

# THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND THE OLD TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES<sup>1</sup>

By BLEDDYN J. ROBERTS, M.A., D.D.

PROFESSOR OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES IN THE UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF NORTH WALES, BANGOR

**D**ESPITE the very large number of controversial topics associated with the Dead Sea Scrolls, there is practical unanimity that the nature of the literature shows that the scrolls belonged to an apocalyptic party or sect, and that both the literature and the sect can be studied against the apocalyptic background provided by extant Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and by the New Testament. It is generally assumed, too, that the period to which the composition of the scrolls should be assigned corresponds with that of these writings, namely, the first centuries B.C. and A.D. That the party of the scrolls were dissenters from orthodox Pharisaic-Rabbinism hardly needs demonstration, for the fact of the disappearance of the party from known Jewish history and the deposit of its literature in caves could not well be accounted for in any other way.

Attempts to identify the dissenters with Essenes or Ebionite Christians or, again, early Karaites or Sadducees are still only partially successful, and because the case for all these parties can be presented more or less plausibly, it must be concluded that the evidence for any definitive identification is still lacking. It should be emphasized, however, that absence of identification does not in consequence necessarily minimize the importance of the scrolls, for, in the last resort, their major contribution is to the study of apocalyptic literature, and only indirectly to the study of Jewish history. They contribute substantially to our knowledge of apocalyptic as a literary and religious phenomenon of their period, whereas any purely historical contribution they can make must necessarily be conjectural: consequently a scrutiny

<sup>1</sup> The contents of this paper were read to the Oxford University Society of Historical Theology and the Oxford University Origen Society on January 28th and 29th, 1953.

of the scrolls simply for " history " might be regarded as misleading and precarious.

It must always be allowed, of course, that the " historical occasion " is of considerable importance to the study of the scrolls, even as it is to all other apocalyptic writing : but, just as New Testament scholarship has been abundantly helped by the study of the term " Son of Man " in apocalyptic literature in the Book of Enoch without undue concern being paid to " history " in that literature, so can the scrolls be turned to good account, even though " history " as such is likewise elusive. In all apocalyptic writing, we find either that the historical occasions are heavily camouflaged or that the religious tension which produced the literature makes any reference to actual events irrelevant.

## I

Prominent among the characteristic features of the Dead Sea Scrolls as apocalyptic is the part played by the Scriptures. They are basic, not only to the Habakkuk commentary but also to such scrolls as the Songs of Thanksgiving, the Warfare Scroll and the two descriptive documents, the Manual of Discipline and the Damascus Document. In general, we can conclude that apocalyptic as represented by the Dead Sea Scrolls is really produced by a fusion of two extremely strong forces. On the one hand is the force and tension of events, with political and social catastrophe threatening the people with doom and annihilation. What constituted the threats is the problem of historical criticism, and it must suffice here to say that they were the result of either external events such as any series of episodes which belong to the troublesome era between the Maccabees and Bar Cochba, or internal factions and persecutions, and these, too, are numerous. On the other hand is the unique religious development of those centuries, namely, a concern for and a profound recognition of the Scriptures as having a peculiar application to the Jewish way of life in a variety of ways. Adoration of Scripture seems to have been exceptionally strong in the period around the beginning of the Christian era, and it found expression in the legalism of the Rabbis, with its outcome in the

Mishnah, in the philosophizing allegorization of Philo and Hellenistic Judaism, and yet again in the "interpretation" of apocalyptic, which is particularly obvious in some of the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament, but is by no means absent from Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.

It has long since been recognized, e.g. by R. H. Charles,<sup>1</sup> that apocalyptic contains an element of Scripture study and interpretation. But whereas Charles would limit the apocalypticist's interest to what he calls "unfulfilled prophecy", the Dead Sea Scrolls show that Old Testament Prophecy, so far as we know in its entirety, was to be interpreted as having relevance to contemporary exigencies. There appears to be no evidence in either the Old Testament Apocalyptic or in the non-canonical writings to support Canon Charles' view that "unfulfilled prophecies of the older prophets were re-edited" by the apocalypticists. It is rather to the contrary. The apocalypticists regarded the prophets as having foretold what was to happen and that the fulfilment of their words was at hand. In Dan. ix. 2, "the word of the Lord to Jeremiah the prophet, for the accomplishing of the desolations of Jerusalem, even seventy years" is "understood" by Daniel as having explicit reference to his own day, and he immediately proceeds to "interpret" the passage by multiplying the number of years mentioned in Jeremiah to produce 490 years, that is, the length of the period between the exilic Daniel and his own day. It was not that Jeremiah's prophecy had been "unfulfilled"; we know that the writer of Chronicles certainly regarded Jeremiah's prediction as having been literally correct (2 Chron. xxxvi. 21), and Zech. vii. 5 refers to the same period of seventy years. The troubles of the Maccabean times were in accordance with the divine plan, and the plan is revealed to Daniel, hence the visions and their interpretation in vii-xii. He, too, knows the meaning, as applicable to his own day, of Jeremiah's oracle. When we turn to Daniel's prayer in the remainder of chapter ix, the importance of Scripture as a source of solace is again prominent, for Biblical phrases are interwoven to provide a most effective petition for mercy. Similarly, the Dead Sea Scrolls

<sup>1</sup> E.g. *Religious Development between the Old and New Testaments*, Home University Library (1914), pp. 25 ff.

give instances of apocalyptic as consisting of the same kind of Biblical exegesis, with an infusion of terror and eschatology. The Songs of Thanksgiving, and the Song of the Priest in the Warfare Scroll are similar in character to Daniel's prayer. The Habakkuk commentary,<sup>1</sup> of course, is the prime example of interpretation according to the principles of apocalyptic exegesis.

Before proceeding to examine this particular feature in the scrolls, however, mention must be made of some recent expositions of the New Testament use of the Old Testament, especially in studies by T. W. Manson<sup>2</sup> and C. H. Dodd.<sup>3</sup> The latter has demonstrated how the very first statement of the Christian faith in the Apostolic Kerygma is to be traced to a particular method of Old Testament interpretation. "Certain large sections of the O.T. Scriptures", he explains, "especially from Isaiah, Jeremiah and certain Minor Prophets and from the Psalms" were brought into play, one upon the other, until there emerged from them "the creation of an entirely new figure, who is Christ himself, with a variety of attributes connected with his person and work".<sup>4</sup> Professor Dodd's emphasis throughout the discussion is that the relationship between these attributes and the Old Testament is a basic one, and consequently that most, if not all New Testament Christology is essentially a matter of a special usage of Old Testament exegesis. The sections of the Old Testament chosen as the foundation of the structure show that, in the first instance, the Old Testament apocalyptic passages are especially important inasmuch as they reveal the "pattern" which, disclosed in the past history of Israel, is conceived by the New Testament writers to have been brought into full light in the events of the Gospel story and which they interpret accordingly.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> That this is not an isolated product is shown by the fact that fragments have been identified of a commentary on a Psalm and a portion of Micah. But these texts are too short for inclusion in the present discussion.

<sup>2</sup> T. W. Manson, "The Argument from Prophecy", *J.T.S.*, vol. 46 (1945), pp. 129 ff.; and "The Old Testament in the Teaching of Jesus", *Bull. of the John Rylands Library*, vol. 34, no. 2 (1952), pp. 312 ff.

<sup>3</sup> C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (London, 1952).

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 127 f.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 128.

In this type of exegesis the prophetic oracles are specifically made to refer to the historical person who is the author of the interpretation and to the historical circumstances which he brings about, including the final redemption of all who believe in him. It is just this personal and circumstantial aspect which characterizes, too, the Religious Teacher in the Habakkuk scroll, and the events which surround him. One cannot but sense the fundamental difference between this interpretation and the casuistic *pilpulism* of the Mishnaic appeal to Scripture and the ingenious metaphorical expansions of Philo. Whereas the Rabbis seem to have had a genius for inductive reasoning, and the Jewish Greeks make the Scriptures merely an allegory, apocalyptic passionately expounds the interpretation of the Divine promise of the Saviour and the salvation which had been kept hidden in the Word of God until the time of its fulfilment. This seems to be basic to the story of Jesus at Nazareth, Luke iv. 16 ff., and equally basic to the Teacher of Righteousness in the Habakkuk scroll. Another point made by the New Testament scholars in this connection is that the interpretation does not involve violence to any essential teaching of the Old Testament.<sup>1</sup> In this respect, too, the Habakkuk scroll is similar. In both places it is assumed that the Old Testament contains the promise of divine redemption as it is realized in history and mediated through Men of God : it is certainly true of Christ in the New Testament, it is equally apparent in the Righteous Teacher and his salvation. Nevertheless, both in the New Testament and in the scrolls respectively, there is exercised a freedom in the way the exact terms of the divine oracles are made to refer to contemporary events. Once more I refer to Professor Dodd's book because of the aptness of his observation to describe the same important characteristic in the Habakkuk scroll. He explains that in those portions of the Old Testament which are interpreted in the New, "the actual meaning discovered in a passage will seldom, in the nature of things, coincide precisely with that which it had in its original context"<sup>2</sup> : but rather "grows out of it". In the same way we find passages in the Habakkuk scroll which "grow

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Dodd, *op. cit.* pp. 126 ff. ; T. W. Manson, *Old Testament in the Teaching of Jesus*, p. 331.

<sup>2</sup> Dodd, *ibid.*

out" of the original oracles, under the guidance of the Righteous Teacher's exposition.

An important instance of the fluctuation and change of meaning may be found in the way the term *Kittim* is interpreted in the scrolls. In the Warfare scrolls the *Kittim* of Assyria and the *Kittim* of Egypt quite obviously refer to the Seleucids and Ptolemies once the period of the second or first century B.C. be accepted for the composition of the scroll. In the Habakkuk commentary, however, there are strong reasons for assuming that the reference is to the imperial forces of Rome;<sup>1</sup> though there are some scholars who insist on an identification here, too, with the Hellenists.<sup>2</sup> In the book of Daniel, however, the reference is almost certainly to the Romans, even though the Seleucid and Ptolemaic rulers are likewise referred to in the context. Dan. xi. 30 states, "ships of *Kittim* shall come against him: therefore shall he be grieved". If the "grieved one" is, as is reasonably certain, Antiochus Epiphanes, the Seleucids and Ptolemies are assuredly "the Kings of the North and the South", respectively. It is generally agreed that it was because of Roman intervention that Antiochus Epiphanes was deprived of the spoils in his victory over Egypt and then spitefully wreaked vengeance on Jerusalem, and that this is the episode to which Daniel xi refers. Again, from a historical point of view, it is significant that the Septuagint translated *Kittim* in Dan. xi. 30 with "Romans". Furthermore, it would appear that the identity of *Kittim* with Romans was commonly accepted in the early Christian era, for both Onqelos and Jerome render Balaam's oracle

<sup>1</sup> It is unnecessary, for the present purpose, to interfere in the dispute which is now taking place between protagonists for and against this identification; suffice it to say that though Professor H. H. Rowley (*The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (1952), pp. 46, 74 ff., and elsewhere) criticizes Professor Dupont-Sommer's case for identity with the Romans, the latter has returned to the debate in *Nouveaux Aperçus sur les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (Paris, 1953), pp. 33-61, and still persists in the views he had earlier presented. It appears to the present writer that a Roman setting seems best to fit in with most of the indications in the scroll, but Professor Dupont-Sommer's exact identity does not carry conviction in every respect. For a recent review of the discussion, cf. M. Delcor, "Où en est le problème du Midrash d'Habacuc", *Rev. de l'Hist. d. Religions* (Oct.-Dec. 1952), pp. 129-46.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. H. H. Rowley, *op. cit.*

in Num. xxiv. 23 f. with Romans.<sup>1</sup> Obviously it does not necessarily follow from this that in the Habakkuk scroll the identification of the actual historical incidents with the Roman capture of Jerusalem or any other definite Roman episode must be accepted; what should be indicated is that because Kittim in the scrolls, as indeed in the Old Testament, has an apocalyptic nuance, it can be understood as having reference in the one place, e.g. Warfare, to Seleucid-Ptolemies and again in other places, e.g. Habakkuk (?) and Daniel to the Romans. What the scroll is definite in stating is that they are the persecutors of the people of God and the means of bringing about the final throes of the time of woe. In column 6 of the Habakkuk commentary we are told that "the *Kittim* will destroy many with the sword, young men and old, women and children, and will not spare the unborn. At the end of the days the riches (of the last priests of Jerusalem who amassed riches and spoils by plundering the people) will be delivered into the hands of the forces of the *Kittim*. For it is they who are the remnant of the people (Hab. ii. 8a, had said 'all the remnant of the peoples will plunder thee')". The interest of the interpreter is not in the historical or actual identity of the *Kittim*, he and his people know only too well who they are! What he is concerned to show is that the miseries of his time are divinely ordained; the prophetic oracles of old, pointing as they do to contemporary events, are an indication of the measure of God's love, for He, by granting to the Righteous Teacher the key to those oracles, is fulfilling the prophecy and accomplishing His promise of salvation. This union of apocalyptic and "history" in one and the same interpretation needs to be clearly realized when we try and solve the conundrum of the *Kittim* in the scrolls. Apocalyptic does not appear to be particularly interested in "history" except as part of the divine order of things, leading to the desired consummation. It is therefore quite natural to have in the literature certain terms

<sup>1</sup> Incidentally, the LXX of this passage shows an interesting variant: for M.T. צִיִּים it appears to have read יוֹצְאִים, "those coming out of", thus implying that a maritime background for כְּתָאִים is not indicated. Whether or not a different basic text from M.T. is to be postulated is not clear: the LXX might well be interpretative.

which are subject to vacillation and "growth" in meaning, provided it be understood that the main concern of the interpreter, and consequently his inner consistency, is the apocalyptic *dénouement* towards which he is directing the hopes of his disciples.

Another interesting instance of "growth" in apocalyptic nuance in the scrolls, this time in contrast to the New Testament, is the title given to the agent of salvation. In the latter he is, of course, the Messiah, Immanuel, Son of Man. Not one of these terms has an apocalyptic application in the scrolls. "Immanuel" seems to be an unique Christian interpretation of the Isaianic oracle (vii. 8), and the term, "Son of Man" appears to be significantly absent from the scrolls, thus providing another hint that in questions of identity the New Covenanters and the Early Christians are to be regarded as two quite distinct parties. Furthermore, the term Messiah, as used in the Warfare scroll, the Manual of Discipline and the Damascus Documents seems to have very few of the New Testament attributes, for here the Messiah is little more than the representative of his people, Aaron and Israel. On the other hand, part of the functions of the New Testament Messiah—Son of Man are performed in the scrolls by "the Elect". It is by means of him that "God will execute judgement on all the nations" (Hab. col. 5, ll. 3 ff.). The Righteous Teacher, too, has a special importance, approximating to a supra-mundane quality; he is "God's accredited exponent of the mysteries of the Prophets" (col. 2, l. 8), and God will deliver from judgement "all those who practice the Torah in the house of Judah, because of their affliction and their faith in the Righteous Teacher" (col. 8, ll. 1 ff.). It is not clear from the literature of the sect whether or not the Elect and the Righteous Teacher are to be regarded as one and the same person. In the Habakkuk commentary it would appear that they are the same, but in the Damascus Documents the Righteous Teacher is dead, whereas the Elect is the spiritual Head of the Community.<sup>1</sup>

When we think of the history of typology and of loose apocalyptic interpretation throughout the centuries of Bible study in the Church, it might appear to us that the greatest danger which beset

<sup>1</sup> Cf. H. H. Rowley, *op. cit.* p. 34, n. 4.

apocalyptic as a literary convention was an indiscriminate use of the text from which the new interpretations were obtained: the fact that the danger was avoided is due to two things. Firstly, "interpretation" was not a common possession, practised by all and sundry, but rather the closely guarded privilege of the Teacher and of the community which subscribed to the teaching of the Founder, and regarded it as divinely inspired. Secondly, the text which was interpreted was accorded the prestige of a sacred oracle. The first of these points indicates the significance of such documents as the Manual of Discipline and the Damascus Documents. There are frequent references here to punishment for heterodoxy, and exhortations to abide by the teaching of the sect. The community, says the Manual of Discipline (col. 5, l. 4), preserves "the divinely guided decision with regard to every matter, whether Torah or property or laws . . ." and some lines later "no member of the community may answer according to non-conformists in regard to any teaching or laws" (ll. 15 f.). "When one enters into the covenant . . . he shall be tested in his understanding and his deeds in Torah, in accordance with the views of the sons of Aaron who are dedicated to establish His covenant in the community, and in accordance with the views of . . . Israel, who are dedicated to turn to His covenant" (ll. 20 ff.). "The Covenanters shall be ruled by the first laws with which the men of the community began to be disciplined until the coming of a Prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel" (col. 9, ll. 10 f.). Likewise in the church of New Testament times the test of orthodoxy became stringent, as we see especially from the Catholic Epistles, where the anti-Christ is marked by his false doctrine. 2 Peter ii. 1 ff., refers to the rising of "false prophets among the people, as among you also there shall be false teachers who shall privily bring in destructive heresies . . . bringing upon themselves swift destruction."<sup>1</sup> In

<sup>1</sup>The affinities between this passage and the scrolls are rather striking. There is reference in v. 5. to a "preacher of Righteousness" and an apocalyptic flight connected with the motif of a Noah *redivivus* in which there occurs a cataclysm of mixed fire and flood in a manner strongly reminiscent of one of the Songs of Thanksgiving. Cf. further, G. Vermes, "La communauté de la Nouvelle Alliance". *Analecta Lovaniensia Bib. et Or. ser. ii, Fasc. 22* (1951), pp. 5 ff.

New Testament apocalyptic, the important part played by the interpretation of Scripture, as instituted by Jesus himself, and as developed in the formation of the Kerygma and the Gospels, naturally led to a fairly rigid orthodoxy during the first century, and the authoritative attitude ascribed to orthodoxy in the later New Testament Writings and in the sub-apostolic age indicates the measure of the need for it. A similar development can be assumed for the New Covenanters.

The second safeguard against heterodoxy was the authority which was inherent to the Scriptures themselves: that is, since the Scriptures contained the oracles whose interpretation meant the realization of salvation, those same Scriptures would be regarded as Holy Writ. On this point, however, a difficulty arises concerning the question of whether or not there was a recognized canon of Scripture at the time in question, and if there was, whether the sect, as dissenters from orthodox Judaism accepted it.

In the first place it is to be noted that the New Covenanters were not particularly concerned with the Prophetical books at the expense of other books in the old Testament. The number of fragments from the Torah which have been recovered from the caves testify that this part of the Old Testament was not only acceptable to them but was in constant use, and the Manual of Discipline frequently asserts that the Torah was basic to their creed and practice. That the Prophets, too, were divinely given "mysteries" requires no further demonstration. It is significant, however, that non-canonical books were also used by the sect, for there are abundant quotations in the scrolls, not only from the present books of the Apocrypha, but also from the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Consequently we can visualize the Biblical literature of the New Covenanters as covering a far wider range than either the Hebrew or Alexandrine canons.

This is not the occasion for a full discussion of what exactly is meant by the Hebrew canon as opposed to the Alexandrine, but it is relevant to observe that the distinction between the two has sometimes been exaggerated. Because of such passages as Baba Bathra 14b-15a we think of the former as a closed, well-defined corpus in contrast to the rather more amorphous Septuagint canon. The latter, of course, was the Bible of the

Hellenistic Diaspora and of the Early Church, and, it may be assumed because of occasional quotations, was also used by the New Covenanters. But it remains an open question whether even orthodox Jews of both the Babylonian and Palestinian traditions either ignored or wholly rejected the Septuagint. The Rabbinic disputes concerning canonicity generally deal with books which were ultimately accepted, such as Song of Songs, Esther, and Ezekiel. Categorical statements prohibiting the use of certain books and versions in synagogue worship, though they mainly concern books now found in the Apocrypha and the New Testament, can also be paralleled by prohibitions about the use of certain books now found in the Hebrew Hagiographa. Indeed, the introduction of the Five Megilloth into the synagogue lectionary for the festivals is probably later than the Mishnah. Again, despite unfavourable comments and decisions by the Rabbis, the contents of books in the present Apocrypha were quite frequently introduced into Rabbinic debates: numerous quotations attributed to the Tannaim also occur in the Apocrypha, and in Baba Kamma 92b the book of Ecclesiasticus is actually listed among the Hagiographa. Furthermore, in Midrash Rabba to Esther, which comes from a period later than the tenth century A.D., additions to the canonical Esther are included practically verbatim as they appear in the Septuagint. Consequently, the fact that the New Covenanters quote sayings which are paralleled by apocryphal books need not in itself be very significant; it may still be assumed that their Bible contained the canonical Law and Prophets, but also included some of the books of the Apocrypha in the same loose sense as they were included in Rabbinic religious literature.

But orthodox Judaists and the Covenanters part company most clearly in their attitude to books in the present Pseudepigrapha. Affinities between them and the scrolls are numerous and far-reaching: but orthodox Judaism always refused to countenance them. They were never included in any list of Old Testament books, Alexandrine or Jewish, nor was there any Rabbinic disputation about them. As G. F. Moore<sup>1</sup> says, it

<sup>1</sup> *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*, Cambridge, Mass. (1927), p. 127.

does not appear that the authorities ever felt it necessary even to repudiate them.<sup>1</sup> Christians, however, apparently made use of them and cherished them from a very early time: there are obvious contacts between Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament itself, and still more with the sub-Apostolic period. It was the Christian church that transmitted the extant copies of these works until the Dead Sea Scrolls were discovered. On the other hand, so far as I am aware, we have no extant apocalyptic literature preserved or transmitted by Rabbinic Judaism until the sixth or seventh century A.D. It is possible that it was on this issue of accepting an apocalyptic interpretation to the Scriptures, rather than a legalistic one, that tension between orthodox Judaism and Sectarians became acute, and the latter were expelled from the synagogues. Be that as it may, it is evident that in Biblical matters there was a fundamental difference of standpoint between Rabbinic Judaism and the Sectarians. Consequently, the fact that the former declared this or that book to be non-canonical does not necessarily mean that the New Covenanters regarded them as such, and were willing to accept the Rabbinic decree. Indeed, it is possible that the Sectarians did not subscribe to the idea of canonicity in any strictly Rabbinic sense, for, to judge by the contents of the Manual of Discipline and the Damascus Documents, it would hardly be consistent with their way of life to spend their energies in arguments about whether or not this or that book "defiled the hands". They were far more concerned with the agony of their times and with "the two ways of living" than with the academic disputations of Rabbinic academies. They were Sectarians, and the available evidence seems to indicate that they diverged from orthodoxy mainly, if not solely, on the grounds of Biblical interpretation, and that they either ignored or, indeed, were totally ignorant of the Rabbinic debates on canonicity.

What the New Covenanters had as their source of inspiration was a traditionally treasured body of literature, which, possibly for centuries, had been regarded as the Word of God—divinely

<sup>1</sup> M. Bittenwieser, *J. E.* vol. 1, art. "Apocalyptic", argues that Rabbis did make use of apocalyptic terms and ideas, but this does not affect the above conclusion about the acceptance of apocalyptic literature.

given oracles of salvation, and which were capable of application to times of woe. It would appear, then, that the prestige of the Scripture for the New Covenanters lay in the oracular nature of the contents rather than in doctrinaire assessments and declarations by the Rabbis.

## II

Because of the independence of the Sectarrians over against orthodox Rabbinic Judaism, it now becomes necessary to survey the Biblical texts as transmitted by the New Covenanters. The texts belong, of course, to two groups: firstly, those texts transmitted in quotations and particularly in commentaries such as the Habakkuk scroll, and secondly, the simple texts of the Isaiah scrolls and of other fragments of the Old Testament. The nature of the text transmitted in the former group, though deliberately departing from the Massoretic text on occasions, shows it to be the same, by and large, as the standard text form.<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to note, however, that the disposition of sections for comment in the Habakkuk scroll vary considerably in length, and it would not appear that the interpreter in any way adhered to a scheme or division of the text such as might be postulated for the use of the Methurgeman in the more orthodox Rabbinic circles, who targumized after each verse or every three verses.

Greater importance attaches to the longer texts, especially the copies of Isaiah. Although the number of Isaiah texts recovered from 'Ain Feshka and other caves in the vicinity are increasing, our present concern must be in the main with DSIa and b, for the simple reason that until facsimilies of the other manuscripts are published, it is impossible to offer adequate comments. It is unfortunate, too, that the manuscript DSI a happens to be such a poor one: indeed one sometimes wonders whether it is not one of the main services of this document that it can be used as a demonstration for students of how scribal errors and consequent textual corruption actually happened! Nevertheless, the scroll is a full length copy of one of the major books of the Old

<sup>1</sup> For a further discussion, cf. the present writer's article, "Some observations on the Damascus Document and the Dead Sea Scrolls", *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, vol. 34, no. 2 (1952), pp. 371 ff.

Testament and as such supplies us with considerable information on matters relative to the present discussion.

The significant fact that must be remembered is that the scroll belonged to a non-Rabbinic party, and consequently it is at best precarious to introduce Rabbinic standards and instructions to explain details in the appearance of the scroll. It is well-known that apart from having its own peculiar orthography, the text of DSIa has a number of textual divergences from the Massoretic Text : it appears to the present writer, however, to be a *non-sequitur* to argue that DSIa for this reason must be regarded as having preceded the creation or emergence of the Massoretic text at the end of the first century A.D. Surely, it was by reason of the authority of the Rabbis that the Massoretic text was accepted, and since the Sectarials defied Rabbinic authority they would also presumably have acted independently in the matter of text-form and scribal activity, and perpetuated, or even "created", their text form quite independently of the Massoretic. Furthermore, it would appear that indications of this independence are to be found in the scroll itself, and since some of them have occasioned considerable argument, they may briefly be outlined here. Firstly, column formation and the scribal features of the scroll show that the transmission ignored the Massoretic customs. The Babylonian Talmud *Menaḥoth* 30a states that a line of text should not exceed a stipulated length in the manuscript, and side-margins are to be strictly measured. The scribe of DSIa did not observe these injunctions, for sometimes the lines are crammed and at other times there are gaps of considerable length. He was innately an untidy and careless scribe, but it is also obvious that he was ignorant of Massoretic scribal regulations. The same Talmudic passage states that word division should be indicated by a space sufficient for two letters. The scroll does show a spatial separation of words, but the space varies in size and sometimes there is none ; in fact, the scribe shows considerable intelligence in this latter respect, for, quite frequently, thought units, such as constructs and absolutes, nouns and adjectives, nouns with particles, run together without separation. The next example of independence is the use of dots for indicating scribal errors. *Genesis Rabbah* 48.15

states that three dots under a word or manuscript indicate its deletion. But the DSIa scribe was far more liberal in the use of dots for this purpose, sometimes surrounding whole words with them, sometimes entering dots above the erroneous consonants, yet again sometimes below; he also sometimes dispenses with dots and boldly crosses out or erases wrong words, and still worse tries sometimes to correct a letter as it stands, leaving it indecipherable. Again, the use of *matres lectionis* seems to indicate a certain freedom by the scribe. There is no consistency in their use in the scroll itself, for, as Professor Kahle has shown,<sup>1</sup> they are more abundant in the second half of the scroll than in the first half. Furthermore, the other manuscripts of Isaiah show variations, e.g. DSIIb has far fewer vowel letters than DSIa, and one of the recently discovered Isaiah fragments has likewise comparatively few orthographic divergences from the Massoretic text. It must be admitted that the Massoretic tradition itself shows an obvious absence of any fixed tradition in the matter of *matres lectionis* in the Prophets, as even a casual glance at the apparatus criticus of Kennicott or de Rossi will show. It is true that the account of establishing the minutiae of the Temple Torah, given in Mishnah Ta'anith 4.2, includes decisions about vowel letters, but it is unlikely that any attempt was made to establish the *matres lectionis* of the text outside the Torah, and vocalization was largely left to the individual scribe until the invention of pointing. Nevertheless, the extent to which DSIa diverges from the Massoretic text shows that the whole tradition of recitation ran along lines quite different from those of the Massoretic.

Finally, the vexed question of paragraphing seems to be capable of a solution that supports the submission that the scribe of DSIa represents a non-Massoretic tradition. The Mishnah Megilla 4.4 refers to the existence of paragraphs, *parashiyoth*, in a way that assumes that they were well-known to Jewish scribes. In Babylonian Talmud Shabbath 103b, two kinds of paragraph, "open" (*pethuḥah*) and "closed" (*ṣethumah*) are mentioned, and again the inference is that they are considerably earlier than

<sup>1</sup> *Die hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle* (Stuttgart, 1951), pp. 74 ff.

Talmudic times. Professor Driver<sup>1</sup> surmises paragraph division "to have been part of the work of ordering the sacred text in consequence of the fixing of the Canon c. A.D. 90-120", but obviously all Biblical scribes did not adopt the Rabbinic rule if Professor Driver's surmise is correct, for, on his own showing, Greek papyri from the second and third centuries A.D. showed only a sporadic "increase in the marking of verses and paragraphs".<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, there is evidence that the Massoretic tradition itself lacks uniformity in paragraph division, which is unlikely if the tradition is to be traced back to such an authority as Rabbi Aqiba. As Rabbi Freedman<sup>3</sup> states, Maimonides and Asheri differ on the definition of *ḥethumah* and *ḥethumah* paragraphs even as late as the Middle Ages. Again, out of some eighty fragments of Isaiah texts from the Cairo Genizah deposited in the University Library of Cambridge, at least half show divergences in the two types of paragraph. Indeed one need not go far in comparing the Leningrad Codex of the Prophets with *Biblia Hebraica* to see a similar divergence, and when C. D. Ginsburg<sup>4</sup> complains that "in *Isaiah* Dr. Baer (in his edition of the Massoretic text) has omitted twenty four sections", what he reveals is that the manuscripts used by Baer lack uniformity. It would seem then, that the Massoretic tradition was comparatively lax in the matter of an exact transmission of the two types of paragraph. These divergences, however, are on the whole concerned with "open" and "closed" paragraphs and it would appear reasonable to refer to a Massoretic tradition of paragraph division. Indeed, in the admitted absence of definite proof, there seems to be nothing inherently impossible in a sense division having been introduced into Hebrew manuscripts at a very early time. Strophic construction was essential to Hebrew verse; prophetic oracles were normally very brief. Word division was customary as far back as the Mesha and Siloam

<sup>1</sup> *The Hebrew Scrolls from the Neighbourhood of Jericho and the Dead Sea* (Oxford, 1951), pp. 43 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Soncino Talmud*, Shabb., 103b (1938), p. 498, n.

<sup>4</sup> *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* (London, 1897), pp. 14 f.

inscriptions ; again, the Gezer Calendar normally begins each fresh item with a new line.

The division of Isaiah into paragraphs in the DSIa manuscript has been examined in detail by Dr. Curt Kuhl<sup>1</sup> and this excellent survey would have sufficed for the present purpose were it not for Dr. Kuhl's adoption of a theory that the Massoretic division of paragraphs into "open" and "closed" was late<sup>2</sup> and that, consequently, the scroll makes no distinction between the two types but has presumably only "open" paragraphs. Dr. Kuhl, however, recognizes the existence of fairly long gaps in the lines and proceeds to discuss them, along with much smaller gaps, as sentence endings. Admittedly, these spaces are irregular in size, but it would appear to the present writer that the distinction between the space for a "closed" paragraph and that for a sentence ending is reasonably clear, and that we can postulate for the scroll, as for the Massoretic transmission, a dual paragraph division. If we turn to DSIb, which is a much neater manuscript, there is quite definite evidence of a "closed" paragraph in a passage<sup>3</sup> where it coincides with a similar paragraph in *Biblia Hebraica*. In another portion of the same scroll,<sup>4</sup> a space in the line again indicates a "closed" section coinciding with the Massoretic text.

Assuming, then, the presence in DSIa of both "open" and "closed" paragraphs, a comparison of the scroll with *BH*.<sup>3</sup> shows the following extent of similarity and divergence :

identical "open" paragraphs :	34
identical "closed" paragraphs :	33
divergent "open" paragraphs :	56
divergent "closed" paragraphs :	40

There are over 100 additional places where DSIa has indented "open" and the M.T. has "closed" paragraphs. The measure

<sup>1</sup> "Schreibereigentümlichkeiten. Bemerkungen zur Jesajarolle (DSIa)", *Vet. Test.*, vol. ii, no. 4 (1952), pp. 307-33. Cf. pp. 312 f.

<sup>2</sup> He quotes in his support R. H. Pfeiffer's suggested date c. 500 A.D.

<sup>3</sup> In the frontispiece to the *Biblical Encyclopedia* (Hebrew) (Musad Bialik, Jerusalem, vol. i. 1950). The whole passage consists of Is. lvii. 17-lix. 8, and the space is after lvii. 20.

<sup>4</sup> In *Meg. Gen.* vol. ii. Plate XVII, col. a ; consisting of Is. xlvi. 17-41. 7, and l. 7-li. 8. The space is after xlvi. 22.

of agreement between DS1b and the others, however, in the very short passages available for collation, is considerable, for in ten paragraphs, DS1a and b have an "open" paragraph to the Massoretic text "closed", another "open" where the Massoretic text has no paragraph division, and DS1b agrees once with the Massoretic Text in having no paragraph where DS1a has a "closed" section.

It may again be argued, as with the *matres lectionis*, that because the Dead Sea Isaiah scrolls reveal a comparative lack of agreement, and because there is also a lack of agreement in the Massoretic tradition of paragraph transmission, the appeal to this argument is invalidated. In theory this is true, but it must also be allowed that compared with the vacillations within the two types of transmission, the disagreements between DS1a and the Massoretic text are very strong indeed. The impression one gets is that the plethora of open paragraphs in DS1a over against the Massoretic text is almost as impressive as is that of *matres lectionis*. Consequently on both points, it appears plausible to argue that the scribal characteristics of DS1a point away from Rabbinic authority and that the transmission belongs to the sect themselves.

Assuming then, that the transmission and scribal characteristics of DS1a show it to be independent of the orthodox textual transmission, it becomes necessary to examine the text of the scroll from this point of view. The first fact to be emphasized is that the text of the scroll is not a good one—quite apart from the unsatisfactory performance of the scribe. Soon after the first publication of the scroll in facsimile, Professor H. M. Orlinsky<sup>1</sup> expressed his view that the scroll comes from a manuscript which was copied from memory and is an unreliable oral variation on the theme of what came to be known as the Massoretic text.<sup>2</sup> A somewhat similar conclusion appears likely to the present

<sup>1</sup> "The St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll", *J.B.L.*, vol. lxix, no. 2 (1950), pp. 149-66. This article was briefly criticized by Professor W. Baumgartner, "Der palästinische Handschriftenfund. Zweiter Bericht", *T.R.*, vol. 19, no. 2 (1951), pp. 97-154 (cf. p. 115), but in a series of articles "Studies in the St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll", especially in *J.Q.R.*, vol. xliii, no. 4 (1953), pp. 329-40, Orlinsky has taken up explicitly the points raised by Baumgartner.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 165.

writer—though with a very different implication, and from a very different approach. It would appear very unlikely that Professor Orlinsky is correct in assuming an oral *Vorlage* for the scroll. Professor Kahle's discovery of two distinct prototypes<sup>1</sup> for the present scroll disproves it. Furthermore, as Dr. Curt Kuhl<sup>2</sup> has shown, a number of different scribes seem to have been engaged on the writing of the scroll—quite apart from the corrector—all of whom belonged to the same scriptorium, and it is unlikely that an established transmission of this kind would have perpetuated a text which was demonstrably unsatisfactory.

Nevertheless, there are indications which clearly point to a close relationship between the text and what we know as the Massoretic text, and prominent among them are the correctors' efforts, which were directed towards making the relationship still closer. It is well known that in a great number of passages, about sixty in all, obvious textual corruptions and divergences from the Massoretic text have been amended with a resultant alignment with the M.T. This desire for agreement seems to be particularly obvious in the corrections of the Divine Name in its various forms. An examination of the scroll shows that in certain passages, viz. in col. 3, ll. 20, 24, 25; col. 7, l. 27; col. 22, l. 20; col. 24, l. 25; col. 52, l. 18, supralineal additions have been made which bring about an uniformity with the precise form of the Divine Name in the Massoretic text. Other places, especially concerned with the Divine Name, have occasioned considerable discussion.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. pp. 72 f.

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit. p. 332.

<sup>3</sup> Viz. col. 33, l. 7; col. 35, l. 15, i.e. Isa. xl. 7 and xlii. 6. These passages are still enigmatic and all attempts hitherto to explain the substitution of four or five dots for the Divine Name are rather easily refuted. The early suggestion that the scribe was timorous of entering the Ineffable Name cannot stand because the scribe so obviously overcame his temerity in hundreds of other places. Another suggestion is that the space was marked off so that the name could be entered in archaic letters, but why have archaic writing here and not elsewhere? Dr. S. A. Birnbaum, *The Qumrân (Dead Sea) Scrolls and Palaeography, B.A.S.O.R. Supp. nos. 13-14 (1952)*, p. 26, has argued that archaic script in any Biblical scroll with square script would be most unexpected, for the usage was limited to non-Biblical scrolls, e.g. the Habakkuk scroll. But it is noteworthy that in this scroll it is only the Biblical passages that have the Divine Name in archaic

This desire by the party for uniformity with the present Massoretic text is remarkable when we realize how unstable the Massoretic tradition itself was in the matter of the Name. The *apparatus criticus* of *BH*<sup>3</sup> shows an abundance of divergences, not only between the Versions and the Hebrew text, but also among Hebrew manuscripts. A random reference to Kennicott's edition of Isa. iv. 4 shows that for the Massoretic אֲדֹנָי sixteen manuscripts have the Tetragrammaton, and another conflates. To Isa. vi. 1, Kennicott enumerates about fifty manuscripts which read the Tetragrammaton instead of אֲדֹנָי, and the note in *BH*<sup>3</sup> makes the number about one hundred. In Isa. viii. 18, again according to Kennicott, the Tetragrammaton has been replaced by אֱלֹהִים in three manuscripts, and by אֲדֹנָי in one. Of the Cairo Genizah texts of Isaiah there are variations, mainly but not solely, between יהוה and אֲדֹנָי, in about twenty out of the eighty fragments in the Cambridge University Library, and there is one instance where אֱלֹהִים is substituted for יהוה throughout the manuscript.

In view of this considerable lack of uniformity in the Massoretic tradition, it is still more difficult to account for the fact that the Divine Name in DSIa should be corrected, at a time probably considerably later than the original writing, to bring the form into exact agreement with the present M.T. Unfortunately, the revision is not a thorough one, even in the matter of Divine Names. Furthermore, the general orthography in the corrections, especially where lengthy lacunae are filled by the corrector, on the whole agrees with that of the scroll and not with the M.T. Again, there is no attempt to bring proper names into line with the Massoretic tradition; for, apart from the well-known divergence in the names of Isaiah, and Hezekiah, we have דיבון for M.T. דִּימון<sup>1</sup> which corresponds with the form in the Vulgate and is probably correct: and again, in five places דרמשק<sup>2</sup> occurs for M.T. דמשק, which is the form of the name in Chronicles.

script. Dr. Curt Kuhl suggests (op. cit. pp. 321 f.) that in both places the scribe observes the Rabbinic regulation in Bab. Talm. Menaḥoth 30b, that the Tetragrammaton should not be written above the line. But elsewhere in the scroll it is so written. In column 41, l. 14, a supralineal insertion departs from M.T.

<sup>1</sup> Isa. xv. 9 (cf. M.T. Isa. xv. 2).

<sup>2</sup> vii. 8 (bis); viii. 4; x. 9; xvii. 1, 3.

Nevertheless, the text used for correction was nearer the M.T. than any other known to us. Furthermore, DSIb, well-known for its near-identity with the M.T., and the existence of other Biblical manuscripts from the caves which "support" the Massoretic text-form, seem to indicate the existence of a standard text for the New Covenanters which seldom departed from the textual tradition preserved for us by the Massorettes. Since, however, we must assume that in the nature of things this text was not the one drawn up by the Massorettes, it is necessary to seek another provenance for it. We must also assume that the text had acquired a high prestige among the New Covenanters, otherwise it would not have been used for the correcting of DSIa. Consequently we can only conclude that there was in existence among the New Covenanters a standard text which in general coincided with the Massoretic text, and which exercised an authority similar to that enjoyed by that text, in the orthodox parties, but at a much earlier period, and among another, quite independent sect of Jews. It is significant that in a recent article on the text of DSIa Professor M. H. Segal<sup>1</sup> has felt himself constrained to postulate the creation of such an authoritative text, which he assumes to be the Massoretic text, during a period about two hundred years earlier than the time of Aqiba and the Council of Jamnia. The present writer would venture to disagree with Professor Segal, however, on two scores. Firstly, as is evident from the preceding pages, to attribute this text to the Massorettes or their direct predecessors is in no way necessary, nor even desirable. Secondly, the reasons adduced for attributing the textual activity of the Massorettes to the period of the Maccabees are not very convincing. What the Jews tried to do in those days—and succeeded to a degree—was to preserve Biblical texts from confiscation, not from scribal errors. It would appear more plausible to argue that the text-form which the Massorettes, among others, preserved and standardized had been in existence long before the Massoretic period in the stricter sense of this term, and that the Biblical texts in the Dead Sea Scrolls, especially DSIb, and the correctors' texts in DSIa, preserve specimens of it.

<sup>1</sup> "The Promulgation of the Authoritative Text of the Hebrew Bible", *JBL*, vol. lxii, no. 1 (1953), pp. 35-47.

Scandinavian exponents insist that there had been a strict oral transmission of Biblical texts from a very early time—possibly from the fifth or fourth century B.C. ; it appears equally possible to postulate the existence, at an equally early period of a standard written text, transmitted amidst the chaos of *Vulgärtexte*, and which was used, among other purposes, for correcting those texts. True, this standard text does not appear to have enjoyed the final authority among the New Covenanters that the Massoretic text claimed in the Rabbinic tradition, though, even here, one's views are modified after an examination of Cairo Genizah fragments. But obviously the interest of the New Covenanters was not so strongly centred on textual transmission : their concern was for exegesis and interpretation ; and when the exegetes so desired they felt they could with impunity depart from the traditional text and make use of slight though significant modifications. The conclusion to be presented here, consequently, is that, despite the freak readings of DSIa, the Biblical texts among the Dead Sea Scrolls do indicate the existence of a pre-Massoretic Hebrew text which, to all intents and purposes, agrees with the present M.T. This text was treasured and accepted by elements among the Jewish people who rejected the authority of orthodox Judaism, but were nevertheless passionately attached to the Jewish Scriptures and their interpretation. In other words, the text which we know as the Massoretic is probably very much older than the Massoretic period, and was accepted by Palestinian Jews of all shades of belief and custom.