

A "GRONINGEN" HYPOTHESIS OF QUMRAN ORIGINS AND EARLY HISTORY

SINCE the first detailed publication of the so-called "Groningen Hypothesis" about the Origins and Early History of the Qumran Community has just appeared(1) and is easily available, it would be pointless to repeat here the arguments set out there in great detail. It seems more useful to develop some of the assumptions underlying our hypothesis and to make clear the historical consequences that follow from their acceptance.

Therefore this paper will deal with:

- the composition and character of the library from Qumran;
- the hypothesis of Norman GOLB who postulates that the scrolls come from different libraries of Jerusalem and that they represent the literature of the whole of the Judaism of the time.
- After summarizing the contents of the "Groningen hypothesis", the paper will spell out some of the consequences that can be deduced in order to obtain a historical reconstruction of the early history of the community.

I

One of the basic assumptions of our hypothesis is that all the MSS recovered from the caves of Qumran are remnants of the library of the group which used to live in and around Khirbet Qumran. Evidently not all the MSS found at Qumran are of qumranic origin; nobody would ever dream of claiming a qumranic origin for any one of the biblical MSS that make up a sizeable part of the remnants from the various caves; besides, the paleographical dating of certain MSS formally rules out their having been composed or copied in Qumran, and the long editorial history of

(1) F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, "Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis", *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1988), 113-136.

various works equally makes it clear that the oldest levels were written in a period prior to the establishing of the community beside the Dead Sea. But it is our contention that:

1) the texts found in the caves are not a disparate collection of loose elements without any connexion; on the contrary, they are part of a whole and form a unity that we can describe as a religious library, and

2) that this library belongs to and reflects the interests of the group of Qumran, which amounts to saying that it is a sectarian library.

The first element is grounded on an analysis of all the MSS published so far and on the available descriptions of most of the still unpublished texts. (2) Their contents are, in spite of the huge number of works involved, surprisingly homogeneous: biblical texts, apocryphal and pseudepigraphical compositions (previously known or completely new) which are a sort of haggadic extension of the biblical texts, halakhic discussions which are equally derived from the biblical text, hymns, prayers and liturgical compositions, and a whole series of new compositions which in their theological or halakhic orientations reflect a peculiar religious outlook and may be conveniently termed "sectarian".

All these elements, except sectarian works, are precisely the sort of compositions we should expect in a religious library of the time. This library, of course, should not be seen as a modern library, as a kind of repository of all the knowledge of the time; it is a specifically religious library, in which "profane" knowledge has no place: no historical works, (3) no works of medicine (4) or other

(2) See F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, "Lista de MSS procedentes de Qumrán, *Henoah* 11 (1989), 149-232. This list which follows and supplements the list published by J. A. FITZMYER, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Major Publications and Tools for Study*, Missoula 1977, 11-39; 174-177, also contains references to the preliminary publication or description of a good number of the still unpublished fragments of cave 4 of the lots of MILIK, STRUGNELL and STARCKY-PUECH. H. STEGEMANN estimates at about 823 the total of MSS found in all the caves, and at about 580 the total coming from cave 4 (see his "Some Aspects of Eschatology in Texts from the Qumran Community and in the Teaching of Jesus" in *Biblical Archaeology Today*, Jerusalem 1984, 421). Our list includes 668 of the alleged total of 823, 426 of them being 4Q MSS. An examination of the descriptions of the MSS of the original list of distribution of texts between the first team of editors shows that the presumed contents of the about 100 4Q MSS not included in our "List of MSS" does not alter the picture that the evidence already available provides, many of them being only scraps of texts.

(3) 4QpHis ar from STARCKY-PUECH's lot seems closely related to the biblical text of Daniel.

(4) J. NAVEH has proved that the so-called 4QTherapeia published by J. ALLEGRO is not a medical document but a writing exercise. See J. NAVEH, "A Medical Document or a Writing Exercise? The So-called 4QTherapeia", *Israel Exploration Journal* 36 (1988), 52-55, pl. 11.

"sciences" have been discovered; (5) the astronomical and calendrical documents of MILIK's lot (6) are closely related to the festive calendar and the priestly courses, typically religious problems, and even the "horoscopes" (7) have a clearly religious orientation. The only text which at first sight does not fit into this pattern in 3Q15, the *Copper Scroll*, which we will discuss later.

That all the MSS coming from the various caves are part of the same library is shown by the fact that the collections of all the caves, except cave 7, (8) present the same pattern of biblical, apocryphal and sectarian works, that the *same* apocryphal or sectarian compositions are found in different caves, (9) and that even some of the MSS coming from different caves have been copied by the same scribe.

That this library is not the library of one person but of a group is not only evident in the huge number of MSS recovered but is clearly proved by the fact that many copies of the same work are present, as much in the case of biblical texts as in apocryphal or sectarian compositions. (10)

That this library belongs to the group living at Khirbet Qumran is not only suggested by the physical proximity between the caves and the Khirbeh but proved by the relation [or the identity (11)] established between the material remains of the caves and Khirbet Qumran.

(5) *4QpapGénéalogique* ar of STARCKY-PUECH's lot is a genealogy of biblical times that run until the epoch of the Judges; another "topographical" work from the same STARCKY-PUECH lot, with a series of names from Syria and Lebanon to the Negev, seems to be related to the traditions of the division of the promised land and can in no way be considered as a "scientific" topographical treatise.

(6) *4Q317 (4QAslrCrypt)*, related to the calendars of *4QEnasir*, and *4Q319-337 (4QMismarol)*.

(7) *4Q186 (DJD V, 88-91)* and *4QMes ar*, published by J. STARCKY in *Mémorial du cinquantième de l'Institut Catholique de Paris*, Paris 1964, 51-66, that according to É. PUECH is part of one of the MSS designated als *4QNoah^{ae}*.

(8) The cave is not only peculiar because all the MSS found there are biblical texts (in so far they have been identified), but also because all of them are papyri and especially because all of them are written in Greek.

(9) For example, *Jubilees* appears in caves 1, 2, 3, 4 and 11; *The New Jerusalem* texts in caves 2, 4, 5 and 11.

(10) From Cave 4 only, for example, have been recovered 20 copies of *Psalms*, 17 of *Isaiah*, 16 of *Deuteronomy*, etc.; 5 of *Tobit*, 6 of *Jubilees*, 6 of *4QSecond Ezekiel*, etc.; and also 8 copies of *Damascus Document*, 10 of the *Serek*, 8 of the *ShirShabb*, 6 of *4QMMT*, etc. Strictly speaking, the argument of the multiplicity of the copies of the same work applies only to caves 1, 2, 4 and 11 (in the case of cave 5 it is not completely sure that the two copies of *Lam.* are from different MSS); the contents of caves 3, 6 and 7 could represent individual libraries, but the character of the collection of texts coming from these caves (with the exception of those coming from cave 7) is the same as that of the collections coming from the caves 1, 2, 4 and 11; we can therefore consider all the MSS as a unity.

(11) R. DE VAUX concludes: "L'utilisation des grottes n'est pas seulement contemporaine de Khirbet Qumrân, elle lui est liée organiquement. Il est déjà

That this group was a clearly sectarian group is proved by the contents of the sectarian works found in its library. These compositions not only show a different theological outlook, a different calendar, a different halakhah, etc., but also reveal a highly structured and tightly organized community whose members are not only aware of being different from the rest of the Judaism of the time, but present themselves as having consciously *separated* from the rest of that Judaism. Even more, the texts show that the community prohibits contacts with non-members and considers all others as the "sons of darkness", or, as G. VERMES put it: "that the sectaries regarded themselves as the true Israel, the repository of the authentic traditions of the religious body from which they have seceded". (12)

Considering the exclusive character of the community and the repeated prohibition of contacts with non-members, it does seem impossible that the community should have kept the religious literature of alien or clearly hostile groups, not even for polemical purposes or in order to refute their enemies. (13) Even allowing for the ample space necessary to permit an inevitable ideological evolution and recognising that there is nothing that might be considered as a Qumran "canon", in view of the exclusive character of the Qumran community it seems out of the question that they should have preserved and made use of works incompatible with their own ideology. And, indeed, among all the texts preserved there is no trace of any book than can be attributed to an *opposing* religious group. (14)

significatif qu'elle commence et qu'elle s'achève en même temps que l'occupation principale du Khirbeh, mais il y a d'autres preuves. Khirbet Qumrán est au centre de la région où les grottes sont dispersées et certains d'entre elles, les grottes 4Q et 5Q, 7Q à 10Q, sont situées à proximité immédiate des ruines. L'identité de la poterie des grottes et de celle du Khirbet quant à la pâte et aux formes et, spécialement, le grand nombre des jarres cylindriques qui ne sont pas encore attestées en dehors de la région de Qumrán supposent que cette céramique vient d'un même lieu de fabrication: or, on a mis au jour dans le Khirbeh un atelier de potier," *DJD* III, 32.

(12) G. VERMES, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, Third Edition, Sheffield 1988, xvii.

(13) As N. GOLB seems to postulate in his answer to E.-M. LAPERROUSAZ: "Les tenants des diverses tendances qui caractérisent le judaïsme pré-rabbinique avaient évidemment besoin de posséder les écrits de leurs opposants, tout comme je dois posséder la 'note' précédente pour rédiger cette réponse," "Réponse à la 'Note' de E.-M. Laperrousaz," *Annales ESC* 1987, 1313. Such an "ecumenical" understanding may hold for some unknown "tendency" of pre-rabbinical Judaism, but it was certainly not the position of the Qumran community and is clearly contradicted by the explicit affirmations of the texts.

(14) Theoretically it is also possible to postulate that the MSS come from different libraries of the same sectarian group. This could account for the pattern of contents discerned and for the presence of the same sectarian works. But this hypothesis would not solve any problems; besides, although we know of other Essene

That to this group belong not only the clearly sectarian texts but all the texts of the library is shown by the fact that MSS coming from different caves, some of them biblical, some of them difficult to characterize, were copied by the same scribes who copied typically sectarian texts: for example, *1QS* and *4Q174* were written by the same scribe who copied *4QSam^c*, (15) and *1QpHab* and *11QTemple^b* were written by the same hand. (16)

The consequences of this assumption are far reaching. Here we should only underline two of them: the possibility of classifying all the non-biblical texts, and the fact that the date of the settlement at Qumran provides us with a *terminus ante quem* for the composition of the non-sectarian compositions found in the caves.

Our assumption implies that although the fact of its having been found in Qumran is no guarantee of the Qumranic origin of a given work, it does assure us that the work in question was understood by the community as compatible with its own ideology and its own halakhah, that is as coming from the Essene movement or from the apocalyptic tradition which inspired it. Which amounts to saying that the non-biblical literature found as part of the Qumran library may be classified as follows:

- * sectarian works, representing the thought or the halakhah of Qumran in its most developed and typical form

- * works of the formative period, presenting a vision still not so clearly differentiated from the Essenism which is its ultimate source but containing indications of future developments and offering an already characteristic halakha

- * works which reflect Essene thought and accord with what the classical sources teach us about Essenism or which can be attributed to it

- * works belonging to the apocalyptic tradition which gave rise to Essenism and which were considered as part of the common heritage.

settlements in the Judaean desert and of the presence of Essene groups in Jerusalem and other cities, nothing is known of the existence of other settlements of the same sectarian group that wrote the Qumran texts; finally, this hypothesis does not provide a good explanation of the fact that the material remains found in all the caves are closely related to the material remains found in the excavations of the Khirbet Qumran, and that MSS coming from different caves are clearly written by the same scribe. Therefore the origins of all the MSS can better be explained as coming from only one library, the library of the Qumran sectarians.

(15) See E. ULRICH, "4QSamuel: A Fragmentary Manuscript of 2 Samuel 14-15 from the Scribe of the Serek Hay-yahad (1QS)," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 235 (1979), 2.

(16) See J. P. M. VAN DER PLOEG, "Une halakha inédite de Qumrán," in: M. DELCOR (ed.), *Qumrán. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, Paris-Gembloux 1978, 107.

Our assumption implies also that all the works found in Qumran that cannot be classified as strictly sectarian must have been composed *before* the split that gave rise of the Qumran group, because otherwise they would never have been accepted by the sect. Of course, in the case of many works, either because of the fragmentary state in which they have reached us or because they do not show any of the identifiable characteristics of the sectarian compositions, it is impossible to specify to which category they belong and we cannot exclude their having been composed by members of the sect at a later period. Nevertheless this conclusion provides us with a *terminus ante quem* for dating all works whose non-sectarian character can be determined, and this can be relevant at the moment one tries precisely to date the composition of works, e.g., *Jubilees*, amply represented in several caves. (17) It can also be of interest when one tries to explain why only some of the so-called Old Testament Apocrypha or Pseudepigrapha, e.g., *Ben Sira*, *Tobit* and the *Epistle of Jeremiah*, are represented in the caves (18) and not other compositions of the same sort.

II

This understanding is by no means a new or exclusive feature of our hypothesis. In fact this is the way in which the great majority of scholars have understood the composition of the Qumran library since the beginning of the discoveries. But recently it has been severely attacked and depicted as nonsense by Norman GOLB in both its elements: that the MSS derive from a library, and that this library belongs to the sectarian group of Qumran. GOLB denies all relationship whatsoever between the MSS and the ruins of Qumran as well as their Essene or sectarian origin, and postulates that all the MSS come from different libraries of Jerusalem and that they represent the literature of the Judaism of that time as a whole. (19) Therefore it seems necessary to deal with the arguments on which GOLB's hypothesis rests. (20)

(17) 1Q17-1Q18; 2Q19-2Q20; 3Q15; 4Q176 19.20.21-4Q221 and five other copies of MILIK's lot from 4Q [4Q(M)15-16, 17, 18, 20, 21] as yet unpublished.

(18) *Ben Sira*: 2Q18, 11Q5 xxi; *Tobit*: five copies in 4Q as yet unpublished; *Epistle of Jeremiah*: 7Q2.

(19) Although elaborated independently and formulated somehow differently, the theory of GOLB closely resembles the old theory of K. H. RENGSTORF. According to RENGSTORF the MSS have no connexion with the Essenes or with any other sect, they are part of the library of the temple of Jerusalem brought to the caves for safe-keeping at the time of the Jewish Revolt. See K. H. RENGSTORF, *Hirbel Qumran und die Bibliothek vom Toten Meer* (Studia Delitzchiana 5), Stuttgart 1960.

(20) N. GOLB has presented his hypothesis in several publications: "The Problem of Origin and Identification of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 124 (1980), 1-24; —"Who Hid the Dead Sea Scrolls,"

These arguments are of different sorts: *a)* some of them dispute the connexion of the scrolls with the Essenes, *b)* others try to sever the relation between the MSS of the caves and the group living in Qumran, *c)* others aim to establish a relationship between the texts and Jerusalem, and finally *d)* others seek to present the MSS as the literature not of a sectarian group but of Judaism as a whole.

a) To the first category belongs GOLB's emphasis on the celibacy of the Essenes and their peace-loving and non-military nature (pp. 188.196) as described in the classical sources, in contrast both with the presence of graves of women around the Khirbeh (p. 189) and the military fortress character of the Khirbeh on one hand (p. 188), and the fact that none of the Qumran texts espouse strict celibacy and other Qumran texts (so als *IQM*) are of a combative militaristic character on the other. Arguments of this sort are of no relevance to our hypothesis, which makes a clear distinction between the Essenes and the Qumran group, (21) and do not need to be discussed here.

b) More relevant are the three arguments that seek to sever the connexion between the MSS and the group living in Qumran.

1) *The Khirbeh was a fortress in which no manuscript remnants were found* (pp. 188.197). The implications of this argument are that as a fortress, (22) the Khirbeh could not have been the residence of a religious Essene-like group, (23) could not have been a centre of learning, and, of course, could not be the place where an

Biblical Archaeologist 28 (1987), 68-82; —“Les manuscrits de la mer Morte: Une nouvelle approche du problème de leur origine,” *Annales ESC* 1985, n° 5, pp. 1133-1149; —“Réponse à la ‘Note’ de E.-M. Laperrousaz,” *Annales ESC* 1987, n° 6, pp. 1313-1320; —“The Dead Sea Scrolls,” *The American Scholar* 58 (1989), 177-207, but all of them contain basically the same arguments, although not in the same order. The fundamental presentation is the article in *PAPS*; the articles in *BA* and *Annales* are more of a popular sort, and the *American Scholar* version constitutes the most up-to-date version, which takes the latest developments into consideration. We will primarily use this latest presentation of his views (referring to it simply by page number in our text), and we should like to thank Prof. GOLB for kindly sending us a copy of this article.

(21) As GOLB himself seems to recognize, *a.c.* 189.

(22) “Il se révèle, au contraire, être une forteresse d'importance stratégique dans le désert de Judée, et, on peut le déduire de l'attaque armée en 69 ou en 70, c'était encore une forteresse en ce temps-là,” *Annales* 1985, 1140.

(23) “When Khirbet Qumran was excavated, however, various elements of a fortress-like complex were revealed, and the archaeologist working at the site determined that it had been stormed by Roman soldiers after a hard-fought battle that included the undermining of the walls and setting at least part of the site on fire. The resisters would thus have had to be members of an armed troop—precisely unlike the Essenes as they are described in the classical sources” (p. 188).

important library was located. As (a) proof of this assumption is adduced the fact that when excavated the Khirbet did not produce a single scrap of parchment. (24)

But to substantiate this assertion GOLB is forced to confound several elements of the archeological excavations and to forget others equally important. The fortress-like elements present at the Khirbet Qumran complex derive from the first construction of the site as an Israelite stronghold in the VIII century B.C., and especially from the latest transformation of the site after the Roman destruction into a military outpost of the Roman army, which gave the Khirbeh a new character. (25) But in the periods from the end of the II century B.C. until the Roman destruction of the site (the periods I_b and II of DE VAUX) the most characteristic elements of the complex are not the walls of the tower, but the complex water system, the workshops, the meeting places and common rooms, and all the other elements that indicate that the site was designed "for the carrying on of certain communal activities." (26) Although the Khirbeh was constructed as a stronghold in the VIII century B.C. and was adapted by the Romans as a military post after the destruction, the site during the two centuries of sectarian occupation cannot be described as a military fortress. GOLB not only seems to forget at this point the presence of a potter's workshop and other workshops, the mill, the elaborate and carefully constructed water system, and other remains which indicate a communal purpose for the buildings, but, even more important, that after the destruction by the Romans the whole site was transformed by them into a military post and that this perfectly explains the fact that no MSS were found in the Khirbeh. Is it so strange that the new Roman occupants would have cleaned up their quarters, eliminating at the same time possible remnants of MSS or other documents that the former occupants *could* have forgotten?

Besides, if the Khirbeh was a fortress, what could be the explanation for the big cemetery of more than a thousand

(24) "That in the Qumran fortress there was a manuscript-writing room where Essene monks composed and copied texts, although none of the autograph manuscripts that might attest to this literary creativity has ever been found, and although the room identified as this 'scriptorium' was not found to contain a single scrap of parchment when excavated" (p. 197).

(25) The periods I and III of occupation, see R. DE VAUX, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Oxford 1973, 1-3, 41-44.

(26) As DE VAUX put it (*op. cit.*, p. 10), noting that "this establishment was not designated as a community residence" because "the number of rooms which should have served as dwellings is restricted as compared with the sites designed for group activities to be pursued."

tombs? This argument, already used by R. DE VAUX (27) against the theory of K. H. RENGSTORF, who saw the Khirbeh as an agricultural estate, is equally valid against GOLB's view of the Khirbeh as a fortress.

2) *The absence of documentary records in the caves* (pp. 193-195, 204). The point of this argument is not completely clear, because GOLB uses it to illustrate his contention with the example of the finds of Murabba'at. Apparently for GOLB the Murabba'at texts are only the proof that documentary records can survive, (28) but the example adduced implies far reaching consequences. GOLB is perfectly aware of the difference between an archive and a library, and in fact, himself employs this distinction when talking about Jerusalem as the origin of the scrolls. In Jerusalem were archives (which were destroyed in August 66 A.D.) where the documentary records were kept, and also libraries (which in his hypothesis were not destroyed) where the literary documents, in GOLB's hypothesis, were preserved, and only the contents of the libraries would have been brought to the caves for safekeeping. This should explain, in his opinion, why no documentary records were found in the caves. But if the parallel with the Murabba'at findings (in which documentary records and scribal copies of literary texts were found together, and not, as GOLB affirms [pp. 193-194], only documentary records) has any force, it should equally be applied to Jerusalem (where the refugees came from) and it should prove that in Jerusalem the separation between archives and libraries was not so clear-cut as GOLB himself affirms.

Anyway, the meaning of GOLB's argument seems to be that if the MSS were related to the Khirbeh we should have found in the caves the records of the sect together with the literary documents. (29) This not being the case, the connexion of the texts and the Khirbet should be abandoned.

The existence of archives at Qumran seems certain, and is specifically required by the sectarian texts themselves. That the religious literature and the profane deeds, letters or the sect's administration should have been kept and hidden together in the

(27) R. DE VAUX, *op. cit.*, pp. 105-106.

(28) "Thus, the Bar Kokhba documents made clear—or should have made clear—that original Hebrew autographs of a documentary character, such as personal and administrative letters or deeds and contracts, could indeed survive from antiquity in the Judaean wilderness" (p. 194).

(29) "If the scrolls were from Qumran and if, when it was heard that Roman troops were approaching, these scrolls were gathered up in haste from the chambers of the site and from its scriptorium—where one may assume that official letters and other documents of the sect were also produced—how could such documents have been so carefully excluded from the hiding process?" (p. 194).

same place, is on the contrary a rather gratuitous assertion, and one, we may add, that seems to ignore the purity restrictions imposed upon religious literature. Nobody can fathom the reasons why the men of Qumran decided to proceed in the way they did and hid in different places their archives and their library, but the purity concerns of the group are far too evident to be dismissed and in any case the distinction between their archives and their library must be maintained. That the chance of the discoveries has not provided us with specimens of the Qumran archives is certainly regrettable, but no more regrettable than the complete loss of the temple or the royal archives or, for that matter, all other archives of Judaea of the II and I century B.C.

The point is that if the absence of documentary records can be an objection to the MSS coming from a library, the objection must equally apply to its coming from another library, from the temple library or from unspecified libraries of Jerusalem.

3) *The discoveries of MSS near Jericho in antiquity* (pp. 191-192). For GOLB the allusion of Origen to the finding "in a jar near Jericho" of Hebrew and Greek books, as well as the reference of Patriarch Timotheus I of Seleucia to the discovery of Hebrew MSS in a cave "near Jericho", "adversely affects the claim of organic connection between the Qumran settlement and the manuscripts of the nearby caves, instead pointing to another cause for the hiding of manuscripts in the Judaeian desert in antiquity" (p. 192). How the reports of these findings can adversely affect this is not completely clear, because we do not know what sort of MSS were found there, (30) nor of what date. Not even GOLB has suggested that the finding of biblical and other MSS in Murabb'at, Nahal Hever, Wady Seiyal or Khirbet Mird "adversely affects" the connection of the Qumran MSS with the Qumran community. What the argument seems to mean is that the geographical distance between Jericho and Qumran makes it difficult to accept the interpretation some scholars gave to the phrase "near Jericho" as referring to Qumran; (31) this interpretation can be discussed, but its relevance to severing the relation of the Qumran MSS with the group of the Khirbeh can be dismissed.

After examining the arguments put forward by GOLB in order to sever the relationship between the scrolls and the Khirbeh we

(30) Origen seems to imply that one of the Greek texts used for the Hexapla was involved, and the Patriarch Timotheus refers to "books of the Old Testament and others in Hebrew script."

(31) "After these statements became known, Qumran scholars proposed that they implied there had been earlier discoveries at Qumran itself. Timotheus as well as Origen had only spoken imprecisely of the discoveries having taken place "near Jericho" (p. 192).

must conclude that he has failed to prove the soundness of this assumption; we can therefore consider the MSS as coming from the library of the group living in the Khirbeh.

c) For GOLB "the very phenomena that constitute grave anomalies in the Qumran-Essene hypothesis are those facts that point emphatically to the scrolls' Jerusalem origin" (p. 199). But he underlines as more important the following elements:

1) *The discovery at Masada of a copy of ShirShabb.* (32) The argument of GOLB seems straightforward: *ShirShabb* was supposed to be a Qumranic work that has now turned up at the excavations of Masada; we know that the defenders of Masada were Judaeans *sicarii* augmented by refugees coming from the siege of Jerusalem; ergo the MS was brought from Jerusalem. (33) But he is confusing in fact two quite distinct issues: the origin of the composition and the way it reached Masada.

As for the first, the fact that a copy of *ShirShabb* was found at Masada does not prove or disprove that the composition is a sectarian work, in the same way that the finding of a copy of *CD* in the Cairo Genizah does not prove or disprove its sectarian character. The arguments as to the origin and sectarian character of the work are independent of the place of discovery. The arguments that prove the Qumranic origin of the *Shir Shabb* adduced by C. NEWSOM (34) are: the characteristic use of *lmskyl* in the introductory formulas and, especially, the striking parallels with *4QBerakot*, to which others can be added. (35) GOLB does not seem to object to the characterization of *ShirShabb* as "sectarian", at least he does not propose that the work was written by the *sicarii* or by any other "orthodox" Jew. He simply denies that the work

(32) "Without recourse to the special explanation of a bond between Masada and Essenes from Qumran, the discoveries at Masada thus forcefully imply the act of removal of manuscripts from Jerusalem during the revolt. They indicate that Hebrew literary texts were deemed precious enough to warrant rescue during periods of danger" (187).

(33) "The one cogent inference that may be drawn from the presence of first-century Hebrew manuscripts at Masada is that Jewish *sicarii* who inhabited that site possessed scrolls that they had brought there after taking the fortress in 66 A.D. while other Jews took scrolls with them (in addition to basic possessions) when they withdrew from Jerusalem to that site. In the Masada excavations, surviving remnants of these possessions were discovered, including even such texts as the 'Angelic Liturgy' that, before the Masada discoveries, were erroneously believed to have had a unique connection with Qumran" (p. 187).

(34) C. NEWSOM, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (Harvard Semitic Studies 27), Atlanta 1985, 3-4.

(35) See the review of the book of NEWSOM by F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ in *Biblica* 69 (1988), 144-146 and F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, "Estudios Qumránicos 1975-1985. Panorama Crítico IV," *Estudios Bíblicos* 46 (1988), 541-542.

has "a unique connection with Qumran" on the basis of the finding of a copy at Masada, confusing the issue of the origin with the issue of the way in which the work reached the place where it was found later on.

As for the way in which an exemplar of *ShirShabb*, which we consider a Qumranic work, reached Masada, many explanations are possible: "By assuming that it was taken there by a member of the Qumran community who participated in the revolt against Rome, presumably after the destruction of the community center at Khirbet Qumran;" (36) "that the rebels occupied the Qumran area after its evacuation by the Community and subsequently transferred Essene manuscripts to their final place of resistance;" (37) even the one that GOLB could have favoured, namely that it was brought to Masada by a *sectarian* refugee from the siege of Jerusalem. The point is that we do not know precisely how the work reached Masada, but that this ignorance does not affect its sectarian character. And the sectarian character of the scroll implies that, whatever way it took to reach Masada, it came from a sectarian library. The presence of the work in caves 4 and 11 proves to us that the work had a place in the library of Qumran.

2) *The contents of the Copper Scroll (3Q15)* (pp. 195-198). It is well known that since the moment of its discovery, 3Q15 has been one of the most difficult texts to interpret and the one that has elicited more speculation not only about the precise contents of the work (historical document or folkloristic fantasy), but also about its paleographical dating [the opinion of the editor MILIK and that of CROSS, both recorded in the official edition, (38) are not exactly the same], the origin of the treasures described and their exact locations. (39) In our opinion, and despite the hesitations of DE VAUX, it seems fairly certain that the archeological context in which the *Copper Scroll* was discovered demands a classification of the work as coming from the Qumran Library and therefore connected with the Qumran group, although the huge number of Greek loanwords 3Q15 contains set it clearly apart from the rest of the documents. Of course, this assertion does not explain the literary genre of the work, nor (if the treasures are real, as the dry realism of its style and the fact that it is recorded in copper seem to suggest) what was the origin of these treasures. But claiming a

(36) C. A. NEWSOM, *op. cit.*, 74, note 11.

(37) G. VERMES, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 221; *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, III/1, 463.

(38) *DJD* III, 215-221.

(39) For a good survey of the problems and the proposed solutions, see B. PIXNER, "Unravelling the Copper Scroll Code: A Study on the Topography of 3Q15," *Revue de Qumrán* 11/43 (1983), 323-365.

Jerusalem origin for the work does not explain these elements either, and, although a Jerusalem origin could explain why a certain number of the caches are located in and around Jerusalem, it does not explain the caches located in the area around Qumran and Jericho, nor the ones in the Yarmuk area.

In the present state of our knowledge too many uncertainties remain about the correct interpretation of the topographical terms of the scroll, about the language of the text, (40) even about the exact number of the treasures involved, to permit us to solve all the riddles that it presents and especially the question of its character and provenance. The GOLB hypothesis does not advance new elements to solve these riddles, nor does it supply us with new answers to the many puzzles of the text. It is our contention that the obscurities still surrounding this mysterious *Copper Scroll* make it impossible to use this piece of evidence to reduce the value of all the accumulated evidence, even less to serve as a cornerstone of any new hypothesis.

d) GOLB's arguments to prove that the Qumran MSS are not the remains of a sectarian library but represent the literature of the whole of the Judaism of the epoch are the following:

1) *The small number of sectarian texts.* (41) This purely quantitative argument forgets a basic fact, namely that we have not recovered integrally the library in its original form. But even without paying attention to the possible losses and the accidental character of its recovery, the total number of copies of strictly sectarian works is only smaller, as should be expected, to the total number of copies of biblical books, and besides, what is more important, the sectarian works recovered cover all aspects of the literary spectrum: theological treatises, biblical commentaries, rules for internal organization, procedures and penal codes, purity laws, halakhic decisions and discussions, prayers, liturgical and hymnical compositions, etc., in short, the clearly sectarian works recovered cover all aspects of the religious thought and life of a sectarian community.

2) *The scrolls present too many contradictory outlooks and points of view to allow the idea of an origin within any one circle of sectarians* (pp. 190.200). With this argument GOLB is apparently also referring to a twofold problem: the differences appearing between

(40) See the conclusion of Y. THORION, "Beiträge zur Erforschung der Sprache der Kupfer-Rolle," *Revue de Qumrân* 12/46 (1986), 163-176.

(41) "Only a small fraction of the totality of scrolls contained laws or doctrines that might be termed notoriously heterodox, let alone Essenic—even when compared with texts of early rabbinic Judaism (such as the Mishnah and Tosefta), which post-dated the Qumran Scrolls by as much as two to three centuries" (pp. 189-190).

clearly sectarian texts, such as *CD* and *IQS*, (42) and the variety of apocryphal and apocalyptic compositions. (43) This second element is not relevant to our hypothesis which does not attribute the composition of the apocalyptic or Essene works to the sect; in any case, the differences in outlook and points of view of the apocalyptic and apocryphal writings are hardly larger than the differences already apparent within the biblical texts, and if the sectarians were ready to incorporate all the biblical books of the Hebrew Bible we do not see any reason why they could not incorporate all the books of the tradition they sprang from. As we have already said, they would certainly not keep works incompatible with their own ideology, which means that the different "outlooks and points of view" of the apocalyptic and apocryphal writings which disturb GOLB were not perceived as fundamentally opposed to the ideological tenets of the group; they were, as in the case of the biblical texts, part of their heritage and pre-history.

The first element of the argument is more to the point and constitutes an element that has nurtured the discussions around the scrolls since the beginning of the discoveries. It is clearly out of the question to present here all the solutions offered to the problem, and we shall limit ourselves to giving our own opinion. We take as an established fact the long redactional history of *CD*, the pre-Qumran origin of the composition and the later adaptation in the Qumran context (44) and we attribute the first redaction of *CD* to the formative period of the sect; we also consider it an established fact that *CD* and *IQS* legislate for two sorts of communities; we are even ready to accept that the "camps communities" for which *CD* legislates existed before or at the same time that the community for which *IQS* legislates took shape, (45) which implies that the

(42) "There are remarkable contradictions between ideas of the one scroll and the other [*CD* and *IQS*], and these conflicts alone disturb the concept of a single homogeneous sect living in antiquity at the Qumran site" (p. 190).

(43) "Nor can [be seriously believed] the suggestion that the Essenes, said by both Josephus and Philo to have numbered no more than four thousand souls, were the very ones responsible for the outpouring of imaginative texts constituting the apocryphal and apocalyptic literature of the Palestinian Jews. This is too vast a literature, with too many contradictory outlooks and points of view, to allow the idea of its origin within any one circle of sectarians" (p. 191).

(44) Amply demonstrated in the works of J. MURPHY-O'CONNOR and P. R. DAVIES.

(45) The number of copies of *CD* found in cave 4 suggests that the interest in the work was not only antiquarian. We will never know the precise relationship between the two kinds of communities, nor will we ever be able to ascertain whether the legislation of *CD* was later modified in view of the experience of a desert community, or if the legislation for a desert community of *IQS* was later adapted to the groups of sectarians living not in the desert but in towns or camps, or if both legislations for the two branches of sectaries coexisted all the time.

members of the sectarian group could live in two sort of communities. But it is our contention that at the basic level of ideology, calendar and halakhah, the two works are not, as GOLB asserts, contradictory, but that they share the same sectarian outlook in spite of the different concrete legislations they offer.(46) Therefore their differences cannot be adduced as a proof that the library could not have belonged to a sectarian group.

3) *It is inconceivable that all the literature of early Judaism has disappeared and only the literature of a small fringe group has been preserved.*(47) The ingenuity of the argument is disarming. A look at the *Materials for the Dictionary. Series I. 200 B.C.E.-300 C.E.* of The Academy of the Hebrew Language - The Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language(48) shows that, indeed, almost all the materials between 100 B.C. and 70 A.D. are provided by the Qumran MSS. How this fact can affect the attribution of this library to a sectarian group is by no means clear, unless one supposes that all accidental discoveries of MSS must be representative of the whole literature of the time.

We must thus conclude that GOLB has also failed to prove that the Qumran MSS represent all the literature of the Judaism of the time. This was an impossible task; if not for other reasons, at least because the characteristic elements of rabbinic Judaism are not present in the scrolls, as GOLB himself seems to recognize.(49) He explains their absence by the chronological distance between pre-70 Judaism and post-70 rabbinism. But not even GOLB would deny (we assume) that there is a link between the pre-70 Pharisees and the post-70 Rabbis. Now, the characteristic ideas and halakhah of the Pharisees are equally absent in the MSS. How is it possible, if the scrolls represent all the aspects of the actual state of Judaism at that time, that the ideas and the halakhah of the Pharisees, the

(46) As G. VERMES put it: "Yet despite these many dissimilarities, at the basic level of doctrine, aims and principles, a perceptible bond links the brethren of the desert with those of the towns," *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, op. cit.*, p. 16.

(47) This element is more clearly and forcefully formulated in the French article of *Annales* of 1985: "Dans cette théorie, les manuscrits fondamentaux de la littérature hébraïque du 1^{er} siècle appartenant aux autres juifs de Palestine, qui à l'époque ne comptaient pas moins de deux millions d'hommes, auraient disparu. D'autre part, ceux des prétendus qoumrano-esséniens, qui auraient fait partie d'un groupe qui selon Philon et Josèphe ne comptait pas plus de quatre mille âmes, sont représentés à travers les siècles par quatre découvertes au moins, ce qui porte à plus d'un millier le nombre de manuscrits 'esséniens'." 1142.

(48) Distributed in microfiches, Jerusalem 1988.

(49) "The scrolls were written a century and more before the age of the Tannaïc masters who modeled rabbinic Judaism in the wake of the destruction of the Second Temple, and thus reflect aspects of religious and social thinking not characteristic of rabbinic Judaism" (p. 200).

group that forms the basis of later rabbinic Judaism are not represented?

It is surely not the intention of GOLB to assert that the basic tenets and the halakhah "of the Tannaitic masters who molded rabbinic Judaism in the wake of the destruction of the Second Temple" (p. 200) were non-existent before 70, and that the Tannaitic masters invented Judaism *ex nihilo*, but this is the inescapable conclusion of his hypothesis and shows how wrong it is.

III

Assuming thus that the Dead Sea Scrolls derive from the library of the sectarian group of Qumran, we can legitimately ask what these scrolls tell us about the origins and the history of this group. As a matter of fact, these are precisely the sort of questions all the theories propounded since the beginning of research into the scrolls have tried to answer, and, in spite of some aberrant proposals, many of the findings obtained can be considered as established. But a growing discomfort with the identification of the Qumran group as Essenes, (50) the dissatisfaction with the proposal to place the origin of the group in a Babylonian context, (51) and the need to integrate the new data supplied by lately published texts, (52) have moved us to formulate a new attempt to integrate coherently the apparently contradictory elements furnished by the scrolls.

This "Groningen hypothesis" tries specifically to answer two questions: where are the origins of the ideas, the doctrinal roots, of the group to be found? and: what do we historically know of the early years of the group?

This hypothesis is the combination in an integrated whole of the insights of A. S. VAN DER WOUDE as to the application to more than one single Hasmonean ruler of the designation "Wicked Priest" in the Habakkuk *pesher*, (53) which are solidly anchored in the known political and religious history of Palestine in the early

(50) As postulated in the prevailing consensus, elaborated by A. DUPONT-SOMMER, G. VERMES and J. T. MILIK, perfected by G. JEREMIAS and H. STEGEMANN, and represented in such a recent work as *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SNTSM 58), Cambridge 1988, by T. S. BEALL.

(51) Best represented in the works of J. MURPHY-O'CONNOR and P. DAVIES. For the latest expression of their views see J. MURPHY-O'CONNOR, "The Damascus Document Revisited," *Revue Biblique* 92 (1985), 223-246 and P. R. DAVIES, *Behind the Essenes. History and Ideology of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (BJS 94), Atlanta 1987.

(52) Such as 4Q394-399 (4QMMT).

(53) A. S. VAN DER WOUDE, "Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Commentary," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33 (1982), 349-359.

years of the Qumran group, and the proposal of F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ clearly to distinguish between the origins of the Qumran group and the origins of the parent group, the Essene movement, and to trace back to the Apocalyptic Tradition of the third century B.C. the ideological roots of the Essenes. (54) In essence, this hypothesis proposes:

1) to make a clear distinction between the origins of the Essene movement and those of the Qumran group;

2) to place the origins of the Essene movement in Palestine and specifically in the Palestinian apocalyptic tradition before the Antiochian crisis, that is at the end of the third or the beginning of the second century B.C.;

3) to seek the origins of the Qumran group in a split which occurred within the Essene movement in consequence of which the group loyal to the Teacher of Righteousness was finally to establish itself in Qumran;

4) to consider the designation "Wicked Priest" as a generic one referring to different Hasmonean High Priests in chronological order;

5) to highlight the importance of the Qumran group's formative period before its retreat to the desert and to make clear the ideological development, the halakhic elements, and the political conflicts that took place during this formative period and culminated in the break which led to the community's establishing itself in Qumran.

The "Groningen hypothesis" seeks information as to the origins of the Essene movement in the classical accounts of the Essenes, in the Essene works preserved at Qumran and in Essene documents incorporated in later Qumran works. The study of this material allows us to conclude that Essenism:

— is a Palestinian phenomenon that dates from before the Antiochian crisis, as shown by Josephus and 1 Enoch 90, and

— has its ideological roots in the apocalyptic tradition in which we find determinism, the type of biblical interpretation, the angelology, the idea of the eschatological temple, etc., that emerge as characteristics of the Essene ideology;

(54) F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, "Orígenes del movimiento esenio y orígenes qumránicos: Pistas para una solución," in: V. COLLADO-BARTOMEU y V. VILAR-HUESO (eds.), *II Simposio Bíblico Español*, Valencia-Córdoba 1987, 527-556; — "Essénisme Qumránien: Origines, caractéristiques, héritage," in: B. CHIESA (ed.), *Correnti culturali e movimenti religiosi del giudaismo. Atti del V Congresso internazionale dell' AISG*, Roma 1987, 37-57.

— follows halakhic positions that now can best be described as Sadducean.

It seeks further information as to the origins of the Qumran group and the early history of the community in the works of the pre-Qumran formation period, in the documents of this period incorporated in later sectarian works and in the same sectarian works that (like the *pesharim*) refer expressly to the period of the origins. The study of this material allows us to conclude that the fundamental disputes within the Essene movement during the formative period of the sect were centred on the question of the calendar and the subsequent organization of the festive cycle, and on a particular way of understanding the biblical prescriptions relating to the temple, the cult and the purity of persons and things. This particular halakhah is rooted in the Teacher of Righteousness's consciousness of having received by divine revelation the correct interpretation of the biblical text, an interpretation which is thus inspired and prescriptive, and the acceptance by some of the members of the community of this interpretation as a revelation. The rejection of this interpretation and of the particular halakhah deriving from it by the rest of the members of the Essene movement would end by making it impossible for them to stay together. This consciousness of having received through divine revelation the correct interpretation of the Law led the Teacher of Righteousness to propound a series of ideological and legal positions (imminence of the last days, a particular festive calendar, the imperfection of the existing temple and cult compared with what they should be, etc.) and of particular halakhoth conditioning daily life and to wish to impose on all members of the Essene movement this understanding of the Law. The failure of this attempt was due, according to the sectarian texts, to the influence of the Liar, the leader of the Essene movement who "led many astray with deceitful words, so that they chose foolishness and hearkened not to the Interpreter of Knowledge" (*IQ171* i,18-19). The result was to be the break between the adepts of the Teacher of Righteousness and the rest of the Essenes, who remained faithful to the Liar.

The "Groningen hypothesis" tries also to elucidate the historical circumstances in which the split took place and the further development of the group which remained faithful to the Teacher of Righteousness. The central problem constituted by the identification of the person designated "The Wicked Priest" has continued to defy the efforts of the scholars. While recognising that this person provides the key to the early history of the Community since he is the highest authority in the country ("he ruled over Israel" *IQpHab* viii, 9) and makes it possible to connect

the history of the sect with political and religious history (because he is said to have persecuted the Teacher of Righteousness), efforts to identify him convincingly have failed owing to the fact that the many allusions to him in the *pescharim* contain elements so various that it is impossible to apply all of them to any one High Priest of the Second century B.C. P. DAVIES has even gone so far as to deny all historical reality to the figure. (55) All hypotheses so far proposed rest on the unproven presupposition that all mentions of the "Wicked Priest" refer to one and the same person. The suggestion of VAN DER WOUDE that we should see in the designation "Wicked Priest" a description referring to the various Hasmonean High Priests from Judas Maccabeus to Alexander Jannaeus and in precise chronological order, offers a simple elegant solution which at once respects the totality of the data of the Habakkuk *pesher* and the interpretative limits imposed by the archaeological dating of the Qumran settlement, and has, moreover, the advantage of fixing the precise chronological framework for the development of the early history of the community. The data of *IQpHab* show us that the formative period of the Qumran group runs through the pontificates of Jonathan and Simon and that this period is characterized not only by the elaboration of the ideological and political principles previously mentioned, but also by conflicts with the political and religious might of Jerusalem. It also shows us that the break with the Essene movement became complete during the long pontificate of John Hyrcanus, but this break and the settlement in Qumran did not mean a reconciliation with the political power. On the contrary, John Hyrcanus persecuted the Teacher of Righteousness in his desert retreat and his successor, Alexander Jannaeus, was also to be qualified as a Wicked Priest.

A recent attempt to investigate the history of the Qumran community concludes that we can hardly arrive at anything more than "a general chronological framework against which to understand the history alluded to in the other documents—roughly from the first quarter of the second century to 90 BCE" and that there were "conflicts between the Liar, the Wicked Priest, and the Teacher, but nothing more than that". (56) And P. DAVIES has strongly voiced his scepticism as to the *pescharim* information as a

(55) "We may accept the 'Teacher of Righteousness' as an historical individual, but not the 'Wicked Priest'. The latter is possibly an amalgam of several figures, no one of whom, moreover, may have dealt directly with the 'Teacher' (nor maybe even with his community), but who would have been the targets of the community's polemic," *Behind the Essenes*, op. cit., p. 28.

(56) P. R. CALLAWAY, *The History of the Qumran Community: An Investigation* (JSPS 3), Sheffield 1988, 210.

possible source for the group's history. (57) But if our hypothesis is taken seriously we can extract a good deal more information from the available texts than currently thought: —we can take at face value the chronological information of *CD* about the origins of the movement joined after some time by the Teacher of Righteousness; —we can understand the positive assessment of the first period of the activity of Judas Maccabaeus (the first Wicked Priest) and the condemnation of his conduct once in power; —we can exclude the identification of the parent group with the Hassidim on the basis of the condemnation of Alcimus (the second Wicked Priest); —we can specify that the formative period of the sectarian group was in progress at least during the pontificates of Jonathan and Simon (the third and fourth Wicked Priests), giving in this way a more precise date to the documents coming from this period; —we can conclude that the core of original members of the group was made up of dissatisfied priests of the highest circles, which accounts for the Sadducean character of their halakhah; (58) —we can fix the establishment of the group in Khirbet Qumran during the pontificate of John Hyrcanus (59) (the fifth Wicked Priest) and the death of the Teacher of Righteousness during the same pontificate and before the pontificate of Alexander Jannaeus; (60) —we can consequently determine the period (about 40 years after the death of the Teacher) (61) when the group expected that all the wicked would be consumed and the subsequent efforts to cope with the delay of the end; —we can precisely date the composition of the *IQpHab* in the last years of the life of Alexander Jannaeus (the sixth Wicked Priest), still alive at the moment of the first redaction of the pesher.

(57) A leitmotiv in his *Behind the Essenes*, e.g.: "Until we understand how these commentaries work—and that means as midrashim—we have no warrant to plunder them for historical data" (p. 27); "So the *pesher* phenomenon at Qumran may well be a development late in the history of the community and have little to do with the activities of the 'Teacher'. Certainly it may have little to do with real history."

(58) See L. H. SCHIFFMAN, "The Temple Scroll and the Systems of Jewish Law of the Second Temple Period," in G. J. BROOKE (ed.), *Temple Scroll Studies* (JSPS 7), Sheffield 1989, 239-255 and the rather idiosyncratic article of H. BURGMANN, "11QT: The Sadducean Torah," in the same volume, 257-263.

(59) The accepted opinion, based on the presentation of DE VAUX in his Schweich Lectures, admits that the first sectarian occupation of the site goes back to the pontificate of Jonathan, but, as we think we have proved, this opinion is contradicted by the findings previously obtained and published by DE VAUX himself and by the very arguments he advanced to support it, see F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, "Orígenes del movimiento esenio y orígenes qumránicos: Pistas para una solución," *a.c.*, 535-538; —"Qumran Origins and Early History," *a.c.*, 114-115.130-131.

(60) See A. S. VAN DER WOUDE, "Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests?," *a.c.*, 357-358.

(61) According to *CD* XX, 14-15; *4Q171* 1-2, ii, 6-7.

Of course, not all the problems the scrolls present are solved by our "Groningen hypothesis." The history of the ideas of the religious movement that ultimately gave birth to the Qumran group and their relation with the rest of post-exilic Judaism still need to be written, as well as the development of these ideas once the group settled at Qumran. The texts are there, writings belonging to the apocalyptic tradition, to the Essene movement and to the Qumran sect, and our hypothesis suggests that this intellectual history can indeed be written from these sources. Again, a detailed history of the life of the group need to be reconstructed. If our hypothesis has convinced you that it is indeed possible to write this history from the texts of the group's library, or at least that a total scepticism is unwarranted, its utility as a stimulus to historical inquiry will have been proved.

F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ - A. S. VAN DER WOUDE.