"Sectually Explicit" Literature from Qumran

Carol A. Newsom
Emory University

The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Sectarian Library?

For nearly forty years there has been an almost universal consensus that the scrolls found in the eleven caves around Khirbet Qumran form the remains of a sectarian library belonging to the community whose headquarters were located at nearby Qumran. By an assumption that is nearly as widely held, this community has been regarded as an Essene fellowship. In the last few years, however, there have been suggestions that the "sectarian library of Qumran" was neither a library nor particularly sectarian. Hence it has become necessary to reconsider the question whether one can in fact identify "sectually explicit" literature among the Dead Sea Scrolls and, if so, what such texts indicate about the nature of the scrolls as a whole.

One of the most radical challenges has come from Norman Golb. In a recent article entitled "Who Hid the Dead Sea Scrolls?" (1985: 68–82) Golb challenges three of the fundamental assumptions of what can be called the prevailing consensus about the Dead Sea Scrolls. He denies that the evidence is adequate to connect the Dead Sea Scrolls with the reports of Essenes given by Philo, Josephus, and Pliny; he denies the connection between the site of Khirbet Qumran and the caves in which the scrolls were found; and, finally, he rejects the notion that the scrolls themselves should be understood as constituting a community library, that is, an intentional collection of manuscripts belonging to a single community.

On what grounds does Golb challenge these widely held views? He suggests that the hypothesis that these writings constitute the library of an Essene sectarian community "resulted primarily from the sequence in which the finds were made" (1985: 69). The fact that the manuscripts in Cave 1 were found first and that some of these manuscripts showed affinities with Essenism allowed the nearby site to be identified as an Essene community

center and led scholars to attribute discoveries in other caves to this hypothetical Essene community. In the process the substantial diversity of the contents of the other caves was not recognized and their contents were erroneously attributed to this same Essene community. In Golb's view a different sequence of discovery that did not begin with Qumran Cave 1 would have resulted in a different, better hypothesis—that after the fall of Galilee to the Romans and even during the initial months of the siege of Jerusalem, the manuscripts found in the eleven caves were brought by a variety of individuals from Jerusalem, individuals who reflected great diversity of religious practice and belief, certainly not all members of a sectarian organization. The manuscripts that they brought were stored in a number of caves and only by merest chance have been mistaken as the remains of a sectarian library.

I do not intend to review each of Golb's arguments. Since my interest is in whether the manuscripts from the caves can be viewed as a sectarian library, there are two matters in particular that I think may be set aside. First is the issue of whether or not the community described in the Serek ha-Yaḥad should properly be termed "Essene." To be sure, the word "Essene" does not appear in the documents form Qumran. Indeed, it is not clear what its Hebrew or Aramaic equivalent would be. The description of the sectarian organization found in the Serek ha-Yaḥad, though strongly evocative of the descriptions of the Essenes given by Josephus and Philo, also differs significantly from them (see Vermes 1977: 125–30). Even though there is good warrant for describing the community as at least "Essene-like," it is probably better scholarly practice not to use the terms Qumran and Essene as though they were interchangeable. Purists might argue that the proper expression to use is "Yaḥad," drawn from the community's own terminology. The question with which I am more concerned, however, is whether the community referred to in the Serek ha-Yaḥad should be considered responsible for the collection of manuscripts found in the eleven caves.

The other issue that I do not intend to consider here in any detail is Golb's rejection of the connection between the ruins of Khirbet Qumran and the caves and scrolls. Golb rather disingenuously obscures the connections between the pottery found in the caves and the pottery found in the ruins of the nearby site. He suggests, rather lamely it seems to me, that when the Jerusalemites "had brought the bundles or sackfuls of texts from the capital to the desert caves for hiding" that "the Jewish inhabitants of the site and surrounding area might well have contributed to the sequestration by supplying storage vessels" (1985: 80). The relationship of the site to the caves and their documents is an important issue, bearing on the interpretation of the scrolls. A positive correlation between the ruins and the scrolls strongly

supports the hypothesis that the scrolls form the remains of a community library. Even if it could be shown that the ruins have nothing to do with the manuscripts found in the caves, however, one would still have to ask whether the scrolls represent an intentional collection or an accidental congeries. Consequently, it seems worthwhile to consider the manuscripts without presuppositions as to their relationship with the ruins of Khirbet Qumran.

If Golb's hypothesis were correct, and the scrolls were deposited by a diverse group of unrelated individuals, one might reasonably expect the caves to contain a random hodge-podge of a broad spectrum of Jewish literature. According to the view that the caves contain a sectarian library, one would not necessarily be forced to claim that everything in the caves is of sectarian *authorship*—that is a different question altogether. But one should expect to see some evidence, just from examining the content and distribution of the manuscripts themselves, that they in some way represent an intentional collection.

One way of obtaining such information is to chart the number of nonbiblical manuscripts that exist in multiple copies, noting especially those that are found in more than one cave. If the manuscripts that occur in multiple copies can be shown to have a distinctive profile (in terms of content, idiom, style, etc.) and to have affinities with the Serek ha-Yaḥad, then one has good grounds for the hypothesis that the community referred to in that text was the agent responsible for the collection of texts found in the eleven caves.

Table 1 indicates the number of copies and the distribution of texts that occur in multiple copies. It should be obvious at a glance that the distribution is not a random one, such as Golb's hypothesis should produce. While it will be necessary to discuss the criteria for determining the provenance of a text in more detail below, I will anticipate the results of that discussion here. Texts that can be securely identified as products of the sectarian community known as the "Yaḥad" include the following: the pesharim (both continuous and thematic), the Serek ha-Yaḥad, the Damascus Document, the Hodayot, the Ṭeharot (see Milik 1972: 126–30; Kobelski 1981: 37–42), and the Berakot (Milik 1972: 130–37). To this group one should probably add the War Scroll (at least in its final form), and the Songs of the Maśkil (see discussion below). The Miqṣat Maᶜaśe ha-Torah are also of Qumran provenance, according to Qimron and Strugnell (1985: 401). The books of Enoch and Jubilees probably antedate the establishment of the Yaḥad but have strong theological affinities with the sectarian documents, Jubilees even being alluded to in the Damascus Document. The large number of calendrical texts from Cave 4 may or may not be Qumran compositions but are perhaps, like Jubilees, sources for Qumran literature. Milik (1976: 61) reports

TABLE 1. *Distribution of Qumran Texts Existing in Multiple Copies*

Text	*Cave Number: Number of Copies*							*Total*
Calendars				4:20		6:1		21
Pesharim[a]	1:3			4:11				14
Serek ha-Yaḥad	1:1			4:10	5:1			12
Sabbath Songs[b]				4:8			11:1	9
Enoch[c]	1:2			4:7				9
Damascus Document[d]				4:5	5:1	6:1		7
Hodayot	1:1			4:6				7
Milḥamah	1:1			4:6				7
Jubilees	1:2	2:2	3:1	4:1			11:1	7
Miqṣat Maᶜaśe ha-Torah				4:6				6
Ṭeharot				4:6				6
Berakot				4:5				5
New Jerusalem	1:1	2:1		4:1	5:1		11:1	5
Visions of Amram				4:5				5
Prayers for the Feasts	1:1			4:3				4
Words of the Heavenly Luminaries				4:3				3
Songs of the Sage (Maśkil)				4:2				2
Temple Scroll[e]				4 (disputed)			11:2	2

[a]There are no duplicates of any individual pesher. I am treating the pesharim as a distinct type of composition for purposes of tabulation. For the identification of the pesharim see Horgan 1979.
[b]One copy of the Sabbath Songs was discovered at Masada.
[c]Four copies of astronomical texts related to Enoch were discovered in Cave 4.
[d]Two copies of the Damascus Document were recovered from the Cairo Geniza.
[e]The identification of Temple Scroll fragments among the manuscripts of Cave 4 is discussed by Stegemann, 1988.
Sources: This table has been compiled from the official and preliminary publications of texts and from reports of forthcoming publications; see, in particular, Fitzmyer 1975; Milik 1972; Milik 1976: 61; and Qimron and Strugnell 1985. The identification of certain fragmentary texts is not always certain, and the figures in the table could vary slightly.

that one copy of the Serek ha-Yaḥad (4Q260) contains portions of the calendar. Qimron and Strugnell (1985: 400) also state that one manuscript of the Miqṣat Maᶜaśe ha-Torah begins with a copy of the calendar. Similarly, whether or not the Visions of Amram can be shown to be of sectarian authorship, its articulation of a light/darkness dualism that involves angelic and human beings is very close to the ideas found in the Milḥamah and in the Serek ha-Yaḥad. The provenance of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice

will be discussed further below. Whether or not it is a composition of the Qumran community, this text shares with the texts of sectarian authorship an adherence to the solar calendar and a preoccupation with priesthood and angelology. The New Jerusalem texts (Aramaic descriptions of a heavenly city in terms dependent on the style of Ezekiel's temple visions) are not well understood. I hesitate to venture a judgment on their authorship or relationship to the theology of the Qumran community. The Prayers for the Feasts and the Words of the Heavenly Luminaries give no particular evidence of sectarian authorship or special affinity with theological themes characteristic of the Qumran community. The provenance of the Temple Scroll has been sharply debated (Levine 1978: 5–23; Schiffman 1980: 143–58; Yadin 1980: 153–69). Although Yadin claimed that several fragmentary manuscripts of the Temple Scroll were found in Cave 4, the interpretation of these fragments has been challenged by John Strugnell and Hartmut Stegemann, who believe them to be expanded pentateuchal texts but not copies of the Temple Scroll (see Stegemann, 1988). According to their conclusion the Temple Scroll is attested only in two copies, both from Cave 11.

What appears from this simple count is that most of the nonbiblical texts that exist in two or more copies and the great majority of those found in more than one of the caves are either products of the Qumran community or are closely related to central aspects of its theology and praxis. It is not the order of discovery but the pattern of multiple copies that suggests that the scrolls do not simply represent a random collection of texts. Among the texts that exist in multiple copies—and only among those—one finds descriptions of a sectarian organization that it is reasonable to identify as the social agent responsible for the collection and preservation of the group of manuscripts of which these texts form a part. The hypothesis that the scrolls from the Dead Sea caves represent a sectarian library remains the best one available. Like Golb's hypothesis it also can account for the wide variety of the texts, both biblical and nonbiblical. But it succeeds better than Golb's in explaining why certain texts and not others are present in multiple copies.[1]

1. Two other questions might be raised about the distribution of texts. The first is the absence of duplicate texts from caves 7–10. While it is not impossible that manuscripts from certain of these caves might be independent of the sectarian library, one has to reckon with the fact that very little manuscript of any sort was found in them. Only if they contained much more material would the absence of texts found in the other caves be of significance. The other question concerns the still unpublished material from Cave 4. Will it change the picture developed here? While I do not have access to all of the unpublished materials, Prof. John Strugnell has shared with me information about the texts for which he is responsible. In the conspectus for the first volume of texts that he will be publishing from Cave 4, there are indeed several examples of apocryphal narratives and psalms that exist in two copies and that are almost certainly nonsectarian in origin. But the two texts that exist in substantial numbers of copies are either of sectarian origin or are closely related to the theological issues characteristic

What Does It Mean to Call a Text "Sectarian"?

Even if one concludes that the scrolls represent the remains of a sectarian library, what does that conclusion have to say about the provenance of the individual texts? Dupont-Sommer represents one point of view that has been quite influential. His governing assumption is that if a nonbiblical document was found in one of the Qumran caves, then it is presumed to be of sectarian (specifically, Essene) composition. Even concerning the Targum of Job from Cave 11 (a document that gives few internal clues as to its provenance) he says "its presence in the Essene library suggests that it was written by an Essene" (1973: 306). In a less explicit fashion a similar view has informed the highly influential books of Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (1975) and *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (1977), and may be said to have been characteristic of most scholars of the Dead Sea Scrolls. For the past several years, however, there has been increasing reluctance on the part of Qumran scholars to make such a blanket assumption. An appreciation of the diversity of the texts has led to a growing concern to distinguish sectarian from nonsectarian texts, and attempts have been made to establish the criteria that will allow this distinction to be made. In a lecture on apocalyptic literature at Qumran, given in Uppsala before the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Hartmut Stegemann outlined criteria for distinguishing "specifische Qumrantexte." Such texts, he suggested, may be recognized as those that ascribe an authoritative function to the figure of the Teacher of Righteousness; or that reflect the particular rule of the Qumran community; or whose formal or terminological connections *necessarily* associate them with such texts (1983: 511).[2]

Before one begins to sort through the great pile of manuscript, however, it is best to think for a moment about the kind of judgment one is trying to make. What does it mean to attempt to distinguish between sectarian and nonsectarian texts? The terms require some definition. There are at least three different things that one might mean by referring to a scroll as

of the theology of the Yaḥad. These are a pseudo-Ezekiel document concerned with calendrical calculations (seven or eight copies) and the Miqṣat Maᶜaśe ha-Torah (six copies), which Qimron and Strugnell have suggested may be a letter outlining the basis for the separation of the Yaḥad from other parts of the Jewish community (1985: 400–407).

2. Stegemann would include as specifically Qumranic the pesharim, the Damascus Document, the Serek ha-Yaḥad, the Hodayot, the thematic midrashim 4Q Florilegium and 11Q Melchizedek, as well as other texts. Stegemann regards the Milḥamah as a pre-Qumran text edited and adapted by the community. Some texts may be excluded as non-Qumran compositions (noncanonical hymns in several Psalm manuscripts, the Words of the Heavenly Luminaries, the Genesis Apocryphon, the Temple Scroll, and many fragmentary compositions of various genres). There remains, however, a large "gray zone" of works whose provenance is difficult to determine.

sectarian. First, one might mean that it had been written by a member of the Qumran community, and, indeed, in most discussions of this sort the terms sectarian or "specifically Qumranic" clearly are used to mean texts written by members of the Qumran community. But that is not the only way that the terms sectarian and nonsectarian might be used. A second possibility is that one might assert that it was the way a particular text was read that made it a sectarian text, no matter who had written it. While this criterion would include almost all of those texts written by members of the community, it might also include a number of others besides—adopted texts, one might say. Finally, one might use the term sectarian not as shorthand for facts of authorship or community use but as a way of describing content or rhetorical stance, that is, those texts that speak specifically of the unique structures of the community and the history of its separation from a larger community, and/or that develop its distinctive tenets in a self-consciously polemical fashion. This last use of the term "sectarian text" might well not include everything actually written by members of the community. Each usage points to a question worth asking. To consider only authorship is to oversimplify. It remains to be seen, though, how these are three distinct questions.

Use and Readership of Texts

Consider first what it would mean to think about the terms sectarian and nonsectarian as referring to patterns of text use within the community. One might argue that the criterion of use (rather than authorship) corresponds more closely to the ancient sense of what are "our writings" as opposed to "not ours" or "theirs." As is well known, attribution of a text to a particular author is virtually ignored in ancient Israel (the special case of pseudepigrapha being an exception). It is difficult to imagine a member of the Qumran community puzzling over the question of whether a member of the community did or did not write the War Scroll or the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice or another of the texts that falls into the gray area, insofar as authorship is concerned. The large number of copies of these two texts, and, in the case of the War Scroll, the apparent existence of variant textual traditions suggest that these documents were of particular interest to the community. Whether or not these texts were written by members of the Qumran community, it is plausible that they may have influenced the self-understanding of the community as deeply as the pesharim or the Hodayot.

In one sense, to focus on the use of texts within the community rather than on their authorship would be to revive a slightly more sophisticated form of Dupont-Sommer's thesis. The presence of a document among the Dead Sea Scrolls would not be an indication of Qumran authorship but of Qumran readership and appropriation. In a rough fashion the number of

copies of a document might be taken as indicating the frequency of its use or some measure of its importance in the community. Such an approach would seem not only to be consistent with ancient values but also to receive support from modern theorists. Recent discussions of the nature of texts and the reading process in literary criticism have made the point that it is not adequate simply to define a text by reference to its authorship. In a very significant sense a text is created through the reading process. (See the various perspectives represented by Jauss 1982 and Fish 1980.) A text written by someone not a member of the sectarian community may nevertheless become a sectarian text through the type of reading it is given in a sectarian setting.

The problems with this approach, however, become evident when one considers the best documented case we have for understanding how texts were read at Qumran. Through the evidence preserved in the pesharim, we know how certain biblical books were read at Qumran. They were read as referring specifically to the history and fate of the sect and its enemies. If one understands a text not as the utterance of an author but as the product of the reading of an individual or reading community, then one would have to say that the biblical texts found at Qumran were sectarian texts. It does indeed take a strong effort of the imagination for modern scholars to set aside their own reading conventions and to appreciate fully how a member of the sectarian community did read scripture. The claim that the biblical texts found at Qumran are sectarian texts has a certain heuristic value. At the same time one cannot help but feel that such a conclusion obscures more than it clarifies. The fact that such sectarian interpretation was not simply a matter of unconscious assumption but of self-conscious effort, the results of which were embodied in special compositions, should warn us against wholly collapsing the categories of text and reading.

Moreover, we really know very little about the interpretation of most texts at Qumran. While the pesharim do give an indication of how biblical texts were read and understood, there is no positive ground for thinking that other texts were read in such a manner.[3] It is because the biblical texts have

3. A rather interesting attempt to read a nonbiblical text as it might have been read at Qumran is the interpretation of the Wiles of the Wicked Woman as an allegory of the enemies of the sect (see, for example, Carmignac: 1965 and Burgmann 1974). To be sure the scholars who advance this interpretation consider the text to be written by members of the Qumran community and consider their interpretation to be an explanation of the author's intentions. Quite rightly, their view has not been widely accepted, for they do not make their case on those terms. Their interpretation becomes much more provocative if understood as an attempt to read the text as it might have been read at Qumran, whatever its meaning for readers in other contexts. But there are problems even so, since we do not know whether nonbiblical texts were interpreted in a manner analogous to the biblical exegesis found in the pesharim.

a peculiar authority that they are read in this fashion—other texts that did not have such authority might well have been read according to very different conventions.

While there are some texts that appear to be of non-Qumran authorship but became very influential in the Qumran community (for example, Jubilees), for the most part we simply lack information about the use or lack of use that a text received in the life of the community. Even the presence of a large number of copies of the text may be difficult to interpret. Milik (1976: 7), for instance, has tried to make a case from the date and condition of the Enoch manuscripts that the text ceased to be of much significance for the Qumran community fairly early in its history.

For both practical and theoretical reasons it does not seem advantageous to use the term sectarian to designate texts that had a particular status or use within the community, irrespective of their authorship. But posing the question of the way in which particular texts were used and interpreted within the community is extremely important, even though the information available to us is often limited.

Authorship of Texts

Most scholars who raise the question of distinguishing sectarian from nonsectarian Dead Sea scrolls would explain that what they are interested in *is* the question of authorship. Was a text *composed* at Qumran (or by a member of the Qumran community) or merely *copied and preserved* by the Qumran community? Just because the ancient Semitic world was not particularly interested in the question of authorship does not mean that it is not an important question for scholarship. The problem, of course, is that since the ancient writers did not explicitly assert authorship, the assignment of authorship has to be deduced from internal criteria—historical or social allusions, distinctive vocabulary, particular theological ideas, etc. It certainly seems reasonable to assume that writings by members of a sectarian community would tend to bear distinctive traits of content, vocabulary, and style—and many undoubtedly do. But *must* all documents written by members of a sect be so marked? I have a scholarly friend who humorously dismisses the question of distinguishing sectarian from nonsectarian literature from the Qumran caves by saying that it is like what former Chief Justice Berger said about pornography: I may not be able to define it, but I know it when I see it. My friend, I would suggest, is conflating the categories of content/style and authorship. If sectarian is assumed to mean Qumran authorship and if it could be shown that members of the Qumran community wrote material that was not readily identifiable by details of content and style, then the adequacy of my friend's appealingly simple non-definition would be put in question. To put the matter another way, is it certain that

all psalms or prayers written by a member of a sect would be discernibly different from those written by a nonmember? For some important categories of writing (for example, prayers and certain liturgical texts) stereotypical, traditional language might well have been the norm for the sectarian as well as the nonsectarian author.

An example of this problem is the curious document form Cave 4 that Baillet (1982: 81–105) called a "Marriage Ritual." Whatever the nature of the text (its interpretation as a marriage ritual has been questioned; see Baumgarten 1983: 125–35), my interest is in the grounds Baillet finds for calling it Essene (or, as I would prefer, Qumranic). There is no reference to the name of the sectarian community or to the Righteous Teacher, no reference to organizational features of the community or its distinctive institutional structure, no reference to distinctive theological ideas or use of distinctive idiom. By the criteria that Stegemann and others have proposed such a text would not attract attention as possibly of sectarian authorship. What Baillet noticed, however, was that one fragment (4Q502 16) apparently cites a part of the Serek ha-Yaḥad. Although the fragment is small, Baillet's judgment about its overlap with 1QS iv 4–6 seems well founded.[4] Because it cites a clearly sectarian text, one would be justified in concluding that this "marriage" text is also of sectarian authorship (or at the very least updated for use by a member of the sect). The existence of such a text is thus a reminder that much that does not strike us as sectarian in content may nevertheless have been written by a member of the sect.

The opposite problem exists, too. Where a text makes explicit references to the organizational features of the group or to its history, one may be able to conclude quite confidently that it was written by a member of the community. But what about texts that lack such clear markers of origin but do employ a diction, style, and theological slant that has significant overlap with what one finds in the core group of texts that are of sectarian authorship? It is possible to describe the similarities and differences of content or idiom, but much more difficult to move convincingly from such descriptions to claims about authorship.[5] In such cases perhaps it would be

4. Baillet does not discuss the relationship between the paleography of 4Q502 and that of the copies of the Serek ha-Yaḥad from Cave 4 that Milik is to publish. One assumes, however, that the possibility that the fragment belongs to a copy of the Serek ha-Yaḥad was investigated. Although Baillet does not discuss at length his reasons for assigning the fragment in question to 4Q502, he does say in his general introduction that some of the fragments of 4Q502 might belong to 4Q503 (Daily Prayers). Even if that were the case with the fragment that cites the Serek ha-Yaḥad, the issue with which I am concerned would be the same. Like the Marriage Ritual, the Daily Prayers are not marked by the features that one usually points to as characteristic of texts of Qumran authorship.

5. In fact the entire notion of authorship and the production of a text within a single community may become problematic categories. A case in point is the War Scroll. The

better for heuristic reasons to reverse Dupont-Somer's presumption and to regard such texts as of non-Qumran origin. One does not "lose" the text for Qumran—the readership of the text within the community is still assumed. But one is forced to consider what other place of origin such a text might have had in Second Temple Judaism.

Even if one cannot be certain that documents composed by members of the sect will contain a distinctive content, there may be some features that are clearly *incompatible* with sectarian authorship. In documents that are demonstrably of Qumran authorship the tetragrammaton is always avoided, except in quotations from scripture. This practice is not unique to Qumran, of course, but is arguably the norm for Jewish writings after the third century B.C.E. (Stegemann 1978: 216; cf. Skehan 1980: 14–44). It means, though, that any text containing the tetragrammaton in free and original composition can be presumed to be of non-Qumran authorship. See, for example, the collection of noncanonical psalms recently published by Schuller (1986: 38–41).

Calendrical assumptions might provide another criterion. While adherence to the solar calendar is reflected in texts written by the Qumran community, it is widely agreed that not every text that reflects the solar calendar is necessarily of Qumran provenance. Since the calendar was a polemical issue for the sect, however, a text that reflected different calendrical assumptions could be excluded from the list of documents written in the Qumran community. An example of such a text is 4Q507–509, the Prayers for the Feasts. The text, of which 1Q34–34*bis* is an additional copy, has been construed as a Qumran sectarian composition, apparently on the basis of the reference to the renewal of the covenant (1Q34*bis* 3 ii 6). While the language is suggestive, the adjoining reference to separating the covenanted ones 'from all the peoples' (*mkl hʿmym*) makes one wonder if the reference might not be to Israel as a whole. None of the rest of the preserved fragments contains language that points clearly to Qumran authorship.

The impasse can be breached by examining the order in which the feasts appear in the cycle of prayers. One of the copies, 4Q509, is written on the recto of a papyrus scroll, the verso of which contains a copy of the War

different recensions of the book that exist and the complexities of its structure have suggested to many scholars that the work has a complicated textual history. Some have argued that the work derives in whole (Rost 1955: 205–6) or in part (von der Osten Saken 1969: 88–91, 105) from a period before the emergence of the Qumran community. Because we possess so little of the literature from the period, it is extremely difficult to judge whether terms such as *grl*, *mʿdy tʿwdwt*, the pair *bny ʾwr/bny ḥwšk*, etc., were distinct idioms developed in a relatively closed intellectual environment or whether they were rather broadly shared terms used in sectarian and nonsectarian settings for discussing predestinarian and dualistic ideas.

Scroll (4Q496) and a copy of the Words of the Heavenly Luminaries (4Q505). One of the fragments (4Q496 3 = 4Q509 3) contains on the verso a portion of text from the beginning of the War Scroll (= 1QM i 4–9). The recto contains part of the prayer for the autumn New Year.[6] The simplest explanation for this state of affairs is that fragment 4Q496 3 = 4Q509 3 comes from the beginning of the scroll and preserves material from near the beginning of both compositions.

The question next to be asked is whether a calendrical sequence beginning with the New Year in Tishri is consistent with the calendrical practices of the Qumran community. It appears that it is not. Judging from what Milik (1957: 24–25) has published on the priestly courses from Qumran, their calendar reckoning begins not with Tishri but with Nisan (see also Talmon 1965: 172). Although it is not difficult to see how such a collection of traditional prayers for the feasts might have been valued and used at Qumran, it seems most unlikely that a cycle of prayers *composed* at Qumran would begin with the fall New Year if the rest of the sect's cultic organization began its reckoning with Nisan. Consequently, one seems warranted in concluding that the Prayers for the Feasts were not written by a member of the Qumran community.

The question "What kinds of texts did members of the Qumran community actually compose?" is an extremely important one. To the extent that we can answer it, the question not only provides valuable information about the life and values of the sect but also opens new perspectives on Second Temple Judaism in general. Every text whose composition cannot be placed at Qumran must have originated elsewhere. It appears, however, that the matter of distinguishing texts of Qumran authorship is not so simple as "knowing it when we see it." Some texts that are not characterized by the style and idiom that we associate, for example, with the Serek ha-Yaḥad or the pesharim may be of Qumran authorship, while others that share important features of that style and idiom may not be, or may have a compositional history that begins in another environment.

Rhetorical Function of Texts

Because the issue of authorship seems to be a more subtle matter than first appears, it might be better to reserve the term "sectarian text" for another purpose than as a synonym for "Qumran authorship." Of the three alternative meanings for the term sectarian that I discussed above (authorship, use, and rhetorical purpose) the third and most restrictive category seems the most useful. A sectarian text would be one that calls upon its

6. Fragment 4Q509 3 overlaps 1Q34bis 2 + 1, which contains the end of the prayer for the New Year and the beginning of the prayer for the Day of Expiation.

readers to understand themselves as set apart within the larger religious community of Israel and as preserving the true values of Israel against the failures of the larger community. A text may do this in a variety of ways. There may be overtly polemical rhetoric of an "us vs. them" sort. Or there may be references to the community's history, or teaching about the institutional structure of the community. Liturgies that serve to constitute the community as set apart from the larger community would also be sectarian. While particular theological ideas and values may be almost always present in such sectarian documents, they do not of themselves make a document sectarian. Some self-conscious reference to separation from the larger religious community would be necessary to identify the text as sectarian. By focusing on questions of content and rhetorical purpose one restores attention to differences that are obscured when the issue is seen primarily as one of authorship or use. After all, the Temple Scroll, whoever wrote it, does not present itself as a sectarian document. The Serek ha-Yaḥad does.

I certainly do not mean to diminish the significance of questions of authorship and use. It is important to attempt to discover whether members of the sectarian community wrote a text like that of the Temple Scroll and to know, whether or not they wrote it, why they read it, and how they understood it. But it must not be overlooked that the means by which the text claims its authority and achieves its persuasiveness are not those by which the Serek ha-Yaḥad or the Damascus Document achieve theirs.

A Test Case—The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice

My interest in the issue of what it means to call something a sectarian text stems directly from my work in editing the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (Newsom 1985). It represents one of those texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls whose provenance seems particularly hard to determine. I would like to reexamine that question in the following pages. Certain evidence that I had previously neglected needs to be included in the discussion. In addition, more self-conscious division of the issue into separate questions of use, authorship, and sectarian rhetoric helps to clarify the relationship between the evidence one has and the assumptions one invokes in interpreting that evidence.

The Sabbath Songs are a liturgical cycle of thirteen related compositions, one song for each of the first thirteen Sabbaths of the year. Although there is some reference to the human community and its priesthood, by far the greatest portion of the text is concerned with the angelic priesthood, the praises offered by the angels, the heavenly temple, the chariot of God, and the sacrifices offered in the heavenly temple. Ten copies are extant, eight of which come from Qumran Cave 4, one from Qumran Cave 11, and one

from Masada. Two other compositions from Qumran have phraseology so similar to some of the most distinctive language of the Sabbath Songs that one must assume some pattern of influence among the texts. These other documents are the Songs of the Maśkil (4Q510 and 4Q511; published in Baillet 1982: 215–62) and the Berakot texts from Cave 4 (discussed and excerpted but not yet fully published in Milik 1972: 95–144).

If one examines the Sabbath Songs with respect to content and rhetorical purpose, there is nothing clearly sectarian about them. That is to say, they do not appear to be concerned with defining and maintaining the boundaries between a religious subgroup and a dominant religious community. The songs are nonpolemical. The only contrast between one religious group and another is between the angelic priesthood and the human priesthood (see 4Q400 2 6–8). Although the human community is referred to self-deprecatingly, it appears that the angelic priesthood provides a model and projected self-image for the human speakers/hearers of the text. Deterministic language and references to the eschatological war in heaven do occur, but the references are not explicitly related to the fates of any particular human group (see 4Q402 4). The solar calendar is assumed by the date headings for each of the songs, but there is no indication in the text that the use of such a calendar is regarded as in any way distinctive or exceptional. That is to say, the calendar is not made the subject of polemic. One must remember, however, that a religious sect may have other needs as a community that do not have to do explicitly with defining the boundaries between itself and the larger religious community from which it has separated. The lack of sectarian self-consciousness in the content of the songs cannot of itself exclude Qumran as the place of origin of these compositions.

Are there references to sectarian community institutional structures or history? While nothing of the sort occurs in the body of the songs, it is very significant that the heading *lmśkyl* occurs at the beginning of each composition, for Maśkil does appear to be the name for a sectarian office in texts of Qumran authorship (1QS and 1QSb; cf. CD; Vermes 1975: 22–25). The terse heading *lmśkyl* is not without ambiguity, both with respect to the sense of the preposition ('to'?, 'by'?, 'for'?) and the noun ('sage' or 'the Maśkil'?). But one does have to reckon here with the possibility that the heading served to identify the text as belonging to the provenance of that sectarian leader who had responsibility for community instruction (1QS iii 13) and for certain liturgical tasks (1QS ix 26–x 5; 1QSb). Whether one is dealing with a text composed within the community or adopted by it, the similarity between the angelological and liturgical knowledge attributed to the Maśkil in 1QS/1QSb and the content of the Sabbath Songs makes it seem likely that in the context of the Qumran community *lmśkyl* was construed with reference to this sectarian office.

It is also necessary to assess what can be known or guessed about the use of the text within the Qumran community. The number of copies found at Qumran suggests that it was a text of considerable importance. Of course, we do not have independent evidence to indicate how the text was used. I assume that it was used "as directed," that is, read in sections over the course of the first thirteen Sabbaths of the year. If the text could be shown to be of Qumran *authorship*, then the assumption would be almost certainly true. But if one concludes that the text was not of Qumran authorship, then it would be less certain. While the text may well have been adopted for actual liturgical practice, there would be some chance that the text was not put into actual use but consulted only as a study text for the speculations on the heavenly world that it contained.[7]

There is another measure for the use of a text besides the number of copies extant, and that is the evidence for its influence on other texts. As I mentioned above, there are two documents from Qumran that may show the influence of the Sabbath Songs. One, which I have discussed in greater detail in my edition of the Sabbath Songs, is 4QBerakot. This text, which makes explicit reference to the sectarian community (4Q286 10 ii 1: *ʿṣt hyḥd* 'the council of the Community'), Milik interprets as the liturgy that the Qumran community used for covenant renewal on the day of Pentecost (1972: 136). The points of similarity between the Sabbath Songs and 4QBerakot concern the very peculiar terms used for the description of the heavenly temple, the chariot throne, and the angelic attendants. Since the description of such heavenly realia forms one of the principal subjects of the Sabbath Songs, whereas it appears to be more peripheral in the Berakot, it seems likely that the author of the Berakot has been influenced by the Sabbath Songs rather than the other way around. The other text that shows strong terminological and formal similarities with the Sabbath Songs, the Songs of the Maśkil (4Q510–511), is almost certainly of Qumran authorship (see below). Although it is not possible to examine all the evidence here, the Songs of the Maśkil appear to be literarily dependent upon both the Hodayot and the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.

To sum up so far, the Sabbath Songs seem to have been influential within the Qumran community, judging both from the number of copies extant and from their influence on other Qumran compositions. While the Sabbath Songs do not reflect a significant degree of sectarian self-consciousness, they may well have formed part of the literature of instruction

7. This possibility was suggested to me by H. Stegemann. In my own opinion, however, I think that the liturgical use is more likely. We do know that the Qumran Maśkil was associated with other liturgical utterances (1QSb; 1QS ix–x). Elsewhere I have described the way in which liturgical recitation of these songs would have served the needs of the Qumran community (Newsom 1985: 59–72).

or liturgical praxis associated with the figure of the Maśkil. The question that remains is whether there is enough evidence to justify a judgment as to their authorship.[8]

The lack of explicit sectarian polemic is, as I have suggested above, indecisive. There are, however, two other pieces of information that are important. The first is the presence of a copy of the text at Masada. Previously, I had expressed my agreement with Yadin's suggestion that the text might have been carried there by a member of the Qumran community after the destruction of Khirbet Qumran (Newsom 1985: 74 n. 5). And so it might. I must admit, though, that the suggestion has something of the flavor of the theory of epicycles introduced to save the ptolemaic cosmology from erosion by apparently contradictory empirical observations. The possibilities are more various. While the text might have belonged to a former member of the Qumran community or to a member of the "New Covenant" who lived in a city or village (see the Damascus Document), the presence of the Sabbath Songs at Masada requires one to reckon with the possibility that the text was known and used in circles quite distinct from the Qumran community. The implications of that possibility for the authorship of the text and the direction of its dissemination are quite ambiguous, however. Does one have a document from a nonsectarian source adopted at Qumran because it was congenial to the community's interests or a document composed at Qumran but congenial to a wider readership because of its lack of explicitly sectarian rhetoric? The mere fact of its presence at Masada does not allow one to decide.

There remains one piece of evidence that I did not consider in my previous discussion of the provenance of the text, evidence that I think may be sufficient to tip the balance toward the conclusion that the Sabbath Songs were *not* composed by a member of the Qumran community. As I noted above, in texts whose Qumran authorship seems reasonably certain, there is no use of the tetragrammaton except in direct scripture quotations. It is also the case, however, that the word *ʾĕlōhîm* is avoided. The term *ʾĕlōhîm* is, indeed, rare in most of the nonbiblical texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls from whatever sources they derive (see the discussions of Stegemann 1978 and

8. For purposes of comparison with the following discussion, in my edition of the Sabbath Songs I summarized the question of the provenance of the text as follows (1985: 4): "To conclude, there is no internal evidence which can establish beyond question the provenance of the Sabbath Shirot. The absence of specifically sectarian references in the body of the Shirot, however, need not indicate a pre-Qumran origin for the Sabbath Songs. Strong points of relationship with the clearly Qumran 4QBerakot, the technical significance of the heading *lmśkyl*, plus additional points of verbal similarity with other Qumran documents are adequate to support the working hypothesis adopted here, that the scroll of the Sabbath Shirot is a product of the Qumran community."

Skehan 1980).[9] While the Sabbath Songs also avoid the tetragrammaton, they differ sharply from the pattern of usage in the texts of Qumran authorship in their frequent use of *ʾĕlōhîm*. Of all words, names and terms for God would be among the most likely to be governed by convention and not left to the whim and preference of individual writers within a religious community. Consequently, the deviant use of *ʾĕlōhîm* seems to point toward non-Qumran authorship of the Sabbath Songs.

But the picture becomes clouded again when the relationship between the Sabbath Songs and the Songs of the Maśkil is considered. These mysterious texts share a number of similarities with the Sabbath Songs. There is an apparently similar use of *lmśkyl* as a heading; the individual compositions are referred to as songs (*šyr*) in both; there is a similarity in the imperative calls to praise that open the songs; certain terminology for describing praise is attested only in these two documents, out of the corpus of the Dead Sea Scrolls (for example, *tšbwḥh/tšbwḥwt*). One fragment (4Q511 44) uses terms for the heavens and the cherubim that are almost identical to those of the Sabbath Songs. One of the most interesting points of comparison occurs in 4Q511 35, where the speaker describes God's act of setting apart priests for himself. It is not entirely clear whether the priests are human or angelic. In either case, however, the passage is quite similar to the description of the consecration of the angelic priesthood in the first Sabbath Song (4Q400 1 i), a topic of utmost importance in the Sabbath Songs. The most distinctive point of similarity between the Sabbath Songs and the Songs of the Maśkil, however, is the striking preference for the divine epithet *ʾĕlōhîm* in both texts. At the same time, the Songs of the Maśkil appear to be much more closely related to the language and idiom of the clearly sectarian documents of Qumran authorship than are the Sabbath Songs. Baillet documents extensive similarities with the diction of the Hodayot. Predestinarian and dualistic language similar to that of the documents of Qumran authorship is found (*bqṣ mmšl*[*t*] *ršʿh wtʿwdwt tʿnywt bny ʾw*[*r*] [4Q510 1 6–7]; *bgwrl ršʿ* [4Q510 2 1]; [*g*]*wrl ršyt byʿqwb wnḥlt ʾl*[*why*]*m* [4Q511 2 i 5]; *gwrl ʾlwhym* [4Q511 2 i 8]). And though the terminology is rather different, there is a close parallel between the claims to insight into human nature in the Songs of the Maśkil (4Q511 63 iii 2–3) and that claimed for the Maśkil in the Serek ha-Yaḥad (1QS iii 13–15). While highly suggestive, these features alone would not constitute definitive evidence for Qumran authorship.[10] What seems to

9. The occurrences in 1QS viii 14 and 1QM x 4, 7 are all in the context of quotations from scripture. The only exception appears to be 1QSb iv 25 (*ʾlwhy ṣbʾ*[*wt*]). In his unpublished notes on the Sabbath Songs Stegemann had already observed the uncharacteristic use of *ʾĕlōhîm* as grounds for doubting that the Sabbath Songs were composed at Qumran.

10. In *Gott und Belial* Peter von der Osten Saken (1969) has argued convincingly that not all dualistic terms are necessarily sectarian. In his analysis of 1QM i he has attempted to show

make the case for Qumran authorship in the Songs of the Maśkil is Baillet's claim that one passage refers explicitly to the sect: *tkn lmwʿdy šnh [wm]mšlt yḥd lhthlk[b]gwrl [ʾlwhym]lp̊ŷ kbwd̊[w]* (4Q511 2 i 9–10). Although the passage is damaged, it is difficult to see how one could construe the crucial phrase other than as Baillet reads it ("du go]uvernement de (la) Communauté").[11]

How should this rather complex evidence be assessed? One could assume that both texts originated in a non-Qumran priestly milieu that favored the divine epithet *ʾĕlōhîm* and that had a strong interest in the heavenly and demonic realms and in powerful and esoteric knowledge. That approach would fail to explain, however, why only one text (the Songs of the Maśkil) had been rewritten within the Qumran community to incorporate a more explicitly sectarian perspective. Alternatively, if one assumed that both texts originated within the Qumran community, one would have to explain why only these two texts freely use the divine epithet *ʾĕlōhîm*. A case might be made that the use of *ʾĕlōhîm* is an example of privileged speech associated with the figure of the Maśkil. The difficulty is that, in addition to being a rather *ad hoc* explanation for which there is virtually no positive evidence,[12] one would still lack an explanation for the difference between the more strongly sectarian rhetoric of the Songs of the Maśkil and the apparently nonsectarian orientation of the Sabbath Songs. The most plausible explanation seems to be that the Sabbath Songs alone originated outside of and probably prior to the emergence of the Qumran community.[13] Appropriated by the Qumran sect, this document became an important text in the community for the reasons that I have discussed in my edition of the Sabbath Songs. At some point, probably during the first century B.C.E., the Songs of the Maśkil were composed, under the strong influence both of the Hodayot and the Sabbath Songs. That the normally avoided divine epithet *ʾĕlōhîm* should be used in this sectarian composition is not as surprising as it

how the Qumran community drew on an existing vocabulary and literature in the development of its own sectarian terminology.

11. There are other examples of unarticulated *yḥd* that refer to the community. Cf. 1QS iii 2, 12; ix 6; xi 8; 1QSa i 26; 1QSb iv 26. So long as *mmšlt* is understood to be in construct and not used absolutely (as it is in Ben Sira 7:4), one can scarcely construe *yḥd* as other than a noun.

12. It is perhaps relevant that the one free (that is, nonquotational) use of *ʾĕlōhîm* in a text of Qumran authorship occurs in a blessing spoken by the Maśkil (1QSb iv 25). Elsewhere in that text, however, *ʾādôn* and *ʾēl* are used to refer to God.

13. It is not possible to consider here what the original *Sitz im Leben* of the Sabbath Songs may have been, if it was composed outside of the Qumran Community. The adherence to the solar calendar and the preoccupation with the priesthood and its angelic representatives have significant affinities with the traditions associated with Levi in the Aramaic Testament of Levi and in Jubilees. But the liturgical form of the document assumes a rather well-organized community.

might first appear. According to the Songs of the Maśkil, the description of the "splendor of His beauty" (4Q510 1 4) serves a quasi-magical purpose, "to frighten and ter[rify] all the spirits of the angels of destruction . . ." (4Q510 1 4–5). The Songs of the Maśkil are conceived of as words of power. In such a context the use of a normally restricted divine name is readily explicable.

Is Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, then, a sectarian text? In terms of its rhetoric, no, it is not. In terms of its authorship, it appears most likely not to have been composed within the Qumran sect. But in terms of its use—that is, the way in which it was read and employed within the Qumran community (whether as a document for study or for guiding worship), the number of copies found in the caves, and the apparent influence that it had on other texts of the community—there are good grounds for thinking that the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice functioned as an adopted or naturalized text within the sectarian perspective of the Qumran community.

The problem with "sectually explicit" literature from the Qumran caves is that it is often not sectually explicit enough. The question of determining what is sectarian or nonsectarian literature from the Qumran library cannot be a matter merely of dividing the manuscripts into two separate piles with appropriate labels. The questions of content/rhetoric, of authorship, and of use must each be posed for the document in question. With certain texts, such as the Milḥamah or the Sabbath Songs, the answer to the question "Is it sectarian?" cannot be answered either with a simple yes or no. Despite the need for nuance in assessing the relation of particular texts to the life of the Qumran community and for being sensitive to the possibility of diverse origins, there remain good reasons for assuming that the documents recovered from the eleven caves near Khirbet Qumran are indeed the remains of the library of the sect described in the Serek ha-Yaḥad.

Bibliography

Baillet, M.
1982 *Qumrân Grotte 4: III (4Q482–4Q520).* Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 7. Oxford: Clarendon.

Baumgarten, J.
1983 4Q502, Marriage or Golden Age Ritual? *Journal of Jewish Studies* 34: 125–35.

Burgmann, H.
1974 The Wicked Woman: Der Makkabäer Simon? *Revue de Qumran* 8: 323–59.

Carmignac, J.
1965 Poèm allégorique sur la secte rivale. *Revue de Qumran* 5: 361–74.

Dupont-Sommer, A.
1973 *The Essene Writings from Qumran*. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith.
Fish, S.
1980 *Is There a Text in This Class?: The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge: Harvard University.
Fitzmyer, J.
1975 *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study*. Sources for Biblical Study 8. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press.
Golb, N.
1985 Who Hid the Dead Sea Scrolls? *Biblical Archaeologist* 48: 68–82.
Horgan, M.
1979 *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 8. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association.
Jauss, H.
1982 *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Theory and History of Literature 2. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
Kobelski, P.
1981 *Melchizedek and Melchireša*ᶜ. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 10. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association.
Levine, B.
1978 The Temple Scroll: Aspects of Its Historical Provenance and Literary Character. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 232: 5–23.
Milik, J.
1957 Le travail d'édition des manuscrits du désert de Juda. Pp. 17–26 in *Volume du Congrès: Strasbourg 1956*. Supplement to Vetus Testamentum 4. Leiden: Brill.
1972 Milkî-ṣedeq et Milkî-rešaᶜ dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens. *Journal of Jewish Studies* 23: 95–144.
1976 *The Books of Enoch*. With the collaboration of M. Black. Oxford: Clarendon.
Newsom, C.
1985 *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*. Harvard Semitic Studies 27. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
von der Osten Saken, P.
1969 *Gott und Belial*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
Qimron, E., and J. Strugnell
1985 An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran. Pp. 400–407 in *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, April 1984*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.
Rost, L.
1955 Zum Buch der Kriege der Söhne des Lichts gegen die Söhne der Finsternis. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 80: 205–6.
Schiffman, L.
1980 The Temple Scroll in Literary and Philological Perspective. Pp. 143–58 in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*, vol. 2, ed. W. S. Green. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.

Schuller, E.
1986 *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran: A Pseudepigraphical Collection*. Harvard Semitic Studies 28. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
Skehan, P.
1980 The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada Scroll, and in the Septuagint. *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 13: 14–44.
Stegemann, H.
1978 Religionsgeschichtliche Erwägungen zu den Gottesbezeichnungen in der Qumrantexten. Pp. 195–217 in *Qumrân: sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, ed. M. Delcor. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 46. Leuven: University Press.
1983 Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik. Pp. 495–530 in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*, ed. D. Hellholm. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
1988 The Origins of the Temple Scroll. Pp. 235–56 in *Congress Volume: Jerusalem 1986*, ed. J. A. Emerton. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 40. Leiden: Brill.
Talmon, S.
1965 The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judean Desert. Pp. 162–99 in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Scripta Hierosolymitana 4. Jerusalem: Magnes.
Vermes, G.
1975 *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. 2d edition. Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin.
1977 *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*. With the collaboration of P. Vermes. Cleveland: Collins and World.
Yadin, Y.
1980 Is the Temple Scroll a Sectarian Document? Pp. 153–69 in *Humanizing America's Iconic Book: SBL Centennial Addresses 1980*, ed. G. Tucker and D. Knight. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.