

RBL 02/2016

Shani Tzoref and Ian Young, eds.

***Keter Shem Tov: Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in
Memory of Alan Crown***

Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures and its Contexts 20

Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias, 2013. Pp. x + 400. Hardcover.
\$150.00. ISBN 9781611438666.

Andrea Ravasco
ISSR Genova
Genova, Italy

The book collects the essays presented at the Dead Sea Scrolls Conference held in 2011 in Sydney in memory of Alan Crown, who passed away in 2010. In the introduction (1–8), editors Shani Tzoref and Ian Young present the figure and the scholarship of Alan Crown, Professor at the University of Sydney, best known for his work on the Samaritans and the Dead Sea Scrolls. In addition, the editors present a very useful summary of every essay in the book. The introduction is followed by the eulogy for Alan Crown (9–13) delivered by Rabbi David Freedman at the funeral service for Crown in 2010.

The body of the book is divided into four parts. Part 1, “Qumran Scholarship: Now and Then” contains only Shani Tzoref’s “Qumran Communities—Past and Present” (17–55), which deals with the evolution of Qumran studies. Tzoref distinguishes three phases in the Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship: acquisition and allocation of the texts, limited to a closed circle of scholars and excluded to Jewish scholars; opening access to unpublished texts; and cooperation and collaboration, in which joint publications by Jewish and Christian scholars, previously rare, became the norm. About the identification of the Qumran community, Tzoref identifies, under a “Hegelian” model, three phases as well: the Essene hypothesis, the anti-Essene hypothesis, and a synthesis of both. With regard to the third phase, Tzoref points out the interest in exploring the Qumran community as a

“sect” from a sociological perspective, “particularly with respect to exclusivist boundary-setting”(48).

The second part of the book, “Textual Transmission of the Hebrew Bible,” contains three essays. In “The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Proximity of the Pre-Samaritan Qumran Scrolls to the SP” (59–88), Emanuel Tov analyzes the relation between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the so-called “Pre-Samaritan” Qumran scrolls, in comparison to MT and LXX. Through the analysis of editorial changes, harmonizations, and orthography, Tov argues that the SP-group, named “Palestinian” by F. M. Cross, “formed a popular group of texts in ancient Israel” (83). Pre-Samaritan texts are not Samaritan documents, and “beyond MT, this text was the major popular text used in Palestine, with close ties to the ancestor of the LXX, although the one-sided information from Qumran does not show the extent of its popularity” (83–84). In conclusion, Tov argues that, given (1) that MT stands apart from SP, the pre-Samaritan texts, and the LXX and (2) that SP and pre-Samaritan texts form a firm subgroup, the LXX is clearly related to the SP-group.

Ian Young presents two papers. The first, “‘Loose’ Language in 1QIsa^a” (89–112), deals with the linguistic features of 1QIsa^a. Young proposes that a better term for the majority of literary works is “Standard Classical Hebrew,” formerly called “Late Biblical Hebrew,” that continued as the standard literary Hebrew down to Qumran Hebrew. “Peripheral Classical Hebrew” (PCH) is better to denote what was formerly called “Late Biblical Hebrew.” After a detailed statistical analysis of the data, Young notes that First Isaiah presents LBH/PCH linguistic features, but the second part of Isaiah does not have indications of any transition toward a LBH. According to Young, 1QIsa^a is not in LBH, despite the tendency to have more forms in common with the PCH books.

In his second essay, “The Contrast between the Qumran and Masada Biblical Scrolls in the Light of New Data: A Note in Light of the Alan Crown Festschrift” (113–19), Young returns to the article published in 2005 in a Festschrift in honor of Alan Crown. Young summarizes “the relevance of the full presentation of the data in the Alan Crown Festschrift for the argument that the assemblage of biblical texts at Qumran and Masada are in sharp contrast” (114). Masada biblical texts strongly contrast with the Qumran biblical texts, differing fundamentally in their character from the Qumran biblical texts, but have closer similarity to the text deposited in the Bar Kokhba era. Young explains this contrast with Doudna’s and Hutchesson’s theory that the Qumran scrolls were deposited in the caves in the first century BCE, not 68 CE.

Part 3, “Reception of Scripture in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” contains five essays. Four authors have written the first one, “A Case for Two Vorlagen Behind the Habakkuk Commentary

(1QpHab)” (123–50): Stephen Llewelyn, Stephanie Ng, Gareth Wearne, and Alexandra Wrathall. 1QpHab presents problematic scribal features, in particular crosses and vacats. Furthermore, the word *peshet* is used in two different ways: on the one hand, it looks back to the community’s past; on the other, to a future time. The possible explanation, according to this essay, is that the copyist of the *peshet* could have copied from more than one manuscript. Other indications, such as different versions of Habakkuk or awkward anaphora in 5:5, might corroborate the hypothesis of two *Vorlagen* and changes between the copying of them—although according to the authors this hypothesis presents weaknesses.

Anne Gardner’s “‘Holy Ones’ and ‘(Holy) People’ in Daniel and 1QM” (151–83) deals with the use of the term *qdš* (holy) in 1QM and Daniel. She wonders whether the term applies to earthly or heavenly beings. Through an intertextual approach and a detailed analysis, the author argues that the *qdwšym* of 1QM are to be identified with the members of the community, thus suggesting that the majority of references to “holy ones” are to be identified as human beings. The essay also provides a detailed summary of the interpretations of the argument by earlier scholars .

In “What has Qohelet to do with Qumran?” (185–201), Martin A. Shields contests Armin Lange’s idea that Qumran wisdom works (4QInstruction and the Book of Mysteries) and 1QS quote Qoheleth. According to Shields, wisdom at Qumran and belief in afterlife were of a form quite different from Qoheleth. For these and other reasons, Qoheleth does not belong to the covenant and should be spurned. The book was not accorded the same authority as other biblical texts, and there is no strong evidence to support that the Scrolls directly quote Qoheleth.

John A. Davies, in “4QTestimonia (4Q175) and the Epistle of Jude” (203–15), analyzes the quotations of 4Q175 and the Letter of Jude. In 4Q175 the biblical quotations have a judgment theme against fellow Israelites. In Jude allusions and quotations demonstrate that “the impostors” stand condemned. Both Jude and Testimonia inhabit a world in which apocalyptic expectations play a prominent role and “may have filled a sociological need—bolstering a community’s self-identity and morale as over against a group of illegitimate pretenders to the truth” (214).

Marianne Dacy, in “Plant Symbolism and the Dreams of Noah and Abram in the Genesis Apocryphon” (217–32), after a general presentation of 1QapGen, focuses on the plant symbolism in the dreams of Noah and Abram (vine, cedar, and palm tree). 1QapGen does not mention Noah’s drunkenness, but Noah’s sons celebrate a feast of the wine from Noah’s vineyard, thus changing the image of Noah to one legitimately rejoicing in the festival of the vineyard. Moreover, 1QapGen mentions the destruction of an olive tree,

normally interpreted as the wicked generation of Noah, although Dacy prefers a multilayered meaning. As the cedar identifies both patriarchs as righteous, whereas Sarai is presented as a fruitful, beautiful and wise palm tree, the positive picture of the patriarchs “balances the image of the destruction of the olive tree, suggesting the image of adverse fortune striking the Jewish nation in the second or first centuries before the Common Era” (232).

The fourth part, “Community and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” contains three essays. Albert I. Baumgarten, in “What Did the ‘Teacher’ Know? Owls and Roosters in the Qumran Barnyard” (235–57), attempts an interpretation of the Qumran community by using the terms suggested by R. Landes based on a rabbinic analogy. The roosters eagerly proclaim the imminent arrival of the eschatological dawn, while the owls insist that darkness will last a long time. Through the analysis of the figure of the Teacher in Peshar Habakkuk, Baumgarten suggests that there were some dissidents who were disappointed when the final time—predicted by the Teacher—did not come. Perhaps the Teacher was not the founder of the movement but entered in a second stage. In this case, 1QpHab reflects the tension between those who followed the Teacher and the prior community. According to Baumgarten, 1QpHab 7:1–8:3 reflects the perspective of an owl who controlled the written historical record. Also, the Teacher possibly was once a rooster, but then something happened causing him to become an owl, while those who did not make the switch with the Teacher became dissidents.

Bradley J. Bitner’s “Exclusion and Ethics: Contrasting Covenant Communities in 1QS 5:1–7:25 and 1 Cor 5:1–6:11” (259–304) points out that both Paul and the writer(s) of 1QS were drawing on similar Jewish texts and participating in similar political and ethical debates, but there are significant contrasts between the contours of their communities. Bitner identifies five terms (exclusion, standing, process, purity, and penalty) and other aspects (e.g., resources and rhetoric) that demonstrate that both texts, “although [they] instruct their respective communities in processes of evaluation and exclusion, ... do so in a widely differing manner” (303). In both texts temple space and purity must be maintained through expulsion of transgressing members, but they present contrasts and distinctive features.

William Loader, in “Eschatology and Sexuality in the So-Called Sectarian Documents from Qumran” (305–16), tries to uncover how the writers of sectarian documents might see sex in their image of the ideal world, that is, eschatology. The future world in Qumran texts is envisaged as a transformed existence, an embodied existence, and not one that was without human sexual relations in their proper place. The scrolls do not promote permanent celibacy, but celibacy is related to the phenomenon of holy war (1QM) or to holy space and holy time, that is, the sanctuary and the Sabbath.

Part 5, “The Temple and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” contains three essays. In “A Temple Built of Words: Exploring Concepts of the Divine in the Damascus Document” (319–31), Dionysia A. van Beek offers a reading of CD based on the extraliterary evidence of the architectural structure and ritual function of the temple at Jerusalem. According to van Beek, the language, structure, and expression in CD fundamentally manifest boundaries comparable to the physical structure of the temple. Although different entities, the temple and the Dead Sea Scrolls share concepts of sacred space, and the concept of a divine sanctuary remains central to the community.

Philip Church’s “4Q174 and the Epistle to the Hebrews” (333–60) deals with connections between 4Q174 and the Epistle to the Hebrews. Church analyzes a range of expressions, such as “the last days,” “the eschatological temple,” and “the world to come,” and argues that the heavenly temple in Hebrews can be read as the eschatological dwelling of God, the same reality anticipated in 4Q174. Despite the differences (e.g., in Hebrews there is no need for an interim sanctuary because the dwelling of God is established with the exaltation of Jesus), both texts present evidence of a conversation about eschatological expectation in Second Temple Judaism.

In “The *Temple Scroll*: ‘The Day of Blessing’ or ‘The Day of Creation’? Insights on *Shekinah* and Sabbath” (361–74), Antoinette Collins explores Temple Scroll 29:7–10. After a general presentation of the Temple Scroll, Collins starts from Yadin’s interpretation, according to which the author of the Temple Scroll believed in an earthly temple together with a possible future, heavenly temple that God would finally build on the day of blessing/day of creation. Collins identifies the day of blessing with the Sabbath, whose observance is a strong and active component of covenant commitment.

The book is an undeniable contribution to Qumran scholarship and a great tribute to the memory of Professor Crown. It is a welcome contribution to Dead Sea Scrolls research.