

COMMUNICATIONS

TO THE EDITOR OF *TRADITION*:

I wish to thank the editors of *TRADITION* for according space in their worthy publication to my letter on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Following the maxim of Ecclesiastes, "There is a time to speak," I shall speak openly on the idolatry of the Dead Sea Scrolls and their worshippers.

In the last issue of *TRADITION* there appeared an article by Dr. Joseph M. Baumgarten entitled "The Dead Sea Scrolls: A threat to Halakhah?" the title of which is a misnomer. Scrolls written by semi-literate persons could never be threats to Halakhah. Judaism needs no support and does not look for it. Only liberal Christian theologians seek support for their religion.

The *sine qua non* for scholarship is not only the understanding of the sources but also the quoting from them correctly. If there are different versions of the sources, every one should be given to the reader. The understanding and the correct

interpretation of the sources is imperative. Unfortunately many who have dealt with the Scrolls could not even read the Hebrew text properly. Their knowledge of the Scrolls was based on faulty translations. Even worse, some professors made references to works that do not exist. Others misinterpreted the sources which they quoted. Still others indulged in conclusions, *ex cathedra* statements upon which their arguments were based, following the logic of the lawyer who said to the jury, "Gentlemen, here are my conclusions upon which I have based my arguments."

Dr. Baumgarten accepts the view of the Christian theologians that the Dead Sea Scrolls were composed by the Essenes. He writes, "The Essenes, according to Josephus and Philo, were distinguished by their very severe observance of the law of ritual purity. This led many of them to renounce the commandment 'be fruitful and multiply' and to live in celibacy

near the shores of the Dead Sea." Neither Josephus nor Philo ever said that the Essenes lived near the shores of the Dead Sea. Josephus, in his book *Jewish Wars* 2. 8. 4, wrote, "They [the Essenes] occupied no one city, but settled in large numbers in every town." Philo also stated that the Essenes lived in every village. Only Pliny the Elder, who visited this region after the destruction of the Second Temple, spoke of Essenes who lived near the Dead Sea. It is evident that the Essenes came to the shores of the Dead Sea after the destruction of the Second Temple.

Dr. Baumgarten, in blindly following the generally assumed view that the Dead Sea Scrolls were written by the Essenes, writes, "When the Qumran Manual of Discipline was published scholars noticed immediately the marked resemblance in organization, customs, and doctrines between the Qumran sect and the Essenes. This resemblance clearly pointed to the close affinity if not identity of the two groups." There is a similarity between the customs and organization as set forth in the Hebrew Scrolls and those described by Josephus and Philo about the Essenes. But there is also a similarity between the customs and organization as given in the Hebrew Scrolls and those of the different factions of the Karaitic sects, particularly the "Mourners for Zion." Baumgarten did not tell the readers about the great dissimilarities between the views of the Essenes and the authors of the Scrolls. Josephus, in writing about the Essenes, said that they were strict in their observance of the laws of the Sabbath, "they

do not venture to remove any vessel or even to go to stool." Further he related that they were prohibited from carrying anything on the Sabbath even while in the house. According to the Zadokite fragments they were prohibited only from carrying anything on the Sabbath outside of the house, or from the outside into the house. Also they were allowed to walk two thousand cubits outside of the city. This is not in accord with what Josephus said about the Essenes. Both Josephus and Philo stated that the Essenes laid stress upon the belief in immortality of the soul and in reward and punishment after death. There is no mention whatsoever in the Scrolls of these points of belief, which were cardinal among the Essenes. Had the Scrolls been written by the Essenes they would not have failed to refer to these beliefs in one way or another. Again the idea of the Messiah occurs in the Scrolls whereas the Essenes did not believe in a Messiah.

I have frequently pointed out in my articles that the Scrolls could not have been written by the Essenes or anyone else before the destruction of the Second Temple since certain terms and expressions used in the Scrolls came into vogue after the destruction of the Second Temple. Some of these terms were coined by the Karaites. I shall not repeat here all of those terms used in the Scrolls which are of a late period. The reader can find these in my articles in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*. However there is one term to which I shall refer. In the Zadokite fragments we have the following: "Nor shall he sell them his manservant or maidser-

Communications

vant who entered with him into the Covenant of Abraham." The term "Covenant of Abraham" is used here for circumcision. Apocryphal literature often refers to circumcision, but the phrase "Covenant of Abraham" was never used in connection with circumcision. In the Apocalyptic literature the phrase "Covenant of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob" appears frequently but never in connection with circumcision. The term "Covenant of Abraham" for circumcision was introduced in the second century C. E. when the spiritual leaders of the Jews fought Paulian doctrines. Paul denied the necessity of circumcision, maintaining that God made a covenant with Abraham not by circumcision but before circumcision. The Jewish spiritual leaders in combatting Paul maintained that God made a covenant with Abraham by circumcision and hence circumcision was termed "Covenant of Abraham." The first sage who applied the term "Covenant of Abraham" to circumcision was R. Eleazar of Modin. Hence the term "Covenant of Abraham" as synonymous with circumcision shows clearly that the Zadokite fragments had been written long after the destruction of the Second Temple. To maintain that the Scrolls were written by the Essenes reveals lack of knowledge of the history of the Jews during the Second Commonwealth.

"One of the most promising clues for identifying sectarianism of the Qumran type in rabbinic sources," says Dr. Baumgarten "is found in *Tosefta Berakhot* VII: 6: 'To begin a blessing with Alef-Lamed and to conclude with Alef-Lamed, this is a divergent way.' This statement

refers to the extremists, who avoided the שם אדנות (*Adonai*) even in prescribed blessings; instead they substituted the divine name אלה למד (*El*). It is precisely this practice which is strikingly displayed in the Qumran documents."

The text of the *Tosefta* is also given in the Palestinian Talmud but with a different version. If a person makes a statement and quotes a rabbinic source to support it, it is imperative that he give all the different readings found in rabbinic literature. The reading in the Palestinian Talmud is as follows: "He who begins a blessing with Alef-Lamed and concludes with Alef-Lamed is ignorant." That Dr. Baumgarten is a tyro and is thus unaware of the Palestinian Talmud is no excuse. In my essay *The Zadokite Fragments* I quoted the Palestinian version.

Dr. Baumgarten continues, "Thus we find a blessing beginning with the formula ברוך אתה אלי an obvious substitution for the normal 'ברוך אתה ד'." Surprisingly he never referred to the fact that this formula is used frequently by the Karaite writers.

On the false assumption that the Dead Sea Scrolls were written by the Essenes, which is only a whim of the Christian theologians, Baumgarten says, "Thus, we now have some indication of how our Sages looked upon the sectarians of the Qumran-Essene type." This statement has no basis in fact. There is no indication whatsoever in the Talmud as to how the sages looked upon the Qumran-Essene sectarians. To state that the Sages in the Talmud knew about the Qumran sect is a falsification.

Communications

Some who have dealt with the Scrolls connected them with the book of Jubilees. I maintained that the calendar in the book of Jubilees is solar. The day began with the dawn. In the Zadokite fragments the day began with sunset and hence the calendar is lunar. Baumgarten says, "the new findings have cast serious doubt upon several of Dr. Zeitlin's ideas concerning the Jubilees calendar." This statement is untrue. There is nothing in the new findings which shows that the calendar in the book of Jubilees is lunar. Baumgarten adds a note to his statement, "See the writer's paper in the beginning of the day in the calendar of Jubilees, *JBL.*, Vol. LXVII (December, 1958)." In the said article it is revealed that Baumgarten is not equipped to deal with ancient documents. The book of Jubilees was composed in Hebrew and was later translated into Greek. However the Hebrew original and its Greek translation are no longer extant. We do have the book of Jubilees in Ethiopic, rendered from the Greek, and we possess fragments in Latin, also rendered from the Greek. Charles, in his edition of the book of Jubilees, followed the Ethiopic version. Any scholar who has dealt with Apocryphal literature knows that many words of the Hebrew text were misunderstood by the Greek translators. In using the English version of Charles one must seek to determine what word could have been employed in the original Hebrew. In citing Charles, Baumgarten did not take into consideration what words and phrases were used by the author of the Hebrew text. In his article he said, "An even more explicit indication of the day

beginning after sunset is found in the regulation concerning the paschal lamb:

Remember the commandment which the Lord commanded thee concerning the Passover, that thou shouldst celebrate it in its season on the fourteenth of the first month, that thou shouldst kill it before it is evening, and that they should eat it by night on the evening of the fifteenth from the time of the setting of the sun. (Jub. No. 49 1)

Here the night on which the paschal lamb is eaten is specifically designated as part of the 15th day." It is regrettable that Baumgarten followed Charles' faulty text without taking into consideration what were the Hebrew words used by the author. Charles' rendering is, "They should eat it by night on the evening of the fifteenth." Why the tautology "By night on the evening of the fifteenth?" The author could have said by the night of the fifteenth or by the evening of the fifteenth. Undoubtedly the Hebrew text had **בַּלַּיְלָה בְּעֶרְב** "by the night on the eve (before) the fifteenth." The word **עֶרֶב** also has the connotation of the eve, before, as **עֶרֶב רֵאשׁ הַשָּׁנָה**, before the new year.

Baumgarten states further, "It now appears from a Qumran fragment dealing with the priestly watches (*mishmarot*) that the sectarian calendar did not lack 'the notion of *Sefirah*.'" The Qumran table of *mishmarot* has no connection with the book of Jubilees. Moreover it is of the Middle Ages. (Compare *JQR*, January 1959).

The Hebrew alphabet has five final letters. In my opinion these were introduced into the Holy

Communications

Scriptures after the destruction of the Second Temple. Baumgarten takes exception to my opinion. To prove this he first quotes from the Talmud, and secondly bases his argument on traditional grounds. He writes, "According to the talmudic tradition . . . the final letters were apparently known in the time of the Second Temple. Professor Zeitlin, however, dismisses this talmudic tradition as a legend." Baumgarten forgot to quote the Palestinian Talmud *Meg.* where it is stated that Rabbi Eleazar and Rabbi Joshua introduced the five final letters into the Holy Scriptures. They lived after the destruction of the Second Temple.

Dr. Baumgarten takes issue with Dr. Hoenig, who denies the antiquity of the Scrolls, incidentally commending Dr. Hoenig for his courage in upholding his opinion that they were written during the Middle Ages. Dr. Hoenig's knowledge of the period of the Second Commonwealth and rabbinic literature impelled him to maintain that the Scrolls could not have been written by the Essenes or others before the destruction of the Second Temple. Baumgarten maintains that the antiquity of the Scrolls is supported by scientific data. "These include analysis of pottery, the dated coins found at Qumran, the internal philological study of the Scrolls, historical allusions as well as paleography and radio carbon testing." Of what analysis of pottery does Baumgarten speak? The Scrolls were brought to the archbishop in a bag, not in jars. Sukenik purchased the Scrolls from a Bethlehem merchant, also jars which contained the Scrolls accord-

ing to the merchant. None of the archaeologists and scholars saw the Scrolls in the jars. Muhammad Ed-Deeb, who, according to the scholars, discovered the Scrolls in 1947, said in an interview which was published in the *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, October 1957, that when he entered the cave and found ten jars, "I began to break the jars with my staff . . . When I broke the tenth jar, which was the smallest of the jars, I found in it some rolled leather with scrawling on it." So Muhammad broke all the jars. How then could Sukenik purchase two jars, from the Bethlehem merchant, which according to him had contained the Scrolls, when, according to Muhammad, there were none left intact? Again Muhammad said that he broke the jars, consequently the breaks should have been new. We were never told that archaeologists found jars in the cave which showed evidence of new breaks.

Again Professor O. R. Sellers, in an article published in the *Bassor*, April 1949, wrote, "Among the finds in the cave were part of a Roman lamp and a Roman cooking pot and cigarette stubs which evidently were left by a casual visitor who took refuge in the cave, or by some one who was interested in the deposit." Professor Sellers adds, "Who the Roman visitor was we cannot tell but a natural suggestion is Origen." So Origen was in the cave studying the Scrolls by the light of a Roman lamp. Judging by the cooking pot he remained for some time and to soothe his nerves he smoked cigarettes. The brand of cigarettes used by the visitor was not revealed by the archeologists

Communications

probably so as not to arouse the animosity of different manufacturers. Muhammad, in his interview, did not mention having seen a Roman lamp and cooking pot. So Baumgarten's assertion regarding the scientific analysis of the pottery is simply nonsense.

Another proof offered as to the antiquity of the Scrolls is the finding of coins in the different caves. True, coins of the Hellenistic and Roman periods were found in caves, also Byzantine coins, and fragments of the Byzantine and Arabic periods. Hence the coins are not a criterion by which to determine the antiquity of the Scrolls. Furthermore, all the above objects were found in other caves, not in the cave where the seven scrolls were *supposedly* discovered.

Dr. Baumgarten speaks of the "internal philological study of the Scrolls" as a proof of their antiquity. To which philological study does he refer? To misspellings, the authors being semi-literate persons? Is Baumgarten of the opinion that the Essenes were semi-literate? Some texts of the Scrolls make no sense. The syntax is wrong. There is no connection between the phrases. These definitely were written by semi-literates.

Baumgarten also makes reference to "historical allusions," as a proof of the antiquity of the Scrolls. What does he mean by historical allusions? Does he refer to the terms "Teacher of Righteousness" and "the wicked priest" as historical allusions? Those who maintain the antiquity of the Scrolls identify the "Teacher of Righteousness" with all the righteous people who lived during the Second Commonwealth

from Nehemiah to Rabban Gamaliel. Others are of the opinion that the teacher of righteousness was Jesus. The wicked priest is identified with any of the wicked people who lived during the Second Commonwealth according to the whim of the scholars. As a matter of fact the term "teacher of righteousness" was coined by the Karaites. Not in the entire Tannaitic, Apocryphal, and Apocalyptic literatures does this term occur. Neither Josephus nor Philo uses this term. In a fragment found in a cave (actually purchased from a Bedouin) the name Demetrius is mentioned. Archaeologists have assumed that this referred to Demetrius III of the Seleucid dynasty. Following this faulty logic we have the right to conclude that the commentaries on the Bible by Rashi, Ibn Ezra, and other mediaeval commentators were written during the Second Commonwealth since they refer to Alexander of Macedon, Antiochus, Augustus, Vespasian, Herod, and Agrippa. Is not Baumgarten aware of the simple fact that a person writing in the Middle Ages could refer to one who lived during the Second Commonwealth? What are the historical allusions in the Scrolls which indicate that they were written by the Essenes? It seems that those who speak about historical allusions do not know how to use historical facts.

Baumgarten employs paleography as a criterion for the antiquity of the Scrolls. Paleography cannot be a criterion for the antiquity of the Scrolls since we have no Hebrew manuscripts of the Second Commonwealth which other manuscripts can be compared with and

Communications

dated from. The Nash papyrus cannot be used as a criterion since it itself is of an unknown date. I have pointed out elsewhere that the Nash papyrus belongs to the fourth century of our era, used as a charm by the Babylonian Jews.

Those who dealt with the Hebrew paleography of the Scrolls have committed a gross error. The Jews had two types of literature—the Holy Scriptures and profane writings such as documents and other secular writings. Changes were introduced early in the secular writings but not in the Holy Scriptures. In the first centuries of the Christian era there were Jewish communities both in Palestine and Babylonia. There were scribes in both countries and undoubtedly there was a marked difference in their scripts. The scribes were a professional group and the manner of their writing remained in the families possibly for centuries without change. There were, however, different changes in the manner of writing by individuals. The script in the documents, supposedly discovered by a Bedouin in a cave, about the sale of a cow, was written by a professional scribe and differs in form from that of those who signed it. All this was not touched upon by the paleographers. Hence paleography must be eliminated as a criterion in establishing the antiquity of the Scrolls. Many of the archeologists have admitted that paleography cannot be employed to ascertain the date of the Scrolls.

Baumgarten, in enumerating the scientific data for establishing the antiquity of the Scrolls, included the radio-carbon test. The readers were not told that the radio-carbon

test was applied to a piece of linen in which, it was assumed, the Scrolls were wrapped. There is no evidence that the Scrolls were wrapped in linen. As a matter of fact, we have mentioned before, the Scrolls were brought to the Archbishop in a bag. In the interview with Mohammed he did not mention any wrappings. The validity of the radio-carbon test is questioned by many scientists. It is admitted by all scientists that to obtain data the radio-carbon test must be applied several times, and in this case it was applied only once and only on a piece of linen. *The radio-carbon test was not applied to the Scrolls.* For many years I have demanded that the test be applied to each Scroll. To apply it to one Scroll is not sufficient. The seven Scrolls are not of the same period; some are of the sixth century C.E., while others are of the twelfth century. The scroll "The War Between the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness" is of the latter period.

In conclusion, Baumgarten wrote that neither Dr. Hoenig nor I offered any explanation for a whole literature which was found in the caves "wrapped in genuine Roman linen and placed in genuine Roman pottery." No "whole literature" ever was found in the caves. The seven Scrolls were purchased. The archeologists did find small fragments, some of them consisting only of letters. During the wars between the Persians and Byzantians and later, after the conquest of Palestine by the Arabs, these caves were used as a *genizah* by the "Mourners for Zion" and other sectarians.

Communications

Some of the readers may think that I have been unduly severe in my criticism of Dr. Baumgarten. It has always been my policy to guide and assist young students. In my many years of teaching as well as editing the *Jewish Quarterly Review* I have helped many young men in their works, especially those who opposed my point of view. I encouraged them not to follow me blindly but to express themselves independently. Scholarship is based on learning and integrity. It has also been my policy to expose those who write on subjects of which they have no knowledge and who, instead of making use of sources, use secondary literature.

I am not disturbed that the Dead Sea Scrolls have been assigned to the pre-Christian period by the Christian theologians, archaeologists, and some Jewish professors. Scholars in due time will recognize the fallacy of such a view, just as scholars eventually admitted that the Clozel and the Piltown man were hoaxes, and recognized the forgeries of Shapiro, the hoax of the Slavonic Josephus and other forgeries and literary hoaxes in history. I am particularly disturbed, however, not only by the lack of knowledge revealed by the theologians and professors in their writings about the Dead Sea Scrolls, but more so by their lack of responsibility in advancing their theories with regard to the Scrolls. I shall exemplify with but a few citations:

In a book, *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, edited by Krister Stendahl, there is an article by Professor N. Glatzer, entitled "Hillel the Elder in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Why Prof. Glatzer's

article was brought into a book which deals with the New Testament might be due to the fact that the editor needed a coadjutor. In this article Dr. Glatzer states, "There are indications that in his teachings and activities Hillel the Elder took notice, among other religious and social issues of his time, of some doctrines and institutions current in the sectarian movement." This would seem to imply that Hillel's ideas were influenced by the semi-literate persons who wrote the so called Dead Sea Scrolls. This is a distortion of Judaism and could delude the reader into thinking that Judaism of the Second Commonwealth, molded by Hillel, borrowed ideas from these semi-literate writers. It appears that the editor was actually deluded into thinking that the Scrolls give "insight into the history of Judaism regardless of their relation with Christianity." This sort of nonsense is not only written for popular publication and adult education for the B'nai B'rith but also taught in the halls of learning.

Professor Theodore Gaster's book, *The Dead Sea Scripture in English Translation*, well written in a fluent English style, is really *not* a translation. He has misrendered the text. He has made this statement, "Note that in Pal. Targum to Dt. 18: 18, the Future Prophet is called expressly 'the prophet of righteousness.' The title was later adopted by the Karaites." There is no Palestinian Targum to Deut. 18: 18. Furthermore there is no Targum which makes reference to the future prophet as "the prophet of righteousness." Laymen and students who are not versed in rab-

Communications

binic literature are misled by this unwarranted statement which is but one of many fallacies and distortions in this book.

In the scroll "War between the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness" the word **הרת** occurs which has the connotation "writing" and in this sense it was used in the rabbinic literature. On page 319 Professor Gaster wrote, "The writer used the rare Hebrew word *heret* which occurs only in Ex. 32: 4 with the here inappropriate sense of 'graving tool.' Perhaps he chose this recondite term to suggest the Latin *charta*, somewhat in the sense of 'charts.'" Professor Gaster was apparently unaware of the passage in Isa. 8: 1 where the word *heret* occurs. The targum according to Jonathan translated it **כתב מפורש**. Based on Gaster's paralogism a professor of Belfast University ventured into a further distortion holding that the word *heret* is not a Latin derivation as professor Gaster suggested, but is a Greek loanword, "with the otherwise unknown meaning of 'written document.'" He maintained that this scroll was written in Egypt during the Ptolemaic period.

The *Jewish Chronicle* of May 15, 1959 gives a report of Prof. Gaster's lecture before the Hebrew Department of University College, London, in which it is stated that he said, "that the technical vocabulary and the specific ideas in the Scrolls were abundantly paralleled in the Iranian scriptures." There is no Iranian vocabulary found in the Scrolls. The words are all Hebrew but the semi-literate writers, with scant knowledge of the language and its forms, misspelled words,

used them incorrectly thus making many passages senseless and incoherent. Professor Gaster is of the opinion that most of the Scrolls were written in the first pre-Christian century. Apparently he is unaware of the fact that there was no Iranian influence on the Palestinian Jews and their literature during the Second Commonwealth. There was such influence on Babylonian Jewry but this was much later.

In reference to the Teacher of Righteousness, Prof. Gaster stated "that this was a general name for spiritual monitors in Israel." The term "Teacher of Righteousness" was first coined by the Karaites. Hence Professor's Gaster's statement that this term was a general name for spiritual monitors in Israel is false.

Professor Cecil Roth has advanced another theory regarding the Dead Sea Scrolls. He states that the Teacher of Righteousness was Menachem, the son of Judas the Galilean. I have dealt at length with his fantastic theories in my articles in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*. Roth, in his article in the Winter issue of *Judaism*, 1959, identified the sects of the Dead Sea Scrolls with the Zealots. He wrote, "In his account in the *Jewish Antiquities*, Josephus informs us that the Zealots agreed with the Pharisees 'in all things' except for their basic political doctrine." I pointed out in my letter to the editor of *Judaism*, Spring issue, 1959, that the word "Zealot" does not appear in the passage quoted by Roth. Furthermore "the term Zealot referring to a sect never occurs in *Antiquities*. Josephus employs the term Zealot for the first time in his

Communications

book *The Jewish Wars* 2. 22, 1, when a government was established in Judaea after the great victory over the Romans." To this Professor Roth replied that Josephus, in the *Jewish Wars*, used the term Zealots in 2.17, 9 and 2. 20, 3. The term Zealot as a name of a sect does not occur in the latter passage. With regard to 2, 17, 9 Josephus used the word "Zealot" as an adjective. Dr. Roth surely knows that there is a distinct difference between an adjective and a proper name. There were many zealous people before the Zealots arose as a party. As analogy there were many republicans in this country before the Republican Party came into being. The word occurs in the Greek translation (Septuagint) of the Pentateuch. This does not mean that there was a Zealot party and that Phineas, who was called a zealot, belonged to the Zealot party, which came into being after the Jewish victory over the Romans.

These two professors are not the only ones who made references to passages which do not exist. Others too have done so. I shall mention but one. Professor Bowman, in dealing with the Dead Sea Scrolls, wrote that the fifteenth of Shebat is listed in the *Megillat Ta'anit* as a day on which there could be no fasting. *Megillat Ta'anit* does not list the fifteenth of Shebat as the day on which there could be no fasting.

The reckless assertions regarding the Dead Sea Scrolls are based on faulty readings and false assumptions. Some of the Christian professors could not even fully comprehend the Hebrew text of the Scrolls. They relied either on "broken reeds" or on the faulty trans-

lations of the Scrolls, which is pabulum for the consumption of those uninformed of the history of the Second Jewish Commonwealth and rabbinic literature.

Some, who are not versed in rabbinic literature, regard the Scrolls as important for the study of the halakhot. I instance the case where a phylactery, purchased by archaeologists from a Bedouin who claimed that it was discovered in a cave, had the Pentateuchal passages placed in the order which is in accordance with the opinion of R. Tam. Father G. Vermes wrote that this phylactery "constituted important material for the historical study of tefillin." Professor Rabin of the Hebrew University, in an article published in the *Jewish Chronicle*, July 17, 1953, wrote, "Now archaeology has magnificently come to the assistance of Rabbenu Tam . . . The finds in the cave put the view of Rabbenu Tam in an entirely new light. They make it probable that he was in possession of some ancient tradition which reflected the Palestinian usage of the pre-Talmudic times." The phylactery supposedly discovered in a cave by the Bedouin came from Babylonia. It throws *no* light on the dispute between Rashi and Rabbenu Tam. There were two customs with regard to the placing of Pentateuchal passages in the phylacteries. One was Palestinian which was followed by Rashi, the other Babylonian, which was followed by Rabbenu Tam. The question which confronts us is—how could a Babylonian phylactery of the Middle Ages be discovered among the Essenes writings in a cave near the Dead Sea? (See S. Zeitlin, *The Dead Sea*

Communications

Scrolls and Modern Scholarship, pp. 35-39).

The literature on the Dead Sea Scrolls may be divided into categories. There are those who want to throw light on the origins of Christianity, particularly on some institutions like the Eucharist, and radicals who want to show that there is no originality in Christianity, that Jesus was an incarnation of the teacher of righteousness. Some archaeologists who are for delusive nationalistic pride maintained that the Scrolls are of the period of the Second Jewish Commonwealth. Recently one of the leaders of the Mormon Church published a book, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Original Christianity*, asserting that on the basis of the Dead Sea Scrolls the Mormon Church is the original Christianity. He writes that the Apocryphal Genesis Scroll "confirms the accuracy of the account in The Pearl of Great Price," which is one of the accepted scriptures of the Mormon Church. Christian Missionaries are using the Scrolls in their propaganda to convert the Jews to Christianity claiming that the true Jews were the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls and that the Teacher of Righteousness was the forerunner of Jesus. The Dead Sea Scrolls may be compared to the Oracle of Delphi — where every one received the answer he desired.

It is indeed Socratic irony that scrolls written by semi-literate sectarians, have become idols in Israel for which a shrine has been built. Recently replicas of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the jars, in which they were supposed to have been found, were brought out for sale. The Bed-

ouin Muhammed Ed-Deeb, who supposedly discovered the Scrolls, said he broke all the jars when he entered the cave. How could one make a miniature duplicate of the jars in which the Hebrew scrolls were found when *no jars were left intact*? One may even surmise that the Bethlehem merchant perpetrated a hoax on the late Prof. Sukenik and sold him jars which never contained the Hebrew Scrolls. Hence the sale of the miniature reproduction of the jars in which it is claimed that the Scrolls were found is a misrepresentation, to say the least.

The entire story of the discovery of the Scrolls is like a tale in the *One Thousand and One Nights*. It is full of contradictions. Harding told one story, Burrows another, Cross still another. Allegro's account contradicts all the others. Sukenik's tales do not tally with those of the Archbishop. One Scroll, the *Haftorah*, was suppressed. The Archbishop bought five scrolls from the merchant and sold four scrolls to the Hebrew University for two hundred and fifty thousand dollars. I have asked many times — where is the fifth scroll? I was informed that the Manual of Discipline consists of two scrolls. When the Manual of Discipline was published not a word was said that it consists of two scrolls. Why were we not informed of this? In the Scrolls *there are* parentheses, ellipses, indicating that a word has been omitted, and connecting lines. None of those who dealt with the Scrolls ever referred to these signs, although I pointed out repeatedly that these devices came into usage in the Hebrew literature during the Middle Ages. Hence the use of these de-

Communications

vices is sure proof that the Scrolls are of the medieval period. The translators have never referred to these signs used in the Scrolls. The prerequisite for a translator is to be exact — to record every period and comma. Why the silence on the use of these devices? Is there a conspiracy among the theologians and archaeologists to conceal this fact in order to sustain their contention of the antiquity of the Scrolls? Were they apprehensive that the laymen would question the antiquity of the Scrolls on the basis of these signs?

The vast literature on the Dead Sea Scrolls shows not only that the authors were unfamiliar with the period to which they ascribe the Scrolls but it also manifests the degradation of learning. Some professors who have never dealt with the history of the Second Jewish Commonwealth and rabbinics became "authorities" overnight in order to be counted among the authorities on the Dead Sea Scrolls. They supported their faulty hypotheses by quoting rabbinic literature which they misunderstood, while others quoted sources which are nonexistent.

The Seven Scrolls which are idolized were not discovered by archaeologists. They were purchased from merchants by the Archbishop and the late Professor Sukenik. There is no evidence that the Scrolls were hidden in the caves. They might have been placed in the caves in order to be "discovered" later. Some of the Scrolls might be traced to Hebron where they were looted during the pogrom in 1929. A Syrian living in America recently brought to me a few scrolls which he said he had

purchased a few years ago from a Bedouin who asserted that he had found them in a cave near the Dead Sea. These fragments were parts of a *Sefer Torah*, consisting of sections from Num. and Deut. These fragments undoubtedly were part of the loot from Hebron.

What is the reason for the delay in publishing a photostat of the Copper Scrolls? Three years have passed since the sensational announcement of their discovery was heralded to the world. Is there a valid reason for not furnishing the original text to the scholarly world?

The Seven Scrolls which are revered and for which a *bamah*, a shrine, was built to house them, are definitely of the medieval period, written by semi-literate sectarians. As in ancient times the idols and the *hamot*, shrines, vanished when the truth was recognized, so in days when profound knowledge of the history of the Second Jewish Commonwealth and rabbinic literature will be acquired, the idolatry of the Dead Sea Scrolls will also vanish.

Solomon Zeitlin

Philadelphia, Pa.

P. S.

In my letter to the editor of *Judaism*, Summer 1959, as well as in this letter I stated that the term Zealots, either as a noun or as an adjective, does not occur in the *Jewish Wars* 2, 20. 3. Dr. Cecil Roth challenged this statement by quoting the Greek original: *tous hup' au tou zelotas* showing that the word "zealot" does occur in this passage. I expected this challenge.

The Greek word zealot has the connotation of jealous, fanatic. It

Communications

also has the connotation of imitation, spirit, nature. This latter meaning was employed by the Greek writers. The historian Polybius, whose writings greatly influenced Josephus, used the word zealot also in the sense of imitation and nature. Dr. Roth is unaware that the word zealot in the passage referred to has the meaning of spirit, nature. The passage in the original reads *auton te turannikon arontes kai tous hup' autou zelotas*, correctly rendered by H. St. J. Thackeray: "because they observed his despotic (tyrannical) nature." Hence my statement that the term Zealot as referring to a sect does not appear in the *Jewish Wars* 2, 20, 3. is correct. The first time that Josephus employed the term Zealot as referring to a party is in the *Jewish Wars* 2, 22, 1, after relating the establishment of the provisional government in Judaea.

Dr. Roth's challenge reminds me of one who made a statement that the word שבת (Sabbath) does not occur in a certain passage. Some one challenged him that it does occur and quoted the word שבת not knowing that this quoted word has the meaning "sit." The challenger not only revealed lack of comprehension of the passage but also his lack of knowledge of the Hebrew language. In Hebrew as well as in the Greek words of the same spelling may have different meanings.

An interesting article, giving a summary of the battle of the Dead Sea Scrolls, appeared recently in *Queen's Quarterly*, Vol. LXV, N. 4, published by Queen's University, Canada, entitled "The Dead Sea Skeptics" by Dr. G. Gerald Harrop. Since this publication is not well

known to the readers in the United States, I am availing myself of the privilege of quoting some extracts:

"The letter supposed to have been signed by Bar Kochba, the pretender-Messiah who led his futile revolt against the Romans in 132 A.D. cannot be genuine as letters of the Roman period do not begin with *from*, and are not signed. Such New Testament letters as I Thessalonians and Colossians show the usual form of letters of this period.

"How is it that we find among these treasures such trivial material as the bill of sale for a cow?"

"It is an open question whether or not sound scholarship is advanced by early, perhaps premature, announcement by press, radio, television and popular journalism. Second thoughts never seem to catch up to first thoughts so promiscuously broadcast. We still have a lot to learn about the Scrolls, and the skeptics, especially Solomon Zeitlin, have asked some questions which have yet to be answered.

"Dr. Zeitlin and his fellow skeptics must be given full marks for their courageous and stubborn refusal to be awed; they stand in the great tradition of non-conformist scholarship."

With humility I say that courage was not required for the stand I took on the question of the antiquity of the Scrolls. From the outset I noted that the writings of those who maintained that the Scrolls are of great antiquity revealed the authors' lack of knowledge of the history of the Second Jewish Commonwealth and the Rabbinic literature.

S. Z.

