebrew, just as there has been a revival of Hebrew in Palestine in our own day through the new Zionism. Let us suppose, then, that this DSIa was made well into the 2nd century B.C.; we should then have ample time for the corrections we find in its text to have been made between then and the Maccabean period, and this would also

allow for the constant use to which it was subjected to wear it away in parts.

The non-Biblical books of the cache can have been written by the group at various times prior to their final departure from the site of 'Ain Feshka. There will be no difficulty in explaining the presence in the cave of the Roman lamp and cooking-pot on this hypothesis, for this may have been the final deposit of the group's scrolls and not, as many scholars have held it to be, a later entry. This view would make it easy to suppose that a copy of the Zadokite Work was, as supposed by Kahle, deposited in the cave with the DS.

If it be asked how it is that we only have copies of the Zadokite Work much later, from Egypt and not Palestine, the explanation may be offered that, as Professor Eissfeldt has stated, there is a text of a letter of Timotheus to Sergius, Metropolitan of Elam. In the letter it is related that a cave had been discovered in the area of the Dead Sea which contained a number of MSS; this was c.800 A.D. Again, from other texts scholars have found that during the next century or more there were people known as the 'Cave Sect' who were given this name because their works were found in a cave. It was de Vaux who first drew their attention to this matter. Again, we find mention of this 'Cave Sect' from Karaite sources. From the Karaite writer, Kirkisani, it is learned that the Cave Sect were related in some way to the Zadokites. He places the Cave Sect between the Zadokites and Jesus, but Shahrastani places them four centuries before Arius. If we suppose that the Cave Sect were named thus because their writings were discovered in the Cave and Zadokites because of the references to the Sons of Zadok in their books, then it would look like a definite nexus with the group of the DS. We have already seen that the teachings of the Zadokites are very like what we know of the DS group.

Let us suppose again that the cave found in 800 A.D. is the one at 'Ain Feshka and that many of the MSS were then removed and fell into the hands of the Karaites; on this hypothesis we

would be able to explain the absence of many of the MSS, the breakages in the jars which archeologists have declared to be ancient, the link between the Karaites and the DS group and the fact that the Karaites were, as we have seen, called Zadokites. At the same time, it would be understandable why the Zadokite Work came to be copied so late as the 10th, 11th or 12th centuries A.D. and why it was found in a synagogue in Cairo. It would not be difficult to explain the differences as well as the likeness between the Karaites and the group of the DS. We should then look to the DS group for the influence over the Karaites and not vice versa, and this would suit the archeological and palaeographical evidence much better.

We may think of the group of Essenes making the deposit after the time of Pliny, since he tells us they were near the Dead Sea in his day. Thus we should look to a time after A.D.70, and it may have been after the rebellion of Bar-Cochba in the 2nd century.

This is, of course, only a suggestion and further light on the origin of this strange group of the DS may be forthcoming anytime in the future, when the new finds around the Dead Sea area have been made known to scholars.

IV. IMPORTANCE OF THE DOCUMENTS FOR O.T. STUDY

A) INTRODUCTION

B) BEARING ON THE O.T.

C) VIEWS OF SCHOLARS

W.F. ALBRIGHT

A. BENTZEN

O.H. LEHMANN

A. PARROT

A. DUPONT-SOMMER

G.L. HARDING

B.J. ROBERTS

M. DELCOR

P. KAHLE

G.R. DRIVER

SUMMARY

D) CONCLUSION

IV. IMPORTANCE OF THE DOCUMENTS FOR C.T. STUDY.

A) Introduction.

When the question of the importance of the DS is considered, it has to be recognised that all the studies in connexion with them are to some extent limited by the obscurities which still exist at this early stage of the investigations concerning the date and origin of the documents. It will have been plain already from what has been said that there exists in this matter a very wide range of views on both these themes. It would be foolish, therefore, if any scholars failed to take into consideration the fact that any results of their studies can only be of a tentative character in the very nature of the case, and that they ought not to be regarded as final.

Dr. Kahle in 'Die Hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle' gives a good example of such disregard for the real nature of the evidence by one scholar of repute who is quoted as saying: 'The Leviticus Fragments were part of a scroll written in a beautiful professional hand about the second half of the fifth century B.C.'. This conclusion is arrived at, as Dr. Kahle says, 'On the grounds of a very learned looking comparison of the script of this fragment (DSfLev.) with the independently supported old-Hebrew types of script', and it is not difficult to follow Dr. Kahle's comment when he remarks on the statement: 'one asks oneself with astonishment how he could have arrived at this unusual and precise dating'.¹ The reasons are given by the same scholar in the sentences which immediately follow: 'That is the period when the great change in the script of the Torah took place. Thus the scroll of which the Leviticus Fragments formed a part belonged to the final period when Palaeo-Hebrew was in use'. But very few scholars today would accept the view of the Talmud that the Square Hebrew script was introduced by Ezra; therefore to derive the DSfLev. from a period prior to that time is to go beyond the evidence which is at our disposal at present.

¹'Man fragt sich etwas erstaunt, wie er zu dieser seltsam genauen Datierung kommen kann' - Kahle: 'Die heb. Handschriften aus d. Höhle p.62.

Yet it need not be thought, on the other hand, that no conclusions can be reached at the present stage of study of these documents, for such an attitude would be unduly pessimistic and unnecessary. In spite of the fact that different scholars have propounded a great variety of dates for the DS, the fact remains that the consensus of opinion favours an early dating rather than a late, and it may be claimed that the period two centuries before and two centuries after the Christian era began would find support from many scholars. Likewise on the origin there would be found a large measure of agreement among scholars that whatever the date of deposit of the DS in the cave at 'Ain Feshka, they originally belonged to a group which existed within Judaism and took its rise in pre-Christian times.

B) Bearing on the O.T.

It can be said then that the DS are related to certain post-exilic developments within Judaism and which can in a sense be regarded as a *Praeparatio Evangelica* and must be of interest to the O.T. scholar in any reconstruction he may attempt of the post-exilic period. Again, the thorough study of the O.T. has always included philological and literary studies arising from the Hebrew and cognate texts which had their origin in Israel.

In connexion with the former, one thinks of the studies of the developmental aspects of Israel's religion, such as Dr.H. Gressmann's revision of Bousset's work, 'Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter', or Dr.R.H.Charles' 'Religious Development between the Old and New Testament', or Dr.W.O.E. Oesterley's 'The Jews and Judaism during the Greek Period' and 'The Age of Transition', or Dr.A.Causse's 'Les "pauvres" d'Israël'. In connexion with the latter, one thinks of Dr.R.H.Charles' great work, 'The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament', or Dr.E.Kautzsch's 'Apokryphen und Pseudépigraphen', or smaller but not less important, the work of Dr.H.H.Rowley, 'The Relevance of Apocalyptic'. All these are the products of Old Testament scholarship. The DS, then, it may be claimed, bring a wealth of

new material for the historical, philological and literary study of the O.T. But it must be stressed, even at the risk of repetition, that the importance of the DS for O.T. study lies more in the problems which they raise than in the answers which they can give to these problems.

C) Views of Scholars.

Scholars have been quick to realise the importance of the DS for the study of the O.T. and to see in them material which can be used in their various fields of study.

W.F.Albright.

Dr.Albright has said in 'The Old Testament and Modern Study': 'One recent discovery promises to illuminate the text and canon of the Hebrew Bible in a way previously un hoped for by the most optimistic scholar. I refer, of course, to the finding of the Dead Sea Scrolls... The new biblical texts will provide textual critics with a wealth of new material. Since the Greek translators of the third and early second centuries B.C. probably employed old scrolls of the fourth and third centuries where possible, we must not be surprised to find our new evidence from a later date supporting the Massoretic Hebrew against the Greek most of the time where the two texts diverge. One thing is already certain: though the Hebrew text was far from being fully Massoretic in the period c.150 and c.50 B.C., it was already fixed, and the differences between it and our printed Bibles are seldom significant'. Dr.Albright goes on to state that the new texts from the first century B.C. are written in familiar quasi-Massoretic consonantal orthography and are very close to the Masoretic tradition, though sometimes they depart from it in favour of the LXX readings. The DSIa, he considers to be written in a drastically divergent orthography with a fullness of vowel-letters, which is greater than that of the Nash Papyrus, to indicate the vocalisation. As regards the text of DSIa, he says, 'Though the text is careless and may have been

based on a specially dictated prototype, as thought by H.M. Orlinsky, the spelling yields a rich harvest of morphological and lexicographical details hitherto unknown, since they were lost long before the Massorah'. Speaking on the matter of textual criticism of the O.T., he makes some rather incisive remarks when he says, 'One thing is certain: the days when Duhm and his imitators could recklessly emend the Hebrew text of the poetic books of the Bible are gone for ever; so also is the time when Wutz felt free to reinterpret the original Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX to suit himself'. Of the consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible, Dr. Albright, speaking with the DS in mind, has written: 'We may rest assured that the consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible, though not infallible, has been preserved with an accuracy perhaps unparalleled in any other Near-Eastern literature'.

Dr. Albright refers to the discovery of the DST, which, in his opinion, were composed 'not later than the second century B.C.'. These, as has been observed above, present an odd mosaic of phrases which can be paralleled from many Books of the O.T., even including the latest Psalms and the Book of Job, and this appears to Dr. Albright to give 'the coup de grâce to the hypothesis of Maccabaean Psalms'. Moreover, in the light of the DSH, the composition of which he places in the pre-Christian period, he finds it 'impossible seriously to accept the idea that there are Hellenistic elements in the Prophets'. The fact that many of the words and phrases in Hebrew poetry were apparently misunderstood by the translators when they attempted to put them into Greek in the 2nd century should, he thinks, 'give us pause before suggesting that some of these poems had been composed in the very same century'.

In a postscript to Supplementary Studies Nos. 10-12, published by the American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951, Dr. Albright says of the new material from the DS: 'It is quite true that the discovery of the Scrolls menaces the insecure foundations of many speculative hypotheses of.... Old Testament scholars, not to mention students of rabbinics. Thus the new evidence adds materially to the already impressive arguments against dating any of

the Psalms or Prophetic writings after the fourth century B.C. at latest. The Isaiah texts prove that the basic consonantal text underlying the Massoretic Bible goes back well into pre-Christian times and makes emendation a much more delicate operation than it has often been in the recent past'. On the question of the developmental aspect of Israel's religion, Dr. Albright has written thus: 'The new evidence with regard to the beliefs and practices of Jewish sectarians of the last two centuries B.C. bids fair to revolutionize our approach to the beginnings of Christianity'. Thus scholars of the Old Testament will be able to clarify some points which bear on what we have called the praeparatio evangelica or the O.T. background which is presupposed in the N.T., and is declared in such a statement as that in the Fourth Gospel - 'Salvation is from the Jews'. As rabbinical studies have often been incorporated into the sphere of O.T. scholarship, it may be noted here that Dr. Albright has spoken of the connexion of rabbinics and the new light from the DS in this manner: 'Rabbinic studies are even more directly affected, and it is safe to say that nothing written on the sectarian movements of the last three centuries of the Second Temple can escape thorough revision in the light of the evidence now available and still to be published. The background of the Karaites demands fresh examination'.

A. Bentzen.

Dr. Bentzen, in his 'Introduction to the Old Testament', has written, 'Even if the latest date in antiquity were accepted (for the DS) the manuscripts of Isaiah found among this precious lot would be of great importance'. This, of course, does not lead him to regard the striking resemblance of the biblical texts of the DS to the Massoretic text as an indication that there existed in early times an immutable text. 'When it has been said that they (DS) contain few and irrelevant deviations from the normalised Massoretic Text and accordingly attest the very early existence of a holy and immutable text, this has, on the

other hand, been disproved by closer inspection'. Dr. Bentzen would agree that substantially the DS present us with a text which is the standard text with which we are acquainted, but it is not therefore identical with it. 'Materially, they contain the Hebrew text known to us, but not what must, strictly speaking, be called the Massoretic Text'. This is for Dr. Bentzen a confirmation of what scholars had thought was the case and corroborates what has been known to be the case in other literature. 'Concerning textual criticism in the strict sense they (DS) also give evidence to what we had to expect, namely that there are numerous minor deviations of the kind also found in other traditions of ancient literature, aberrations concerning orthography and phraseology'.

Dr. Bentzen shows much interest in the subject of Form-criticism of the O.T. and anticipates that the DS will bring new material to hand for the student of Form-criticism of the O.T. The Prose of the DS he thinks 'exhibits a mixture of styles'. The DSH he regards as displaying 'a type not found in Biblical literature'. The DSD he believes should stylistically be thought of in its whole 'as a sort of Law-Book. But it uses several styles'. The opening phrases of the DSD in the American publication, which are not the opening of the scroll originally, appear to have a sort of superscription found elsewhere in the scroll, and this Dr. Bentzen finds has a resemblance to sentences [of the same significance in Deuteronomy and the P-sections of Genesis-Numbers'. Whereas in the matter of Form the following chapters of DSD, which give a liturgy of the Covenant, 'are related to descriptive parts in the later strata of the Law'.

O.H. Lehmann.

Dr. Lehmann, writing in the Jewish Chronicle on 'The Value of the Dead Sea Scrolls', states, 'it is too early yet to assess exactly the value and significance of the DS, and it may be a wise step to caution students of Hebrew literature against rash conclusions. There can, however, be hardly any doubt that the texts, even if they belong to the Roman period in Palestine, raise problems of a phonetic, lexicographic, palaeographic,

historical, theological and critical kind'. This value of the DS he does not think can be greatly modified by the uncertainty regarding their dating, since from his special knowledge of Hebrew palaeography based on the study of the rich collection of Hebrew MSS of Oxford, Cambridge, London and New York, he does not think it can be a matter of doubt that the 9th century would seem far too late a date for the DS. Thus he goes on to say, 'even if some of the new texts are not as early as has been suggested, they will in any case be valuable, because they are - in varying degrees - considerably older than the oldest dated Hebrew manuscripts known so far'.

A.Parrot.

Dr.Parrot has raised the question of the uncertainties which attach themselves to the investigation of the DS and these he considers impartially; then he goes on to say, 'Be that as it may, the discovery brings us, on the one hand, biblical manuscripts which are older by a thousand years than any so far known (with the exception of the Nash Papyrus which reproduces short passages from Deuteronomy) and, on the other, reveals for us an unpublished literature which enables us to penetrate into a period and into the heart of a community completely bent on the establishment of a New Covenant, to be accomplished by the overthrow of the Children of Darkness'.

A.Dupont-Sommer.

Dr.Dupont-Sommer has written much on the historical significance of the DS and he considers the new evidence most important for the student of the O.T. Speaking on this point, he remarks, 'the historian cannot remain passive before these new texts. Already he is confronted with trends of thought, working hypotheses and outlines of solution'. Nevertheless, he is quite aware of the tentative nature of the problems, for he speaks also of 'certain views and perspectives' which 'will perhaps have to be modified or corrected or discarded'. This, of course, he recognises as the nature of all true research

which claims to be scientific, for, as he puts it, 'The scholar, no matter in what sphere he works, must always be ready to bow before new evidence; it is thanks to this unscrupulous respect for facts, thanks also to absolute sincerity and independence of judgment, that science always progresses'.

On the literary nature of the new evidence of the DS, Dr. Dupont-Sommer says that there is a need for a fresh evaluation of books such as Jubilees, the Apocalypse of Lamech, the Assumption of Moses, the Psalms of Solomon and certain of the Apocryphal books, as these seem to have definite connexions with the DS and the group which used them. Some of these books have been recognised among the fragments from the 'Ain Feshka Cave, and, in the view of Dr. Dupont-Sommer, 'All questions of literary and historical criticism relative to this literature must be reopened afresh. Here is a whole collection of documents whose historical study presented extreme difficulty, as so many of the allusions they contained remained for the most part undecipherable'. It is his opinion that the DS can and do illuminate many of these difficult allusions which have puzzled scholars hitherto. So he declares: 'Now the religious history of the last two centuries B.C. has been illuminated with fresh light; a thousand details in the writings of this period now become intelligible, emerging at last from chaos'.

He considers himself as only on the edge of this new line of O.T. study, but so far is able to announce: 'I have already made a number of soundings and I can announce that the first results of this hasty exploration are of an amazing richness'. In particular he has made a comparison between the DS and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and holds that the latter is an incomparable mine for the understanding of the doctrines of the Jewish sect or group which possessed the DS. He sees, or thinks he sees, in the messianism of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs a 'Christology' fully developed, and he has no doubt that this Messiah of the 'Testaments' is none other than the Teacher of Righteousness of the DS and the Founder of the New Covenant.

One important conclusion to his argument is that many of the so-called interpolations of Christian copyists in this and related documents can be regarded as original references to a Messiah who suffered and died under Aristobulus II and can be paralleled in the DSH. He sees in the new texts evidence for the existence of a 'whole theology of the suffering Messiah, of a Messiah who should be the redeemer of the world, developing around the person of the Master of Justice'. This he places in the 1st century B.C. and as arising from within the bosom of Judaism. For him this is 'one of the most important revelations of the Dead Sea discoveries'.

Also, he thinks that the evidence of the DSH makes it 'probable the canonical writings of the Prophets could still receive additions even after 40 B.C.'. The reason for his thinking this is that the Psalm which closes the canonical Habakkuk is missing from the DSH, and he is inclined to hold that the 3rd chapter of Habakkuk is an eschatological Psalm which 'is itself of Essene origin'.

Again, he looks to other messianic passages to find clues concerning the Teacher of Righteousness and finds them in references to a Messiah who is to be carried off by a violent death in such well-known places in the O.T. as Daniel ix, Zechariah xii, and above all in the Servant Songs of Isaiah. On these passages he says: 'For twenty centuries people have been asking who was this humble and gentle Prophet, this suffering righteous individual, whose death saved multitudes. In truth, apart from Jesus, the Christian Messiah, only one is known in the whole of Jewish history, and this one has been known for a very short time; it is the pious Teacher who was martyred by Aristobulus II'.

Now whether scholars agree with this interpretation of the new evidence or not, and already there have been sharp protests, the fact remains that a new problem has been raised for O.T. scholars to handle in the future and it would be rash to suggest that the solution has been found so early in the investigations.

Dr. Dupont-Sommer may be guilty of a little exaggeration when he states his convictions of the importance of the DS for O.T. study in these words:- 'It is not a single revolution in the study of biblical exegesis which the Dead Sea documents have brought; it is, one already feels, a whole cascade of revolutions'. It should be said in fairness to Dr. Dupont-Sommer that, though his views are radical with respect to the origins of Christianity and its rise from Judaism and make an advance on those of Renan, he has no intention of denying the original character of Christianity, as he himself has said: 'It is scarcely necessary to say that the author in no way wishes to deny the originality of the Christian religion. He has here noted the resemblances, but differences also clearly exist'. At the same time, it will be plain to many scholars that he is right when he says, 'all these problems henceforth find themselves placed in a new light, which forces us to reconsider them completely'.

G.L.Harding.

Mr. Harding had early noted the importance of the DS when he said, 'The importance to the study of the Old Testament cannot be over emphasized'. The DS is regarded by him as of special importance, for of it he says: 'For the first time we see, for example, a complete copy of the book of Isaiah in its original Hebrew, dating from the second century B.C.'. Pointing out what is known to all scholars, that the earliest known Hebrew manuscripts date from the tenth century A.D. (excluding the Nash Papyrus) by which time many errors had naturally crept into the text during the course of centuries of copying and transcribing, and that because of this it has been customary to regard the Greek translations of about the fifth century, owing to their greater antiquity, as in many ways more authentic than the Hebrew copies of the text; Yet, as Mr. Harding stresses, these scrolls are the earliest known MSS and will 'certainly take precedence over the Greek translations'.

He is cautious and aware that it is too early to reach any final results from the preliminary studies of the DS, but he anticipates a great deal of work will be done in due course. 'It

will be', he states, 'some time before full accounts and translations of the documents can be produced and we are able to assess its (DS) full value; scholars the world over will be kept busy for years working out the significance of details, but the general picture is already before us'.

B.J.Roberts.

Dr.Roberts has added an appendix to his work on the O.T. texts and versions, in which he sums up the bearing of the DS on the O.T. After having referred to the various biblical manuscript scrolls and fragments from the cache, he turns to the non-canonical DS and says of them: 'The non-Biblical texts and scrolls from the cache have also their significance for the study of the Hebrew Old Testament, whether they be historical, eschatological or ritual. They contain a large number of Biblical readings and are particularly important for the linguistic reconstruction of Hebrew in its pre-Massoretic stages'.

The dating of the DS he naturally regards as very important, but says in this connexion: 'But it is generally felt that it is premature to accept these verdicts (on the dating) before the scrolls themselves shall have been submitted to scrutiny by a greater number of experts'. Yet, as others have done, he shows that the importance of the DS is not necessarily wrapped up with a precise dating of the scrolls. As he puts it: 'In one respect, the study of the scrolls provides fundamentally important information regardless of the question of date, provided they belong at latest to the early centuries of the Christian era'.

Dr.Roberts is anxious to underline the differences between the text of DS1a and the Massoretic Text as it lies before us at present, since many scholars have remarked on the resemblances between them. He says: 'It is necessary to emphasize the fact that though there is substantial agreement between the text of the St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll and the Massoretic Text, the divergences between them are both numerous and far-reaching'.

He draws attention to this important matter by stating that 'there are numerous readings in the text of DSIA xxxvi-xxxix, where the scroll agrees better with II Kings xviii.13-20 than does the Massoretic text'. Moreover, as he shows, there are numerous passages in DSIA where the text is in agreement with the text of the LXX against that of the Massoretic tradition. There are places where the text of DSIA does not agree with the parallel passage in II Kings and yet is still at variance with the Massoretic text. Nor is the agreement with the LXX version the only link to be found in the text with other early traditions found in the Versions; For the correspondence of DSIA with the Vulgate is so marked that one scholar, Dr.G.R.Driver, has suggested that the new text is actually Hieronymian. Dr.Roberts makes it clear that these deviations from the Massoretic text have been found in some of the DSfs: DSfDeut., for example, agrees with the LXX rendering of Deut.xxxi.1 against the Massoretic text.

Another important difference between the text of DSIA and the Massoretic text is pointed out by Dr.Roberts, following the remark of Dr.Kahle on the reading of DSIA xl.7: 'The grass withereth, the flower fadeth; but the word of our God shall stand for ever', and the words 'because the spirit (wind) of the Lord bloweth upon it: surely the people is grass' are written above the line by a scribe. The LXX and also the Vulgate are without the insertion and Origen's Hexapla has the words with an asterisk. These are obviously matters of importance for the textual critic.

Dr.Roberts has also remarked on the significance of divergences in the renderings of proper names in the DS. 'Names ending in -jahu in the Massoretic text invariably appear in the DSIA without the final consonant, and thus correspond to the forms generally found in the books of Chronicles in contrast to the books of Kings'. Dr.Albright states that 'the DSIA reflects an oral tradition of pronunciation which often agrees with the LXX but sometimes surpasses it in accuracy'.

Dr.Roberts mentions that the differences in the writing of

the Tetragrammaton are 'still more illuminating'. He quotes Dr. Millar Burrows as suggesting that, in comparison with the Massoretic text, the haphazard use of Adonai, Elohim and Yahweh, with one form sometimes written above the other, leads him to conclude that the copyist of DSIa wrote his text from dictation with the reader using the name Adonai and the scribe entering it in his text according to his inclination. But, says Dr. Roberts, 'a comparison with the LXX and other early versions shows that the early, pre-Massoretic use of the Ineffable Name was never uniform'.

One other important matter which the DS brings before the O.T. scholars is the variants of orthography which they reveal. It has been mentioned above that the scriptio plene is a feature of the DSIa which is carried to a greater degree than has hitherto been known. This is in striking contrast to the Tiberian Massoretic vocalisation as we have it in our standard Hebrew texts. That variants of vocalisation do occur even within the Tiberian Massoretic system can be seen from the examples from Hebrew texts from the Cairo Genizah fragments published by Dr. Kahle. Various attempts have been made to explain these variants. One favoured by Dr. Hempel is that the Massoretic text preserves a more ancient pronunciation and hence is less liberally supplied with matres lectionis, whereas the DS represent a more recent pronunciation of the text and, belonging to a sect, were less sacrosanct and could more readily differ from that of orthodoxy. Dr. Roberts offers the suggestion that the DSIa orthography may perhaps 'represent a manner of pronunciation, for instance, a dialect or possibly a ritual intonation which differed from that preserved by or produced by the Massorettes'. These differences of orthography cannot be squared up with any known Tiberian system, but they have certain features in common, as Dr. Roberts mentions, with the orthography of the Samaritan pronunciation, and there is also found an Aramaic influence which is absent from the Massoretic tradition. This, as Dr. Roberts has suggested, is important for the further understanding of the O.T. language. Further light has been thrown on this subject by Professor Millar Burrows in his article entitled 'Orthography,

Morphology and Syntax of the St. Mark's Isaiah Manuscript'.

The significance of such phenomena, as has been reviewed by Dr. Roberts, is that in the DSIA we appear to have a biblical document which is probably to be regarded as outside the main stream of orthodox Judaism 'and which therefore could have preserved a text which was recensionally divergent from the more pure text which came down through the Massoretes'. If this is true, and it will need the work of more scholars on the texts before it can be considered as established, it would mean that in the DSIA text we have 'not a copy of the Massoretic text but a recension of an early text-form, of which the Massoretic is another recension, and the LXX still another'. Dr. Roberts is anxious to rebut the idea that in the DSIA we have an early copy of the Massoretic text and that this similarity between these texts amounts to anything like identity, for he says, 'Such a view might easily lead to a completely erroneous reconstruction of the history of the Massoretic activity and its text-form'. He prefers to say: 'It is rather a recension text'.

He takes note of the difference between the type of text found in DSIA and DSIB. In the latter, he thinks, 'we do have an early copy of the Massoretic text'. But if this is confirmed by the consensus of O.T. scholars, it would be correct to say: 'This fact would imply that the Massoretic text was not the product of the Massoretic movement, but enjoyed a prestige from a very early period'. Moreover, if it comes to be agreed that the DSIA and the DSIB are to be dated about the late 2nd or early 1st century B.C., another important conclusion could be drawn, i.e. that we would have 'three text-forms from roughly the same period, namely the St. Mark's scroll of Isaiah, the early copy of the Massoretic text probably exemplified in the Hebrew University scroll, and the parent text of the Septuagint'. This would raise afresh the question of the text of the LXX, but this much can be said about that text: 'It does not agree with the other two except in a general way, and that it agrees with the recension text in the St.

Mark's scroll more than with the Massoretic text itself'. This preliminary investigation of the nature of the texts of the DS^{Ia} and DS^{Ib} leads Dr. Roberts to state in conclusion that 'It is in this way that the remarkable discovery in the cave at 'Ain Feshka has contributed to our study: it has added a considerable element of "text" to the practice of "Textual criticism"'.
M. Delcor.

Dr. Delcor, in his book 'Essai sur Le Midrash d'Habacuc', has a concluding chapter on the importance of the DS. As other scholars, he stresses the necessarily tentative nature of conclusions at present. 'It is yet, it seems, premature to assess the new acquisitions, in the realm of philology or history, which the manuscripts of the Dead Sea give us reason to hope'.¹ It is, however, sufficiently clear already to him that the new knowledge which they will bring to scholars, though it will certainly be important, will not be as radical as Dr. Dupont-Sommer thinks. 'It is nevertheless certain that the revolution in the field of biblical studies of which M. Dupont-Sommer speaks will be more modest than he had expected'.² He goes on to mention briefly some of the acquisitions which the finding of the DS has brought to O.T. study. The two scrolls of Isaiah, naturally, are mentioned as of importance for the O.T. study of that prophet. Dr. Delcor only refers to this en passant: 'This is not the place to speak of the renewed studies on the prophet Isaiah which such documents (DS^{Ia}, DS^{Ib}) will bring. One is satisfied to say at first that the text of the great scroll of Isaiah was substantially the same as the Massoretic text'.³ He allows for difference of emphasis in the new scrolls, for he continues: 'They have already brought forth some very

¹ 'Il est encore, semble-t-il prématuré d'inventorier les acquisitions nouvelles, dans le domaine de la philologie ou de l'histoire, que les manuscrits de la Mer Morte nous permettent d'espérer' - Mid. d'Habacuc. p.71.

² 'Il est néanmoins certain que la révolution dans le champ des études bibliques dont parlait M. Dupont-Sommer sera plus modeste qu'il ne l'espérait' - Ess. sur Midrash d'Habacuc, p.70.

³ '...substantiellement le même ..'

interesting variants, which accentuate the messianic element in our Massoretic text'. Here is a problem for the O.T. scholar to consider, for, as Dr.Delcor says, 'This fact moreover, as has been stressed, is quite difficult to interpret. For either the later scribes have desired to reduce the messianic import of certain prophetic texts, probably for the sake of controversial reasons in connexion with such a sect (to whom the DS belonged), or on the other hand, the messianic hope of the sectarian centre has discoloured the text of the manuscripts which they used'.¹ It is possible, says Dr.Delcor, that both these factors may have operated to bring this textual difference. 'The distortion may have taken place in both senses and certain readings may represent "a primitive messianic core" while others may be the work of sectarian interpolators'.

The two DSI, with their differences of readings, convince Dr.Delcor that the Massoretic text had not reached fixity, and although it has been thought to have been so until recently, yet this fixity 'is not as great as one has wished to claim it to be, even from the second or the first century B.C.'.

Speaking on the historical significance of the DS, Dr.Delcor has said: 'The documents properly called of the Sect bring to us a better knowledge of the history of the religious movements at the commencement of the first century, B.C. If the date we have proposed is accepted, we see at the same time the valuable information which our documents furnish us with on the rise of the sect of the Pharisees, descending from the Hasidim of the Maccabaeian period, and from which certain members entirely developed into the Essenes such as we know from later times'. From the DSD he points out, we have notice of a group of refugees of the first century B.C., but refugees of a curious type. Not political refugees, but religious refugees who were forced to leave their land and to forsake their religious way of life much as they

¹ 'des milieux sectariens a déteint sur le text des manuscrits qu'ils utilisaient' - op.cit. p.71.

loved it because it had become impossible for them. They went into the desert, 'like a bird far from its nest' in order to separate themselves from 'the assembly of perverse people' who, Dr. Delcor thinks, were the 'Sadducees in the service of Alexander Jannaeus'. This group we find in DSD dwell together in groups of ten, each with a priest in charge. They study the Law in relays day and night throughout the year. They are also found to have an Inspector over them who is not unlike the Christian Bishop of later days, for he acts the part of pastor, teacher, guardian of orthodoxy and administrator. All this, as Dr. Delcor states, is of great importance for the scholar of the O.T.

Another point of importance which he notes is that the DS would seem to indicate that Hebrew was still written in the first century B.C. As he puts it, 'One of the positive acquisitions which the discoveries from the Dead Sea brings to us is to confirm for us that in the first century B.C. Hebrew was still being written. It is in fact in biblical Hebrew that the DSH is written'.

He is also aware of the lexicographical interest which this must have for the O.T. scholar and writes: 'From the point of view of lexicography, there is not a word (in the DSH) which is not to be found in the Books of the O.T.'. There is also a stylistic interest for the O.T. scholar and he remarks that 'from the point of view of the style (of DSH) we have not brought to light a single trace of Aramaic characteristics; this is not apparently true of the DSD'. These interesting facts which he finds in the DS lead him to state: 'These facts seem to prove sufficiently that in the Hasmonean period a veritable renaissance of the Hebrew tongue took place'. Such a revival of Hebrew he finds to have a modern parallel in Israel today, and the present position in Palestine is not without some clues for the O.T. historian. Dr. Delcor finds himself in agreement with Dr. Kahle when the latter suggests that after the Maccabaean period had begun there was a revival of Hebrew in popular circles, and that this gave rise to the scriptio plana of some of the DS. 'In order to facilitate the reading of the people who knew only the Aramaic, they multiplied the matres lectionis, as is the case in the large scroll of Isaiah, the Habakkuk Commentary and in

general in all the manuscripts of the Dead Sea'. One point here which is of interest to the O.T.scholar is that among the fragments found in the cave at 'Ain Feshka was a portion of the book of Jubilees in Hebrew. Hitherto it had only been known in an Ethiopian version. It is usually attributed to the second century B.C. This book will probably be studied afresh in the light of the DS and the fact that it was of special interest to the Damascus Sect. For a long time now it has been held by O.T.scholars that the Psalms of Solomon, in its present Greek version, was probably a translation from a Hebrew original. Its date of composition has been placed about 63 B.C. It will be clear that the evidence of the language of the DS has made this conjecture more certain.

In regard to the literature of the Pharisees, the DS bring new acquisitions, of which Dr.Delcor has said, 'We may add too that our documents enrich the literature of the Pharisees of the first and second century B.C.', and, as he shows, scholars had already found links between the Pharisees and certain sections of the book of Enoch, and in particular the book of Similitudes, also the Psalms of Solomon, the book of Jubilees and some others, 'but now these texts begin to throw light on each other'.

In the field of O.T.exegesis, Dr.Delcor thinks that the DS have their contribution to make in revealing the mode of exposition which was deemed correct. He rejects the claim of Dr.Kahle here, when the latter holds that the DSH in its text was free from the influence of the official text as represented in the later Massoretic tradition. He argues with much force that the difference of readings found in the Commentary and the text of Habakkuk are the consequence of the commentators' peculiar mode of finding double entendre and a part of his hermeneutic art which was considered correct in his days. In fact Dr.Delcor finds parallels to this method of exegesis in the later New Testament days. He makes the interesting remark that from his study of the method of the 'Midrashite' he has come to the conclusion that 'this method of working seems to indicate plainly to us that the exemplar used by the Midrashite had in its margin variants similar to those of the

Massoretic text'. Sometimes, according to Dr. Delcor, the DSH enables us to get a better apprehension of the text of the canonical book, as its readings are superior to the Massoretic text. 'Finally, we may add', he says, 'that for the understanding of the ancient prophet Habakkuk, the text on which the commentator works occasionally offers better readings than that of the Massoretic text and goes to support the conjectures of certain critics'.

Nevertheless, in spite of these substantial gains in the field of the O.T., Dr. Delcor is led to conclude his investigations with a salutary caution for some scholars by adding, 'It is not then a revolution, neither is it a cascade of revolutions on the grand scale which the manuscripts of the Dead Sea bring to us, but rather some humble acquisitions, which the historians of Palestine Judaism ought to integrate into their future syntheses'.

P. Kahle.

Dr. Kahle has dealt with the matter of the DS very fully in his 'Die Hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle' and many later scholars, such as Dr. Roberts, have availed themselves of his studies. He has emphasised the importance of the DS for the better understanding of the Hebrew language of the O.T. To this purpose he has written a section entitled 'The Significance of the Scrolls for the Tradition of the Pronunciation of the Hebrews'. In this he deals with 'the deviations which, in regard to the orthography and grammar, the DSI offers'. Then he considers the scriptio plene, which in the DS1a 'and in part in the other scrolls is found... a mode of writing with the employment of the vowel-letters 'a', 'h', 'w' and 'y' in an abundance which is found in no other Bible-manuscript which we possess, even up to the time of the Decline'. As has been mentioned above, he holds that this phenomenon is related to a revival of the Hebrew tongue and an attempt to render aid to the reading of Hebrew manuscripts for those unfamiliar with the language. He also points out that there is here represented a different pronunciation of Hebrew from the one which is known from the Massoretic tradition and one which,

in his view, is possibly later than that of the Massoretic. The Massoretic tradition probably goes back to very ancient times when the pronunciation of the Bible text was becoming fixed. The pronunciation found in the DS1a may then be a popular form of the language and it is important to note that the DS1ev. of de Vaux written in the Old-Hebrew script lacks this scriptio plena. Dr. Kahle thus regards the DS1a as a 'vulgärtext', since in the 'vulgärtexten' this same freedom from tradition is present. In the later texts of the Bible the scriptio plena is more used than in the earlier. A comparison of the text of the Books of Chronicles with the parallel parts of the Pentateuch, from which the extracts are taken, will show that in the former the scriptio plena is more prominent, or again a comparison of the texts of the Books of Chronicles with the parallel parts in the Books of Samuel or Kings will show the same phenomenon, or again if we take the Samaritan Pentateuch and compare it with the Massoretic Hebrew Pentateuch the same fact emerges. But, says Dr. Kahle, in the case of the DS1a there is a plethora of scriptio plena, which goes beyond these other cases and this seems to indicate a later pronunciation than that of the traditional Massoretic one, but also a time when it was difficult for Jewish readers to read an unvocalised text. According to Dr. Kahle, we have in the DS1a a pronunciation which is that of the people who used the Scroll and not the stylised one of tradition which, based on an earlier one, had become artificial through the later vocalisation of the text by the Massoretes. By means of the DS1a we can again approach the living speech of the people, and perhaps will be enabled to explain some of the artificial forms of the Massoretic text. Thus he says: 'In the pronunciation which is revealed through the scriptio plena of the Hebrew lies undoubtedly much of the value of the Scroll'.¹

¹ 'In der durch die plene-Schreibung angedeuteten Aussprache des Hebräischen liegt zweifellos ein grosser Wert dieser Rolle' - Kahle in 'Die Hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle', p.41.

G.R.Driver.

Dr.Driver, in the Journal of Theological Studies, April, 1951, refers to the discovery of the DS as 'the most sensational event of recent years in Biblical scholarship'. It is obvious from his detailed treatment of the DSIs that this document is for him a find of great importance for the critical study of the text of the O.T., since it brings a wealth of new material in the field of criticism. He shows conclusively that there are to be found in this text examples of all the usual phenomena of textual transmission. 'The Scroll of Isaiah', he states, 'contains numerous mistakes of every type found in ancient manuscripts; mistakes of orthography often producing grammatical monstrosities and especially noticeable in quadrilateral words, confusion of letters of similar form or sound, transposition of letters and words, omission of letters especially at the end of words, or of words through haplography, or homoteleuton, or otherwise, and additions especially of dittography, faulty anticipation, and tardy replacement, adaptation to parallel passages. A whole clause is sometimes out of order. Words and phrases are replaced by expressions of approximately similar import'. Besides all these usual errors of transcription there are peculiarities which call for the study of O.T. scholars. For instance, the frequent interchange of the imperfect-preterite and perfect-tenses and of the consecutive construction with weak and strong 'waw'. These are matters to which Hebrew grammarians will give their attention.

The scribal method of correcting is of importance for the textual critic. In this DSIs corrections are made by writing the alteration after the erroneous letter or word, or over it above the line, or by putting it in the margin; sometimes they are indicated by dots, the puncta extraordinaria of the Massoretic text, or by cancelling what is wrong by drawing a line through it. By observation of these points it is possible 'to show how errors may have arisen in the Massoretic text; for example 'AHSTHR' representing 'ASTHR', corrected to 'HSTHR' in DSIs lvii.17; and 'AHLKW' representing 'ALKW', corrected to 'HLEW' in DSIs lx.14. Many other examples could be supplied of the guidance the textual

critic can expect to receive from the new discoveries.

Another peculiarity of the DSIa is the way that the usual word form nam (dictum) is written nwam (dictio); as Dr. Driver says, 'The Ancient Versions almost unanimously treat this word as a finite verb, apparently reading it 'NAM'... Its vocalisation as 'NWAM' is not otherwise found before the Piyûtîm of the fifth or sixth centuries A.D.'. This is important for the dating of the DSIa and calls for the attention of scholars. It should be noted, of course, that Origen in the 3rd century A.D. transliterated the word by noun, which shows that it was known to his age in that form.

Dr. Driver has found in the DSIa forms which he would derive from Arabic, but this interpretation has been controverted by Dr. Albright. Sometimes the DSIa seems to offer a better grammatical rendering of a phrase than does the Massoretic text, either by the insertion of a preposition or by the simplification of the syntax.

It has become less common to resort to conjectural emendation of the O.T. text than was at one time the fashion, and scholars are far more inclined to treat the Massoretic text with the respect it deserved. This has been partly due to a reaction of sober scholarship to the wild and extravagant lengths to which this legitimate method of restoring a corrupt text was carried, and this reaction had set in before the discovery of the DS. One very important matter which the discovery of the DS has made abundantly clear is that this reaction was, in the main, a right one, for it can be shown from the biblical texts that there is a far better foundation for the traditional text of the Massoretes than was once thought. There was a time when the exegesis of the O.T. text was accompanied by a brilliancy of scholarship which could import into the text just that which seemed to be lacking, rather than export from it the probable meaning of the original writer. But that is not to say that conjectural emendation is not useful, nor that its use must be fully proscribed. One of the very interesting, as well as very important facts about the DS is that in several

cases, as Dr.Driver has shown in different writings, the DS confirm the conjectures of modern scholars. Thus Dr.Driver writes: 'The Scroll (DSIa) further confirms a considerable number of emendations which have been proposed by various scholars to improve or to obtain sense'.

A few examples of these may be given:-

Is.xii.2 <u>Houbigant</u> DSIa	'For the Lord Jehovah is my strength and song' 'For the Lord Jehovah is my strength and <u>my</u> song' as Houbigant.	M.T. SVPT
Is.xiv.4 <u>Michaelis</u> DSIa	'The golden city ceased' 'The <u>terror</u> ceased' as Michaelis.	M.T.
Is.xiv.30 <u>Bredenkamp</u> DSIa	'He shall slay thy remnant' ' <u>I</u> will slay thy remnant' as Bredenkamp.	M.T. V.
Is.xxi.8 <u>Lowth</u> DSIa	'And he cried, A lion' 'And <u>he who saw</u> cried' as Lowth.	M.T. SVH
Is.xlv.2 <u>Marti</u> DSIa	'And make the crooked places straight' 'And make the <u>mountains</u> level' as Marti.	M.T. S
Is.xlix.24 <u>Houbigant</u> DSIa	'Or the lawful captive delivered?'. 'Or the <u>tyrant's</u> captive delivered'. as Houbigant.	M.T. VP
Is.lxiii.2 <u>Houbigant</u> DSIa	'I will stain all my raiment'. 'I have stained all my raiment' as Houbigant.	M.T. S By e and VP

Many more examples could be given of conjectures which find, or at least appear to find support in the DS. On the other hand, there are many places in the biblical scrolls where new variants appear which were not considered valid by O.T. scholars even when support for them could be found in the Ancient Versions. A few examples from these may be given:-

Is.xxxiii.3 DSIa	'At the lifting up of thyself the nations are scattered'. 'At thy <u>rumbling</u> the nations are scattered'.	R.V.
Is.xxxiv.5 DSIa	'For my sword hath drunk its fill in heaven'. 'For my sword <u>shall be seen</u> in heaven'.	R.V.
Is.xliiii.19 DSIa	'I will even make a way in the wilderness and rivers in the desert'. 'I will even make a way in the wilderness and <u>paths</u> in the desert'.	R.V.

- Is.1111.10 'Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; R.V.
He hath put him to grief'.
DS1a 'Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him;
And he pierced him'.
- Is.1111.11 'He shall see of the travail of his soul R.V.
and shall be satisfied'.
DS1a 'From the travail of his soul he
shall see light'.

Some of these variants are only trivial, while others are important for correct exegesis of the Book, and many more could be given, if space permitted, but sufficient have been given to indicate that the DS have a definite contribution to make in the field of textual criticism. This Dr.Driver has shown in several articles on the subject. Sometimes a much disputed crux may be solved by the DS, as for instance in the passage, Isaiah xxxvii. 27-29, which reads:-

R.V. of Is.xxxviii. 27-29

'As the grass on the housetops and as a field of corn before it is grown up. But I know thy sitting down, and thy going out, and thy coming in and thy raging against me. Because of thy raging against me, and for that thy arrogancy is come up into mine ears..'

This is a very difficult passage and has baffled commentators, but with the aid of the DS1a text it can read thus:

DS1a of Is.xxxviii. 27-29

'(as) grass on roofs which is blasted before the east-wind. Thy rising up and thy sitting down and thy going out and thy coming in I do know, and thy raging against me and thine arrogance is come up into my ears'.

In this way a reading which makes good sense can be obtained with the help of the new evidence of the Scrolls. Dr.Driver has shown that apart from the question of exact dating of the DS they have an importance for the right understanding of the O.T. text. It has been said that the true value of a thing can be judged by the loss entailed if we did not have it.

W.H.Brownlee.

Dr.Brownlee has shown that the DS have raised theological problems as well as textual and grammatical. One of these raised by DSD is the meaning of hesed in that scroll. It is of course one of the very important terms of the O.T. and much has been

written on its meaning in different contexts. One of the most interesting uses of this term in DSD is in its citations from the canonical Book of Micah vi.8. This is a famous O.T. text and much has been made of it, but the interesting point is that in DSD it is used attributively and not as in the canonical prophet. The group or sect of DSD were exhorted 'to practice (1) justice, (2) loving devotion, (3) walking humbly... Five times the text from Micah is quoted and each time the term hesed is used attributively. Is, then, the sect's use of the verse the correct one? As Dr. Brownlee has said, 'If the origin of the sect is in some way connected with the Hasidim the question may well be raised as to whether the sect's use of 'Hesed' and its fondness for Micah vi.8 stem from the Hasidim, who perhaps made much of the word by which they were known.

Another problem which the DSD raises is the significance of the term eam, which appears in this text. Many emendations have been suggested for this strange term, but none that is really satisfactory. Dr. Brownlee finds the clue to the usage in the author's use of Deut. x.16ff. and xxx.6, for he regards it as a surrogate for Yahweh and this seems to be very probable. As Dr. Brownlee has said, 'In the latter reference (Deut. xxx.6) Yahweh is made the author of circumcision of the heart; in x.17 he is described as "God of gods, and Lord of lords, the great God, the mighty, and the terrible" - a very impressive title which could not have escaped the notice of the author of DSD with his extreme reverence for the name of Yahweh'. On this ground Dr. Brownlee finds in the curious term eam of DSD the abbreviation of the term 'God of gods and Lord of lords', for the initial letters of this phrase are ea and the last letter is m: thus ALMNY HALWNYM WADWNY HADWNYM. Dr. Albright has further suggested that the m may also stand for 'King of kings', i.e. MLK HMLKYM.

The problem is raised by Dr. Brownlee concerning the phrase 'The Prophet and the Anointed Ones' found in DSD. It seems that there is a parallel to this in the Zadokite Work and it is suggested

by Dr. Brownlee that 'thus in the "anointed ones" here we are to see a revival of the gift of prophecy beside that of the "Prophet" himself'. This is a problem which might be investigated.

There is also the problem which the esoteric meaning of the terms mem and nan bring from their appearance in the DSD. The term nan in this scroll is linked with the terms 'leader', 'shoot', 'ensign', 'nasi', all words which in Hebrew begin with the letter nan. Mem is, as shown above, also used esoterically. It seems to have had a messianic significance, and Dr. Brownlee, after consideration of its use in the DSD, concludes: 'But if my speculation is correct, the Messiah is the last "great luminary" who with "the key of David" will unlock the "sure mercies" of the "God of Amen".'

Lastly, there is the problem of the significance of the term HUHA which comes in DSD in the expression 'to go to the wilderness to clear the way of HUHA, as it is written:

In the wilderness clear the way....
Level in the desert a highway for our God:

It appears from the way in which the term is followed by the quotation from Isaiah that this must be a surrogate for the name Yahweh. Dr. Ginsberg sees it as merely a surrogate, but it is possible that Dr. Brownlee is correct and that it stands for the phrase 'He is the God', the first four letters of which in Hebrew are HUHA. It may well be that the phrase which is often found in the O.T. - Yahweh, He is God - decided this usage in the DSD. Four dots are used in the DSD for the indication of the Tetragrammaton, as they are also used by the corrector of DSIA in xl.7 and xlii.6. Though the sacred Name is not written in the passage from Isaiah quoted above but is represented by four dots, when the reader came to the place he probably read the word out as HUHA.

These theological problems will probably be the subject of further studies, when more scholars have had time to make use of the published texts.

SUMMARY

From the views of O.T. scholars which have been given, and

these can only be selected from a great number which present themselves, it will be seen that the importance of the DS for the study of the O.T. is very great, ranging over a wide area of subjects, such as Phonetics, Lexicography, Palaeography, History, Theology and Criticism. But though scholars have been quick to see the importance of the DS, it will probably be many years yet before we are in a position to arrive at any degree of finality regarding them, and, in the meantime, it is as well to regard with caution the more dogmatic or extreme views which some have put forward. At the same time, it seems safe to say that the contention of some scholars, perhaps with a mistaken desire to uphold the sanctity of the Massoretic text, that the DS are the work of a forger and were never really deposited in the cave at 'Ain Feshka, is definitely disproved. Likewise we are quite safe in dismissing the opinion of Dr. Zeitlin who states, 'the Hebrew Scrolls are not from the Dead Sea cave. They came from the Genizah storehouse. They may have been planted in the cave for a short while.... Their value is nil'. The best reply to such a depreciation is found in the words of Dr. Albright who writes, 'Every point which Zeitlin has raised has been discussed with me by my colleagues in the Baltimore Hebrew College, Drs. E.H. Golomb and Samuel Iwry, who have pointed out that his arguments from rabbinical data are throughout fallacious. My correspondents in Israel are of the same opinion'. The DS, then, are of great importance and will become more so when the finds from other caves have been collected. As Mr. L. Harding has said, writing in the Manchester Guardian, July, 1953: 'The amount of material recovered is astonishing... the biblical books discovered - on leather and papyrus in thousands of fragments - represent some seventy different books, and because of their range and variety these later discoveries are probably of even greater importance than the first... Most of what has been written about palaeography is going to have to be revised considerably in view of this recent discovery'.

D) Conclusion.

In conclusion it may be said that as regards the dating of the DS there is obviously no hard and fast date possible, but it would appear that a date before 1000 A.D. must be accepted and that on the whole the balance of probability seems to incline towards an early dating; and it would not be going beyond the evidence to claim that the case made for such an early dating, even a pre-Christian one, is more complete than that for any later period. As for the date of the cache, this must not be confused with the date of the composition of the documents; neither must the date of the composition of the documents be confused with the date of the copying of the same. It must be admitted that the archeological argument has been greatly weakened by the official withdrawal of de Vaux from his earlier opinion of the date of the pottery as a result of excavation on the site of Kirbet Qumran. Yet there are still archeologists who hold to his former view. It may be wiser to think of the cache as having been finally made somewhere in the 2nd century A.D., maybe after the Bar-Cochba Revolt.

For the origin of the DS we should look, then, to a group not unlike the Pharisees and which we may think of as rising into being in the stirring days of the Maccabees, and such a group within the body of Judaism which, in later times, might develop into a group with likenesses to the Pharisees, or to the non-marrying Essenes, yet not necessarily to be completely identified with either.

The DS bring into prominence a number of subjects connected with the study of the O.T., some of which have already occupied the attention of O.T. scholars, but all of which receive new material and new impulse from the Scrolls. Among these are the following:-

HISTORICAL

History of the Essenes and their connexion with the Hasidim, the Pharisees and the Sadducees.
The Transliteration of Assyrian names in the DS & IXX.

TEXTUAL

The relationship between the text of biblical DS and the Massoretic text.
Their relationship to the text of the IXX.
Their relationship to Hieronymian texts and other Versions.
The palaeography of pre-Christian times and Jewish sects in relation to the script of DS, with special reference to the newly-acquired fragments.

GRAMMATICAL

The orthography of the DS; the interchange of h with a and the suspected change of heth with ayin.
The morphology of the DS and study of the final letters.
The syntax of the DS, with special reference to use of the tenses and the origin of the verbal-forms.

THEOLOGICAL

The name of God and the Tetragrammaton in the DS.
The Prophet and the Anointed Ones as terms in DS.
Messianism and Apocalypticism in the DS.

WORKS CONSULTED
and
BIBLIOGRAPHY

WORKS CONSULTED and BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- W.F. ALBRIGHT 'Notes from the President's Desk', B.A.S.O.R. No.110, April, 1948, pp.1-3.
 'Editorial Note on Jerusalem Scrolls', *ibid*, Oct.1948, pp.22 ff.
 'On the Date of the Scrolls from 'Ain Feshka & the Nash Papyrus', *ibid*, No.115, Oct.1949m pp.10 ff.
 'Comments on Dr. Lacheman's Reply & the Scrolls', *ibid*, No.116, Dec.1949, pp.17 ff.
 'Are the 'Ain Feshka Scrolls a Hoax?', J.Q.R.n.s.xl, 1949-50, pp.41-9.
 'The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery', B.A.S.O.R., No.118, April, 1950, p.5.
 'The O.T. & the Archeology of Palestine' in 'The O.T. & Modern Study', ed.H.H.Rowley, 1951, pp.1-26.
 'The Chronology of the Dead Sea Scrolls', in W.H. Brownlee, 'The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline', 1951, pp.57-60.
 'From the Acting President's Desk', B.A.S.O.R., No.126, April, 1952, pp.1 ff.
- A. BENTZEN 'Introduction to the Old Testament', 2nd ed.1952; Appendix. addt.
- S.A. BIRNBAUM 'The Date of the Isaiah Scroll', B.A.S.O.R., No.113, Feb.1949, pp.33-5.
 'The Date of the Cave Scrolls', *ibid*, No.115, Oct.1949, pp.20-2.
 'The Date of the Covenant Scroll', P.E.Q. 1949, pp. 140 ff.
 'The Date of the Habakkuk Cave Scroll', J.B.L. lxviii. 1949, pp.161 ff.
 'The Leviticus Fragments from the Cave', B.A.S.O.R. No.118, April, 1950, pp.20 ff.
 'How Old are the Cave Manuscripts? A Palaeographical Discussion' in V.T.i.1951, pp.91 ff.
 'The Qumran Scrolls & Palaeography', B.A.S.O.R. Supp. Studies, No.13-14, 1952.
- W.H. BROWNLEE 'The Jerusalem Habakkuk Scroll', B.A.S.O.R., No.112, Dec.1949, p.8.
 'Further Light on Habakkuk', *ibid*, No.114, April, 1949, pp.9 ff.
 'Further Corrections of the Trans. of the Hab. Scroll', *ibid*, No.116, Dec.1949, pp.14 ff.
 'A Comparison of the Covenanters of the DS with pre-Christian Jewish Sects', B.A. xiii. 1950, pp.50 ff.
 'The Text of Isa.vi.13 in the light of DS Ia', V.T. i. 1951, pp.30 ff.
 'The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline', B.A.S.O.R., Supp. Studies, No.10-12, 1952.
- F.F. BRUCE. 'The Book & the Parchments' (Pickering & Inglis), 1950, pp.112 ff.
- M. BURROWS. 'The Contents & Significance of the Manuscripts', B.A.xi, 1948, pp.57 ff.
 'Variant Readings in the Isaiah Manuscript', B.A.S.O.R. No.111, Oct.1948, p.16. *ibid*, No.113, Feb.1949, p.24.
 'A Note on the Recently Discovered Manuscripts', J.Q.R. n.s.xl, 1949-50, p.51.
 'The Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls', B.A.S.O.R. No.122, April, 1951, pp.4 ff.
 'Review of P.Kahle's 'Die Heb.Handschrift aus d.Höhle', in V.T.i., 1951, pp.231 ff.
 'Concerning the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reply to Prof. Zeitlin', in J.Q.R.n.s.xliii, 1951-52, pp.105 ff.

- 'The Meaning of SR'MR in DSH', V.T.ii.1952, pp.255 ff.
- 'The Dead Sea Scrolls of St.Mark's Monastery' I: The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary', 1950; II Fasc.2: 'Plates & Transcription of the Manual of Discipline', 1951.
- M.DELCOR. 'Les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte: Essai sur le Midrash d'Habacuc', R.B. lviii, 1951, pp.521 ff.
- G.R.DRIVER. 'Letters to the Times', Aug.23 & 30, 1949, Sept. 22, 1949.
'The Hebrew Scrolls from the Neighbourhood of Jericho & the Dead Sea', 1951, Oxford Univ.Press.
'The Hebrew Scrolls', J.T.S.n.s. 1951, pp.17 ff.
- A.DUPONT-SOMMER. 'Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte', 1952. Eng.Trans.E.Margaret Rowley, Blackwell, Oxford.
'Le Maître de Justice fut-il mis à mort?', V.T. i., 1951, pp.200 ff.
'Contribution à l'exégèse du Manuel de Discipline', V.T.ii. 1952, pp.229 ff.
'Encore sur le mot 'bwt dans DSH xi.6', *ibid*, p.276
- D.N.FREEDMAN. 'The "House of Absalom" in the Habakkuk Scroll', B.A.S.O.R., No.114, April 1949, pp.11 ff.
- G.L.HARDING. 'A Bible Discovery', in The Times, Aug.9, 1949.
'The Dead Sea Scrolls', P.E.Q., 1949, pp.112 ff.
- P.E.KAHLE. 'The Age of the Scrolls', V.T.i., 1951, pp.38 ff.
'Die hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle', 1951, Kohlhammer Verlag.
- E.R.LACHEMAN. 'A Method of Method in Hebrew Palaeography', J.Q.R.n.s. xi, 1949-50, pp.15 ff.
'Reply to the Editor', B.A.S.O.R., No.116, Dec. 1949, pp.16ff.
'Can Hebrew Palaeography be called "scientific"?', J.Q.R.n.s.xlii, 1951-52, pp.377 ff.
- Ö.H.LEHMANN. 'The Value of the Dead Sea Scrolls', Jewish Chronicle, May, 1951.
- A.PARROT. 'Les Manuscrits du Désert de Juda' in A.Lods: Hist.de la Litt.heb.et juive'. Payot, Paris, 1950, pp.1024 ff.
- I.RABINOWITZ. 'Sequence & Dates of the Extra-Biblical DS texts & "Damascus Fragments"', V.T.iii., 1953, pp. 175 ff.
- J.REIDER. 'The Dead Sea Scrolls', J.Q.R.n.s.xli., 1950-51, pp.59 ff.
- A.RUBINSTEIN. 'Notes on the use of the Tenses in the Variant Readings of the Isaiah Scroll', V.T.iii. Jan. 1953, pp.78 ff.
- B.J.ROBERTS. 'Some Recent Views on Hebrew Scrolls from near the Dead Sea', Friends' Quarterly, v., 1951, pp.7 ff.
'Some Observations on the Damascus Document & the Dead Sea Scrolls', Bulletin of John Rylands Library, vol.34, No.2, March, 1952.

- 'The O.T. Texts & Versions', 1950, Univ. of Wales.
'The Dead Sea Scrolls; Publications & Review',
Expos. Times, Aug. 1950, vol. lxi. No. 11, pp. 333 ff.
- H. H. ROWLEY. 'The Zadokite Fragments & the Dead Sea Scrolls',
1952, Blackwell.
'The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls',
Expos. Times, Sept. 1952, vol. lxiii. No. 12, pp. 378
ff.
'The Covenanters of Damascus & the Dead Sea
Scrolls', Bulletin of John Rylands Library, vol.
35, No. 1, Sept. 1952.
- O. R. SELLERS. 'Excavations of the Manuscript Cave at 'Ain Feshka',
B.A.S.O.R., No. 114, April, 1949, pp. 5 ff.
'A Study of the Finds in the 'Ain Feshka Cave',
B.A. xii., 1949, pp. 54 ff.
- S. TALMON. 'Notes on the Habakkuk Scroll', V.T. i., 1951, pp.
33 ff.
- R. J. TOURNAY. 'Les anciens manuscrits hébreux récemment découverts',
R.B. lvi., 1949, pp. 204 ff.
- J. C. TREVER. 'The Discovery of the Scrolls', B.A. xi., 1948,
pp. 46 ff.
'Preliminary Observations on the Jerusalem Scrolls',
B.A.S.O.R., No. 111, Oct. 1948, pp. 3 ff.
'Identification of the Aramaic Fourth Scroll from
'Ain Feshka', *ibid.* No. 115, Oct. 1949, pp. 8 ff.
'The "Suppressed" Scroll of Haftarat', J.Q.R. ii.,
1950-51, pp. 71 ff.
- J. TRINQUET. 'Les liens "Sadocites" de l'écrit de Damas, des
manuscrits de la Mer Morte et de l'Écclésiastique',
V.T. i., 1951, pp. 287 ff.
- R. de VAUK. 'Les manuscrits hébreux du Désert de Juda', La
Vie Intellectuelle, June, 1949, pp. 583 ff.
Review of Dupont-Sommer's 'Observations sur le
Commentaire d'Habacuc découvert près de la Mer
Morte', in R.B. lviii, 1951, pp. 437 ff.
Communication to the Académie des Inscriptions
et Belles Lettres, April 4, 1952, reported in
Manchester Guardian, April 7, 1952.
- I. WECHSLER. 'The "Hidden Geniza" once more, or Mr. Trever
versus Mr. Trever', J.Q.R. n.s. xli., 1950-51,
pp. 247 ff.
- P. R. WEIS. 'The Date of the Habakkuk Scroll', *ibid.* n.s. xli.
1950-51, p. 125.
- G. E. WRIGHT. 'A Phenomenal Discovery', in B.A. xi., 1948, pp.
21 ff.
'Archeological News & Views', *ibid.* xii, 1949,
pp. 32 ff.
'Additional Comments on the Scroll Cave', *ibid.*
pp. 64 ff.
'More Cave Manuscripts', in B.A. xv. 1952, pp. 44 ff
- S. ZEITLIN. 'The Hoax of the "Slatonic Josephus"', J.Q.R.
n.s. xxxix. 1948-49, p. 171.
'"A Commentary on the Book of Habakkuk": Important
Discovery or Hoax?', *ibid.* n.s. xxxix, 1948-49,
pp. 235 ff.
'Scholarship and the Hoax of the Recent Discoveries',
ibid. n.s. xxxix, 1948-49, pp. 337 ff.

S. ZEITLIN.
(cont.)

- 'The Alleged Antiquity of the Scrolls', J.Q.R.n.s.
xl.1949-50, pp.57 ff.
'Where is the Scroll of the Haftaret?', ibid.n.s.
xl.1949-50, pp.291 ff.
'The Hebrew Scrolls: once more and finally', ibid.
n.s.xli.1950-51, pp.1 ff.
-
-

