THE QUMRAN PARADIGM

SBL

Society of Biblical Literature

Early Judaism and Its Literature

Rodney A. Werline, Editor

Editorial Board:
Mark J. Boda
George J. Brooke
Esther Glickler Chazon
Steven D. Fraade
James S. McLaren

Number 43

THE QUMRAN PARADIGM

A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF SOME FOUNDATIONAL HYPOTHESES IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE QUMRAN SECT

Gwynned de Looijer

Printed on acid-free paper.

∞

For my father, Bert de Looijer

Contents

Acknowledgments

One of the main arguments of this book is that texts do not emerge as the result of solitary contemplation, but rather as the reflection of a process in which the active engagement with others is of vital importance. Accordingly, this work is a reflection not only of my own thoughts and ideas, but it also was shaped by the many conversations and discussions, both academic and leisurely, that I have had with colleagues and friends.

This book is a reworking of my PhD dissertation, and I am grateful to the people who then helped me structure and shape my work: First and foremost, I thank my supervisors, John Barclay, Lutz Doering, and Loren Stuckenbruck. I especially thank John Barclay, whose clear mindedness and professionalism I greatly admire and to whom I am very grateful for taking on a project outside of his subject area. Also, I have learned much from Lutz Doering, whose fundamentally different views of Qumran kept me on my toes and whose near-photographic knowledge of relevant literature has profoundly humbled me. A very special thanks to Loren Stuckenbruck, whose relentless interest, enthusiasm, support, and friendship have made the gravel road of dissertation writing worth traveling.

During this project, many people challenged, helped, and supported me in many ways and I would like to thank them for that: Kate Hampshire and Johannes Haubold for seeing what was right in front of me; Jürgen Zangenberg for his keen interest in the topic; my examiners Stuart Weeks and Philip Davies for their candid comments and creative suggestions for further research; Mary Ledger and Ed Kaneen, for believing in me and providing practical support; Eibert Tigchelaar, for always being scarily critical and cheerfully helpful at the same time (a true gift); Brian Black for our shared joy in talking "text" and "history" anthropologically; Tobias Nicklas, for his kind advice and positive attitude throughout the years; Douglas Davies for his brilliant ideas and for being Douglas Davies; Frans Louwers for his steady friendship and true southern hospitality at the Dutch side of the North Sea (NU EVEN NIET!); Helen Ball and Jamie

Tehrani at the Anthropology Department for giving me the opportunity to teach; Ellen Middleton and Susan Tait, without whom the Theology and Religion Department simply would not have been the same; and finally, Robert Hayward for his generosity and kindness and for being an extraordinary language teacher! Of course, my gratitude extends to the British Arts and Humanities Research Council for granting me a scholarship, which has helped me tremendously throughout the years. Finally, I am very honored that Rod Werline has kindly accepted my manuscript to be published in the Early Judaism and Its Literature series, and I am grateful for all the help from the people at SBL Press, particularly Nicole Tilford.

In Durham, I have been part of a truly international academic community, thus enjoying the company of friends and colleagues from all over the globe, especially: Christian Schneider, Simon Walsh (my Teacher of Righteousness!), Eduardo Díaz-Amado, Nidhani de-Andrado, Karin Neutel, Yulia Egorova, Susana Carro-Ripalda, Jan de Ruiter, Justin Mihoc, and Claudia Merli. A special thank you to Dorothe Bertschmann, for her warm friendship, her willingness to have poignant and challenging theological conversations, and her encouragement regarding my work.

Finally, I am deeply indebted to Iain Edgar, who over time became a most loyal supporter, cooking meals at the end of long days of revising and finally reading through the final versions of my chapters on the search for typos and "Dutchisms." Any mistakes that might occur in this final version are, of course, my own!

Abbreviations

1QpHab	Pesher Habakkuk
1QS	Rule of the Community
AB	Anchor Bible
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
A.J.	Josephus, *Antiquitates judaicae*
ANYAS	Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences
BAAS	*Bulletin of the Anglo-American Archaeological Society*
BARIS	British Archaeological Reports International Series
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
BDB	Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.*
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BH	Biblical Hebrew
BibInt	Biblical Interpretation Series
BibSem	The Biblical Seminar
B.J.	Josephus, *Bellum judaicum*
BJSUCSD	Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California, San Diego
BRLJ	Brill Reference Library of Judaism
ca.	circa (approximately)
CBC	Cambridge Bible Commentary
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CD	Cairo Genizah copy of the Damascus Document
CEJL	Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature
CJA	Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity
CQS	Companion to the Qumran Scrolls
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CurBR	*Currents in Biblical Research*
DD	Damascus Document

DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DSD	*Dead Sea Discoveries*
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
DSSSE	García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
HCS	Hellenistic Culture and Society
FO	*Folia Orientalia*
frag(s).	fragment(s)
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
JAJSup	Supplements to the Journal of Ancient Judaism
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JRA	*Journal of Roman Archaeology*
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods*
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
LSTS	Library of Second Temple Studies
MH	Mishnaic Hebrew
MS(S)	manuscript(s)
Nat.	Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis historia*
NEA	*Near Eastern Archaeology*
Prob.	Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber sit*
QH	Qumran(ic) Hebrew
RB	*Revue Biblique*
RelSoc	Religion and Society
RevQ	*Revue de Qumran*
RHR	*Revue de l'histoire de religions*
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
ScrHier	Scripta Hierosolymitana
SemeiaSt	Semeia Studies
SHR	Studies in the Histories of Religion
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
STDJ	Studies of the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments

SymS	Symposium Series
TSAJ	Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism
VTSup	Supplement to Vetus Testamentum
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

Figures and Tables

Figures

Tables

1
Introduction

> When I examined the scrolls … I found in one of them a kind of book of regulations for the conduct of members of a brotherhood or sect. I incline to hypothesize that this cache of manuscripts belonged originally to the sect of the Essenes, for, as it is known from different literary sources, the place of settlement of this sectarian group was on the western side of the Dead Sea, in the vicinity of En-Gedi.[1]
>
> — Eleazer Sukenik

> If the writings of Qumran exhibit certain points of resemblance to what is known from other sources about the Essenes, and if the ruins of Qumran correspond to what Pliny tells us about the dwelling places of the Essenes, his evidence can be accepted as true. And this evidence in its turn serves to confirm that the community was Essene in character.[2]
>
> — Roland de Vaux

In the first period of Qumran scholarship (1947–1967), theories and ideas with regard to the historical and socioreligious background, theological outlook, function, and meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran community[3] were integrated into one particular consensus view. For reasons that will be addressed below, early Dead Sea Scrolls scholars devel-

---

1. Eleazer Sukenik, *Megillot Genuzot* (Jerusalem: Bialik Foundation, 1948), 16.

2. Roland de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), 137.

3. A note on terminology: This book consciously uses all terms regarding the group at Qumran (i.e., Qumran sect, Qumran community, *yahad*, etc.) indiscriminately, realizing that each of these terms is limited, incorrect, and provokes certain theoretical presumptions. There simply is no correct terminology available. Where scholarly theories of others are described, I have used as much as possible their own terminology; if they speak of sect, I use this too, etc.

oped the viewpoint that Khirbet Qumran once was the residence of an all-male celibate ideologically, socially, and religiously extreme minority group (or sect), possibly (related to) the Essenes, who had segregated themselves from the majority of the people and were awaiting the eschaton, believing themselves to be the chosen ones. [4] Over the years, this persistent consensus view has profoundly influenced the way scholars have approached the various research areas within Qumran scholarship.

Several initial theories have contributed to the establishment of this Qumran paradigm. First, the paradigm predominantly rests on the scholarly construction of an interconnected Qumran triangle.[5] This triangle combines (1) the early scrolls from Cave 1—including the Cairo Genizah's Damascus Document (CD) with (2) the presumed peculiarity of archaeological site of Qumran and (3) information from the classical sources.[6] Hence, the perceptions about the textual content of the scrolls were derived from the first manuscripts that were found in Cave 1. These theories were mainly based on 1QS and 1QpHab (together with the realization that the Cairo Genizah CD text had an outlook somewhat similar to 1QS).[7] Noticeably, the outlooks described in these three texts particularly resembled what the classical sources told about the Essenes,[8] which led to

---

4. Maybe the strongest contemporary advocate for the establishment of this consensus view was Edmund Wilson, a popular journalist of the *New Yorker*, who, due to his article "The Scrolls from the Dead Sea," surprisingly influenced the scholarly field in the direction of a prevalent Qumran paradigm; see *The New Yorker* (May 14, 1955): 45–121.

5. An artful example of the construction of this triangle can be observed in Roland de Vaux's citation at the beginning of this chapter. Other well-known early examples of this triangle construct are Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1956), and André Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (Gloucester: Smith, 1973).

6. In her study of 1QS, Alison Schofield warns against the methodological dangers that are attached to the harmonization of the Qumran texts, the site, and the classical sources; see Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yaḥad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for the Community Rule*, STDJ 77 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 8.

7. See de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 111–19; Frank Moore Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*, 3rd ed., BibSem 30 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 81–85; Józef T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, SBT 26 (London: SCM, 1959), 91.

8. Philo, *Prob.* 72–91; *Pro judaies defensio* (cited in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 8.11.1–8); Josephus, *B.J.* 2.119–161; *A.J.* 18.18–22; also *B.J.* 1.78–80, 2.111–113 (5.144), and *Vita* 10–12; for the geographical location, Pliny the Elder is of value, *Nat.* 5.17.4; see also

an Essene identification of the scrolls. Furthermore, the presuppositions regarding the content of the scrolls and their resemblance to the Essenes as described in the classical sources led to a specific interpretation of the site of Khirbet Qumran, which at the time was mainly thought to be unique as a result of the absence of any comparable geographical and Hellenistic/ Herodian contemporary archaeological sites in the Judean desert.[9] In this light, scholars interpreted the perceived archaeological uniqueness of the site as reflecting Essene peculiarities. These three elements together—content of the scrolls, information from the classical sources, and peculiarities at the site—thus created the paradigm mentioned above.[10]

A second and subsequent important influence on the establishment of the Qumran paradigm was the proposition that the textual finds were representative of and coherently meaningful to the inhabitants of the archaeological site.[11] Moreover, the Qumran scrolls were not only presupposed to represent accurately the socioreligious reality of a community residing at Khirbet Qumran, but they were also perceived as an accurate and meaningful representation of a once existent and deliberately chosen sectarian library.

Finally, the underlying and less openly acknowledged building block from which much of the paradigm was constructed is the presumed social reality of sect and sectarianism, as put forward by many scholars on the basis of Josephus's account of the four "philosophies."[12] To take the notion of sectarianism as the cornerstone of Second Temple society is not without

---

Phillip Callaway, *The History of the Qumran Community: An Investigation*, JSPSup 3 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988).

9. See de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 112.

10. I hereby thank Prof. Jürgen Zangenberg for his comments and willingness to meet and reflect with me. His reference to the Qumran triangle stems from our first talk on March 20, 2012.

11. This proposition is clearly witnessed in the two citations at the beginning of this chapter.

12. In *Bellum judaicum* (2.119, 122, 124, 137, 141–142) Josephus refers to "parties" (*haireseis*), which is often translated as the less neutral "sects." The translation of *haireseis* as "sects" brings up, sociologically, Christian connotations of sectarianism and provokes a tendency to interpret events in textual worlds in terms of dualistic categories. In Josephus's *Antiquitates judaicae* (and in *B.J.* 2.119), the term "philosophies" is used, which in the ancient world is used for groups that try to convert others to their point of view. Therefore, there is an inherent tension between the two terms that Josephus uses not only with regard to the Essenes, but with regard to all mentioned Jewish groups.

problems and creates certain presuppositions about the origin, nature, and function of the scrolls, as well as, above all, the quality and character of groups and group formation.

The first tenet of the Qumran paradigm basically has laid the foundation for various hypotheses with regard to the identification and history of a perceived radical socioreligious organization (or sect),[13] while the second tenet has persisted in maintaining the idea of a characteristic collection or library, partly to categorize texts by separating the sectarian from the nonsectarian ones and partly to demonstrate the uniqueness of the Qumran community within Second Temple Judaism.[14] The third tenet, the presumed connection between ideology and social reality, which shall be the main focus of the present work, is more essential and fundamental for the way scholars have approached the peculiarities of the Qumran situation itself.[15] The following sections will discuss each of these tenets in more detail.

1.1. A Qumran Community?

In the history of Qumran studies, a development has taken place from the presumption that the manuscripts found in the Qumran caves reflected a single community, residing at Khirbet Qumran and authoring all hidden manuscripts, to the notion that the manuscripts reflect more than one community and were not all written at or in the immediate environs of Khirbet Qumran. Over the last six decades, scholars have developed several models to explain "Qumran," of which three hypotheses about the

---

13. See above, nn. 1, 2, and 4; e.g., Florentino García Martínez, "Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis," *FO* 25 (1988): 113–36.

14. See Devorah Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman, STDJ 16 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23–58.

15. The first to use the term "sect" was Louis Ginzberg in 1922 while describing the community behind the CD fragments of the Cairo Genizah (*An Unknown Jewish Sect* [New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1970]). Critical of this indiscriminate usage of "sect" is, for instance, Jutta Jokiranta, "'Sectarianism' of the Qumran 'Sect': Sociological Notes," *RevQ* 20 (2001): 223–39. See also Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yaḥad*, 21–33. However, less specifically, scholars have addressed the inherent effect of the (historical) usage and connotations of sectarianism over a number of decades.

origins of the scrolls and their preservers seem to be considered most viable within the field. A fourth hypothesis, which argues for Sadducean origins is discussed here as a persistent dissonant proposal that has been thought by some to hold merit.[16] The four hypotheses to be described and evaluated may thus be listed as follows: (1) the Essene hypothesis; (2) the Groningen hypothesis; (3) the multicommunity (Essene) hypothesis; and (4) a dissonant opinion: the Sadducean hypothesis.

1.1.1. The Essene Hypothesis

Since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the so-called "Essene hypothesis" has had a strong influence on Qumran scholarship and basically provided the parameters for the still prevalent Qumran paradigm. This hypothesis was first proposed by Eleazar Sukenik and André Dupont-Sommer.[17] Based on the idea that the Rule of the Community was "a kind of book of regulations for the conduct of members of a brotherhood or sect,"[18] Sukenik made the connection between the community behind the rule and what was written in the classical sources about the Essenes. As such, he concluded that the entirety of manuscripts that formed the Dead Sea Scrolls were the main library of an Essene community, a sectarian group which resided "on the western side of the Dead Sea, in the vicinity of En-Gedi."[19] After publication of the first books and articles proposing this Essene identification, Roland de Vaux's excavations of Khirbet Qumran led him to conclude that the site was an Essene settlement from the middle of the second century BCE.[20] As is well known, the identification of the Qumran community with the Essenes primarily rests on what Josephus, Pliny the Elder, and Philo reported about them.[21]

---

16. Schiffman himself never really argues for the Qumranites to be Sadducean but rather follows Ginzberg's model of "an unknown Jewish Sect." Nevertheless, he argues that Qumran halakah has many similarities with Sadducean halakah; see Lawrence Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran*, SJLA 16 (Leiden: Brill, 1975); also, *Qumran and Jerusalem: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010).

17. Sukenik, *Megillot Genuzot*; André Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey*, trans. M. Rowley (Oxford: Blackwell, 1952).

18. Sukenik, *Megillot Genuzot*, 16.

19. Ibid.; see also n. 1.

20. De Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 134–37.

21. Ibid., 137; cf. n. 2.

Various scholars have raised critical questions regarding such straightforward identification of Qumran as Essene. For instance, Steve Mason noted that classical sources need to be approached with scrutiny, since they might reflect the classical author's own agenda.[22] In particular, according to Mason, Josephus's account of the Essenes is "thoroughly Josephan, part of the historian's rhetorical and apologetic presentation of Judaism."[23] In a comparison of the historical sources, Philip Callaway also demonstrated that, in addition to similarities, these ancient reports are not entirely congruous with the Qumran texts. On this basis, he contested a straightforward identification of the Qumran community with the Essene movement.[24] In his article "Who Cares and Why Does It Matter? Qumran and the Essenes, Once Again!" Albert Baumgarten systematically addressed the question of Essene identification.[25] He compared the descriptions of the Essenes in the aforementioned classical sources to both textual and archaeological evidence (i.e., women buried in the cemetery; the presence of a latrine inside the Qumran walls) from Khirbet Qumran. In his conclusion, he pleaded that so many discrepancies beg for the Qumran-Essene identification "to be jettisoned as an unnecessary burden" to Second Temple scholarship.[26] Finally, Carol Newsom rightly added that the word "Essene" does not occur in the Scrolls. She concluded: "Even though there is good warrant for describing the community at least as 'Essene-like,' it is probably better scholarly practice not to use the terms Qumran and Essene as though they were interchangeable."[27] Currently, many scholars are convinced that the original Essene hypothesis can—in

---

22. Steve Mason, "What Josephus Says about the Essenes in His *Judean War*," http://orion.mscc.huji.ac.il/symposiums/programs/Mason00-1.shtml; http://orion.mscc.huji.ac.il/symposiums/programs/Mason00-2.shtml.

23. See the discussion of Mason's argument in John. J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 122–24.

24. See Callaway, *History of the Qumran Community*, 63–87 for the main discussion between Dupont-Sommer and Driver.

25. Albert I. Baumgarten, "Who Cares and What Does It Matter? Qumran and the Essenes, Once Again!" *DSD* 11 (2004): 174–90.

26. Ibid., 190.

27. Carol Newsom, "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran," in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters*, ed. William H. C. Propp, Baruch Halpern, and David N. Freedman, BJSUCSD 1 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 168.

its strict sense—no longer be maintained.[28] These arguments give suffi-cient reason not to take the Essene hypothesis as a point of departure.

1.1.2. The Groningen Hypothesis

Due to unease with the univocal identification of the Qumranites as Essene as advanced by the Essene hypothesis, some scholars developed modified or new views of the Qumran community in its pluralistic envi-ronment. For instance, Philip Davies argued that the Essene movement is the parent movement to the Qumran sect, while others have argued that the Qumran sect gradually parted from the Essene movement and devel-oped its own ideology.[29] Along similar lines, in 1988, Florentino García Martínez published his influential Groningen hypothesis. His hypothesis marked a coherent attempt "to relate to each other the apparently contra-dictory data furnished by the Dead Sea manuscripts as to the primitive history of the Qumran Community."[30] Five basic propositions characterize this approach:[31]

> (1) A clear distinction must be made between the origins of the Essene movement and the origins of the Qumran community.

---

28. See John J. Collins, "Forms of Community in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Eman-uel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, ed. Shalom M. Paul et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 97–112; and "The Yaḥad and the 'Qumran Community,'" in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*, ed. Charlotte Hempel and Judith Lieu, JSJSup 111 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 81–96. However, quite recently, the late Edna Ullman-Margalit has recon-structed the "Qumran triangle" on rational grounds and concludes that the Essene hypothesis is still the best model for explaining the Qumran situation; see Edna Ull-man-Margalit, "Interpretative Circles: The Case of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings Held at the Israel Museum, Jeru-salem (July 6–8, 2008)*, ed. Adolfo Roitman, Lawrence Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref, STDJ 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 649–66.

29. Philip Davies, *Sects and Scrolls: Essays on Qumran and Related Topics* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 69–82. Another version of such an offshoot theory is advanced by Gabriele Boccaccini, who roots the Essene movement in "Enochic Judaism" and sees the Qumran community as a radical split-off group from that movement; see *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

30. García Martínez, "Qumran Origins," 113.

31. Ibid.

    (2) The origins of the Essene movement lay within the Palestinian apocalyptic tradition (late third to early second century BCE).

    (3) The Qumran movement originates as a split-off from the larger Essene movement over the teachings of the Teacher of Righteousness. Those who were loyal to the Teacher eventually established themselves at Qumran.

    (4) The "Wicked Priest" is a collective term and points to the sequence of Hasmonean high priests in a chronological order.

    (5) The formative period of the community is placed within a larger perspective, which takes "ideological development, halakhic elements and political conflicts" into account to reconstruct the community's split and subsequent settlement at Qumran.

Thus, the Groningen hypothesis aimed to provide a historical framework in which the Qumran sectarian texts and the *yahad* community can be positioned. Furthermore, it also attempted to explain the dissimilarities between certain core manuscripts, for example, the Damascus Document (CD/DD) and the Community Rule (1QS). Moreover, it sketched possible reasons behind the *yahad*'s retreat into the wilderness and provides a model of identity.

For our purposes, it is important to address the core element that moved García Martínez's proposal away from the Essene hypothesis, that is, the discordant split-off that made the Qumran community distinct from its Essene parent movement. The basis of a split-off theory lies in the presupposition that in 1QS and CD/DD different sectarian groups are addressed. According to García Martínez, the main reasons for the alleged split-off (other than the Teacher's emphasis on eschatology, unknown to the Essenes[32]) are the cultic calendar, norms of purity in the temple and Jerusalem, and halakot concerning tithes, impurity, and marriage.[33] However, the problem in his analysis lies in the way he explained

---

32. This might also be evidence against a connection between Essenism and the apocalyptic tradition.

33. Note that much of García Martínez's argument is based upon two documents, 11QT[a] (11Q19) and 4QMMT[a] (4Q394), both of which he closely links to the Qumran community. The Temple Scroll (11QT[a]) is placed in the sect's formative period, while 4QMMT[a] is seen as a document authored after the sect's split-off. However, both documents do not contain any of the typical sectarian terminology that would identify them as *yahadic* texts.

and interpreted the occurrence of differences in and between texts. Some of the arguments in these disputes are important to our evaluation.

First, according to Josephus, two different orders of Essenes—celibate and marrying—"were in agreement with one another on the way of life, usages and customs" (*B.J.* 2.160).[34] Accordingly, and despite Callaway's emphasis on inconsistencies, Todd Beall has shown that the classical accounts often agree with the Rule of the Community.[35] If García Martínez is correct in his Essene identification, these two observations speak against a discordant split-off. Second, the idea of a calendrical dispute as a major split-off factor needs to be approached with care. The argumentation depends heavily on the chronological placement of CD/DD, a point that is not always clear in García Martínez's reasoning. Moreover, the classical sources do not report any calendrical disputes and hence do not give us any additional arguments on which García Martínez can base his "Essene parent and Qumran split-off" theory. A third split-off factor, namely, García Martínez's assessment that the Teacher of Righteousness introduced eschatology to Qumran, which "is precisely one of the elements not brought out in the classical description of Essenism," also needs to be evaluated cautiously. This argument seems somewhat in tension with one of the pillars of the Groningen hypothesis, namely, the notion that both the Essenes and the Qumran sect are thought to stem from the Palestinian apocalyptic tradition.[36]

In conclusion, these uncertainties and contradictions call into question García Martínez's identification of the *yahad* as a split-off group from a larger Essene movement and thus weaken the Groningen hypothesis's basic framework of a parent and break away-movement. Moreover, if the idea of a discordant break between the Essene parent movement and the Qumran sect can indeed be called into question, we also need to critically reassess García Martínez's presupposition of a formative period in the establishment of the community that highlights the differences and developments between the parent and daughter's ideology. García Martínez found the textual basis for a split-off in the ideological development from parent to daughter in two documents, namely, 4QMMT[a] (4Q394) and

---

34. See Collins, "Yaḥad and the 'Qumran Community,'" 92.

35. See Todd Beall, *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

36. Florentino García Martínez, *Qumranica Minora I: Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism*, ed. Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, STDJ 63 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 12–14.

11QTª (Temple Scroll/11Q19). However, the reconstruction of 4QMMTª depends heavily on 11QTª, and both documents have their own problems regarding date, genre, and social location.[37] More generally, the criteria by which García Martínez distinguished between formative writings and *yahadic* writings are not always clear, especially in light of the fact that many texts demonstrate redaction and diachronic development and/or are present in various copies, often with textual variants.[38]

It is therefore not surprising that recent scholarship has moved towards more complex theories of assembly. Even though the Groningen hypothesis has long been helpful as a theoretical framework to further investigate key issues in Qumran studies, with the steady publication of the Scrolls, the basic presuppositions of this hypothesis can no longer be maintained.

1.1.3. The Multicommunity (Essene) Hypothesis

Due to the extensive publication of the Scrolls since 1991, scholars have developed new theories regarding the identity of the group(s) reflected in the Qumran texts. Recently, Eyal Regev proposed the notion of a larger, more complex movement behind the S (Rule of the Community) and D (Damascus Document) traditions. Regev suggests an organizational structure in which small local groups together form a larger organization.[39] He distinguished between the communities of the *yahad* as they occur in the S tradition, which he considered to be "an organisation of autonomous, democratic communities with no definite leader" and the D communities, who lived in camps and were ruled by authoritative leaders.[40] In his analysis, he considered D to be more hierarchical and complex, which leads him to conclude that D has a later origin than S. His conclusion reflected a more radical stance: "D was not a direct continuation or adaptation of S, but an entirely different movement, which adopted certain precepts

---

37. I will elaborate on this topic in chapters 2 and 3.

38. Similar methodological remarks are made by Charlotte Hempel, "The Groningen Hypothesis: Strengths and Weaknesses," in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 249–55; also Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yaḥad*, 38–40.

39. Eyal Regev, "The Yahad and the Damascus Covenant: Structure, Organization, and Relationship," *RevQ* 21 (2003): 233–62; also *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*, RelSoc 45 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007).

40. See Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yaḥad*, 43.

and concepts from S and revised them extensively."[41] Hence, according to Regev, the *yahad* was a collective of small, local communities, loosely organized by one central governing power, the "Many."

John J. Collins has also argued that the Qumran texts give evidence for "multiple small assemblies within a larger umbrella organization."[42] In his understanding of the Damascus Document (D), the Community Rule (1QS, 4Q256/4Q258), and the Rule of the Congregation (1Q28a), he reached the following conclusions:

> The Damascus Document provides for "camps" whose members marry and have children, but also for "men of perfect holiness," with whom these are in contrast. The Community Rule describes a yahad, which is not a single settlement but an "umbrella union."… But the Community Rule also describes an elite group, set apart within the yahad, which goes into the wilderness to prepare the way of the Lord.… Finally, the Rule of the Congregation looks to a time in which "all Israel" will follow the regulations of the sect, but still assigns special authority and status to the "council of the community" in the future age."[43]

Hence, Collins, based on his understanding of the relationship between CD/DD and 1QS (plus 1Q28b), argued against the split-off theory held by the Groningen hypothesis. Instead, he provided a framework of diversification that attempts to address the issue of textual diversities. His notion of the existence of "two orders of Essenes who represented different options within the sect, not dissenting factions" as reflected in the S and D traditions has been met with skepticism.[44] One of the most ardent opponents of Collins's proposal is Sarianna Metso. Even though Metso agreed with Collins that the S and D traditions are harmonized through redaction and bear witness both to a large complex and a small, more primitive organization, she firmly stood against Collins's use of 1QS VI, 1–8 as a decisive heuristic tool to build his case. Metso argued that this passage, which envisions small, geographically dispersed communities (cf. 1QS VI, 2 "all their residences" and 1QS VI, 3 "every place where there are ten men [of/from] the community council"), is

---

41. Regev, "Yahad and the Damascus Covenant," 262.
42. Collins, "Forms of Community," 97–112.
43. Ibid., 112.
44. Ibid., 110.

in fact an interpolation to guide traveling members of the community.[45] Alison Schofield agreed with Metso that Collins "glosses over some of the complexities in the relationship between D and S" by stating that these documents merely represent different forms of community, that is, two different Essene orders. However, she did not concur with Metso's objections with regard to 1QS VI, 1–8, as she held that even if these lines were an interpolation, it must be an early one as the lines occur in every manuscript. She therefore thought that these lines might represent the redactor's meaningful and deliberate strategy to make the text reflect the contemporary *yahad* community structure.[46]

Schofield's own textual research on S led her to argue that the S tradition reflects a radial-dialogic model of semi-independent development. According to this anthropological model of the development of traditions, the various S documents reflect sociologically a multitude of decentralized communities, whose rules and regulations rippled out from their ideological center. Subsequently, the S documents developed in dialogue with or over against the ideology of the central body of the Jewish Other (i.e., the Jerusalem temple), yet semi-independently from their own ideological center in order to meet local circumstances. In her proposal for a radial-dialogic model, Schofield attempted to move away sociologically and historically from the previous models of chronological development, such as the Groningen hypothesis, without neglecting diachronic developments within the S and D traditions, which she interprets sociogeographically.

In contradistinction to the satellite proposals of Regev, Collins, Metso, and Schofield, Charlotte Hempel has argued that "some of the primitive and small-scale communal scenarios … reflect the life of the forebears of the *yahad*."[47] Hempel argued against an umbrella framework or a central

<hr>

45. Sarianna Metso, "Whom Does the Term Yahad Identify?" in Hempel and Lieu, *Biblical Traditions in Transmission*, 213–35.

46. Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yaḥad*, 45.

47. Charlotte Hempel, "Emerging Communal Life in the S Tradition," in *Defining Identities: We, You and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls; Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen*, ed. Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović, STDJ 70 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 43–61. More recently, Hempel repeated her position as she acknowledges a closeness in interpretation to Metso, as she calls her diachronic approach "temporal" or "fossil," while calling Collins's and Schofield's approaches as "spatially spread-out;" see Hempel, "1QS 6:2c–4a: Satellites or Precursors of the Yahad?" in Roitman, Schiffman, and Tzoref, *Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture,* 31–40.

organization. Rather, she reconstructed the D and S traditions chronologically, identifying these texts' multilayeredness and diachronic development. Instead of the existence of a framework or central organization to all small-scale "communal scenarios," Hempel proposed to investigate these forms of community in their own right as the forebears of the later *yahad*, who do not (yet) seem to have separated themselves from others. In what Hempel considered later textual material, she identified an emerging community that is more focused on cultic and priestly ideology, but which nonetheless only holds a moderate dissident perspective.

A common denominator for all these theories is their rejection of previous scholarship's idea of the *yahad*'s singular separation, which is equally challenged by recent archaeological evidence. Recent archaeological studies that focus on the Qumran site have discovered same-type pottery between Qumran and the Hasmonean and Herodian palaces in Jericho.[48] Other archaeological studies have suggested an agricultural, secular function of Qumran.[49] For instance, Yizhar Hirschfeld has argued that Qumran, after being abandoned as a Hasmonean fortress, functioned as a regional agricultural trading estate.[50] Also Yitzhak Magen and Yuval Peleg have recently suggested that Qumran firstly functioned as a Hasmonean military outpost, after which it was thought to function as a pottery-producing site.[51] These archaeological studies provide evidence that Qumran was "an integral part of the regional economy."[52] With emerging evidence demanding the need to reexamine hypotheses

---

48. Katherina Galor, Jean Baptiste Humbert, and Jürgen Zangenberg, eds., *Qumran, The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates; Proceedings of a Conference Held at Brown University, November 17–19, 2002*, STDJ 57 (Leiden: Brill, 2006); especially the essay by Rachel Bar-Nathan, "Qumran and the Hasmonean and Herodian Winter Palaces of Jericho: The Implication of the Pottery Finds on the Interpretation of the Settlement at Qumran," 263–77.

49. Pauline Donceel-Voûte, "'Coenaculum': La salle a l'étage du locus 30 a Khirbet Qumrân sur la mer morte," in *Banquets d'orient*, ed. Rika Gyselen, ResOr 4 (Leuven: Peeters, 1992), 61–84.

50. Yizhar Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004).

51. Yitzhak Magen and Yuval Peleg, *The Qumran Excavations, 1993–2004: Preliminary Report* (Jerusalem: Israeli Antiquities Authority, 2007).

52. Jean-Baptiste Humbert, "Interpreting the Qumran Site," *NEA* 63 (2000): 140–43; see also "Some Remarks on the Archaeology of Qumran," in Galor, Humbert, and Zangenberg, *Qumran, The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 19–39.

and assumptions, Jürgen Zangenberg's statement is no doubt true, that "the more archaeological material becomes available, the less unique and isolated Qumran becomes."[53]

1.1.4. A Dissonant Opinion: The Sadducee Hypothesis

From the beginning, one scholar has rejected the straightforward identification of the sectarian Qumran community with the Essenes—Lawrence Schiffman. Schiffman correctly noted a tendency of "reverse methodology"; that is, Qumran scholars searched for halakic evidence to make the Josephan Essene identification already with "preconceived views on the nature of the sect" in mind.[54] Over the last decades, Schiffman has consistently proposed that the *yahad* was closely related to the Sadducees. On the basis of 4QMMT, which he held to be a final attempt to convince a "false Jerusalemite high priesthood," Schiffman argued that these (successors of a group of) Sadducees were unable to accept the replacement of the Zadokite priesthood with the Hasmonean dynasty; hence the self-identification "Sons of Zadok" (in D and S).[55] Schiffman drew his conclusion more specifically from the occurrence of certain halakot in the sectarian documents, which demonstrate great resemblance to Sadducean halakot known from the later rabbinic literature. He primarily used the Temple Scroll (11QT[a]) and the Halakic Letter (4QMMT) to build evidence for his case. He explained the dissimilarities by postulating that the Qumran *yahad* diverged from a broader Sadducean group at a later stage in time. Schiffman also thought that the D tradition "deals with satellite communities, while the *Rule* [of the Community] deals with the main center."[56]

---

53. Galor, Humbert, and Zangenberg, *Qumran, The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls,* 9.

54. Schiffman, *Halakhah at Qumran,* 2.

55. See Philip Davies, who argues against this self-identification, in "Sects from Texts: On the Problems of Doing Sociology of the Qumran Literature," in *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8–10 September 2003*, ed. Jonathan Campbell, William J. Lyons, and Lloyd Pietersen, LSTS 52 (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 79.

56. Lawrence Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their True Meaning for Judaism and Christianity* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994; repr., New York: Doubleday, 1995), 274.

Schiffman's theory has found limited support among Qumran scholars.[57] Many have brought forward the argument that discussions and disputes about the interpretation of Jewish law were at the core of Second Temple Judaism.[58] Also, the "Sadducean positions" in the highly reconstructed legal section B of 4QMMT are few and according to some not nearly enough to sustain a straightforward Sadducean identification. Moreover, like García Martínez's Groningen hypothesis, Schiffman's case leans heavily on 11QT[a] and 4QMMT, both of which are unclear in relation to a possible *yahadic* or even a pre-*yahadic* origin.

These four hypotheses were attempts to explain the social world behind the Qumran documents. Sociohistorical reconstructions commenced with the Essene hypothesis, and many other theories have sprung from its basic foundations. Textually, scholars have tried to theorize about the provenance of these manuscripts found in the caves. In the following section, the idea of a sectarian library is discussed.

1.2. A Sectarian Library?

In studying the *yahad*, we mostly rely on information we derive from the nine hundred manuscripts found in the Qumran caves. The Qumran paradigm especially rests upon the way scholars have assessed the function, meaning, and coherence of these manuscripts. To arrive at a comprehensive picture of a community on the basis of texts is not only a tricky business laden with a degree of arbitrary decisions but also demands some sort of categorization of texts. The notion of a coherent, meaningful, and representative collection, which is often referred to as the Qumran library, is a cornerstone in the theories of the existence of a Qumran community.

---

57. Some scholars have argued for a comparable halakic approach between Qumran texts (predominantly 4QMMT[a] [4Q394]) and Sadducean legal positions; see Jacob Sussman, "The History of *Halakhah* and the Dead Sea Scrolls—Preliminary Observation on *Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah* (4QMMT)," *Tarbiz* 59 (1990): 11–76; Aharon Shemesh, *Halakhah in the Making: The Development of Jewish Law from Qumran to the Rabbis*, Taubman Lectures in Jewish Studies (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 17–18; Aharon Shemesh and Cana Werman, "Halakhah at Qumran: Genre and Authority," *DSD* 10 (2003): 104–29.

58. E.g., James VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 93–95.

The first to speak of a "Qumran library" were two influential scholars of the first hour: Józef T. Milik and Frank Moore Cross.[59] Hence, from the beginning of Qumran scholarship, the notion of a library has brought about connotations of a meaningful interrelatedness of the texts found in the caves, which subsequently allow for a sectarian community as their writers, owners, preservers, and redactors. Accordingly, in a series of articles, Devorah Dimant has advocated for the coherence of the "Qumran collection," which, according to her, reflects uniqueness "in its size and literary character."[60] Dimant concluded that the Qumran manuscripts form a representative and meaningful collection. Moreover, she seemed convinced that the manuscripts known today represent the whole of the manuscripts that once were hidden in the caves, and she considered the collection an intentional, well-chosen, and uniform sectarian library.[61]

With the connection to the site and the notion of a meaningful coherent library of a particular community presupposed, the Qumran collection needed an inventory with regard to contents. Until recently, the commonplace categorization of the manuscripts and fragments from the caves took place according to neat oppositional categories: "biblical" and "nonbiblical," "sectarian" and "nonsectarian." The exact criteria on the basis of which texts were categorized have been the object of many debates, the most influential of which will be discussed here.

---

59. See Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery*; and Cross, *Ancient Library of Qumran*.

60. Dimant, "Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," 23–57; see also Dimant, "Between Sectarian and Non-sectarian: The Case of the *Apocryphon of Joshua*," in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal Texts at Qumran; Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran, 15–17 January, 2002*, ed. Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant, and Ruth A. Clements, STDJ 58 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 105–34; Dimant, "Sectarian and Nonsectarian Texts from Qumran: The Pertinence and Usage of a Taxonomy," *RevQ* 24 (2009): 7–18; Dimant, "The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community," in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, ed. Anton Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, JSJSup 122 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 197–207; also, Dimant, "Between Sectarian and Nonsectarian Texts: The Case of Belial and Mastema," in Roitman, Schiffman, and Tzoref, *Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture*, 235–56.

61. Dimant does not seem to give any weight to the fact that over two millennia, texts and other archaeological evidence must have got lost forever, and hence it is difficult to prove that the current assembly of texts is representative of what once was there.

The first to label certain texts sectarian were Dupont-Sommer[62] and Géza Vermes.[63] Their early categorization was uncomplicated: all nonbiblical documents found in the Qumran caves were considered to be sectarian. In 1983, Hartmut Stegemann first outlined criteria to evaluate specific Qumran texts as sectarian. He only considered a small number of texts to be sectarian, namely, those texts that reflected the recognizable authoritativeness of the Teacher of Righteousness, which elaborated upon the rules of the Qumran community, or which used distinct terminology tying them to such texts.[64]

In 1995, Dimant proposed to establish a systematic classification of all Qumran scrolls according to their sectarian or nonsectarian character as well as their content.[65] She first proposed three main categories: (1) biblical works, (2) works containing community terminology (CT), and (3) works not containing community terminology (NCT).[66] Such a classification naturally requires determining criteria for "community terminology." Dimant recognized four main criteria to signify the CT texts: "(1) The practices and organization of a particular community, (2) the history of this community and its contemporary circumstances, (3) the theological and metaphysical outlook of that community, and (4) the peculiar biblical exegesis espoused by that community."[67]

The distinction between sectarian and nonsectarian texts has driven scholars to identify sectarian features. Like Dimant, Armin Lange focused on sectarian terminology to evaluate a text as sectarian. Following the example of Stegemann, he set criteria based on certain features in the text:[68]

---

62. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran*.

63. Géza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (Cleveland: Collins World, 1977).

64. Hartmut Stegemann, "Die Bedeutung der Qumranfünde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik," in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979*, ed. D. Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 495–530.

65. Dimant, "Qumran Manuscripts," 23–58.

66. Ibid., 26–30.

67. Ibid., 27–28.

68. Armin Lange, "Kriterien essenischer Texte," in *Qumran Kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer*, ed. Jörg Frey and Hartmut Stegemann, Einblicke 6 (Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 59–69. Under the influence of the discovery of a large number of so-called parabiblical or rewritten Bible texts, Lange advances a categorization tool for this body of texts, still on the basis of the foundational distinction

the absence of the Tetragrammaton (except for quotations from scripture), a specific ideology, a 364-day calendar, strict halakah and torah observance, cosmic-ethic dualism and eschatology, a critical attitude towards the priestly order in Jerusalem, specificity of genre (i.e., pesharim), and finally distinct terminology. However, Hempel has argued that only two of these criteria unambiguously distinguish a text as sectarian:[69] specific terminology (Teacher of Righteousness, Wicked Priest, Man of Lies) and literary genres unique to Qumran and therefore presumably of Qumranic authorship (pesharim).

Under the influence of the steady publication of the Scrolls and heavily informed by the desire to explain the origins of a Qumran community, several additional propositions to further differentiate between the different nonbiblical manuscripts of the Qumran library were made.

García Martínez proposed a fourfold classification of nonbiblical texts in accordance with his Groningen hypothesis: (1) sectarian works, (2) works of the formative period, (3) works reflecting Essene thought, and (4) works belonging to the apocalyptic tradition, which gave rise to Essenism.[70] Moreover, García Martínez already problematized his own proposition, as he recognized different layers within certain texts. He therefore argued for the occurrence of a certain sectarian development; that is, he raises the possibility that the Qumran community elaborated upon, adapted, and modernized texts so as to fit their specific ideology. Another proposal was suggested by Torleif Elgvin, who attempted to honor Emanuel Tov's argument for the existence of a specific Qumran scribal school,[71] and has the following classification: (1) works copied according to the Qumran scribal system, (2) works copied for the *yahad*, (3) works composed by

---

between sectarian and nonsectarian texts: see Lange, "From Paratext to Commentary," in Roitman, Schiffman, and Tzoref, *Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture*, 195–216.

69. Charlotte Hempel, "Kriterien zur Bestimmung 'essenischer Verfasserschaft' von Qumrantexten," in Frey and Stegemann, *Qumran Kontrovers*, 71–85.

70. García Martínez, *Qumranica Minora I*, 3–29.

71. Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, STDJ 54 (Leiden: Brill, 2004). Tov's proposal that the Qumran manuscripts reflect a specific scribal culture, which ties the Qumran caves together, has influenced the theories of various scholars that claim the "representativeness of the Qumran collection" as a library. However, Tov's proposal seems to ignore some considerations in the material culture evidence from Qumran that call into question straightforward links between the caves.

the "parents" of the *yahad*, that is, "Essenes," "presectarians," "Enochians," or "apocalyptics," and (4) works of a wider Jewish setting (non-Essene).[72] Gabriele Boccaccini identified an emerging taxonomic consensus on the classification of three distinct groups of texts: (1) texts distinct by ideology and style produced by a single community (sectarian); (2) texts with only some sectarian features, belonging to either a parent movement or brother/sister movement; and (3) texts where sectarian elements are marginal or completely absent, including biblical texts.[73]

Finally, Dimant called for a further refinement of her earlier classification once it became clear that some Qumran texts lack "sectarian characteristic nomenclature and style but embrace notions shared with the sectarian ideology."[74] Realizing that those texts that lack specific sectarian terminology or style cannot be simply classified as sectarian or nonsectarian, Dimant proposed to assign such writings to an intermediate "in-between" category. This new category is to be placed in between what Dimant considers to be sectarian literature proper and "writings devoid of any connection to the community."[75] According to Dimant, candidates for such an in-between sectarian and nonsectarian category are texts like the Temple Scroll and the book of Jubilees. Generally speaking, Dimant recognized Qumranic works that "rework the Bible"[76] as belonging to this in-between category.

Scholars such as García Martínez and Eibert Tigchelaar have lately challenged the categorization into sectarian and nonsectarian (and also Dimant's in-between) texts.[77] After his initial Groningen hypothesis clas-

---

72. Torleif Elgvin, "The *Yaḥad* Is More Than Qumran," in Boccaccini, *Enoch and Qumran Origins*, 273–79.

73. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 57–58.

74. Dimant, "*Apocryphon of Joshua*," 106.

75. Ibid.

76. Naturally, the term is problematic since in Qumran times there was no canonized Bible.

77. Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, "The Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, ed. John J. Collins and Daniel Harlow (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 163–80; see also Tigchelaar, "Classifications of the Collection of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Case of *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*," *JSJ* 43 (2012): 519–50; Florentino García Martínez, "Sectario, No-Sectario, O Qué? Problemas de una taxonomía correcta de los textos qumránicos," *RevQ* 23 (2008): 383–94.

sification, in which he proposed a fourfold distinction among the Qumran literature,[78] García Martínez proposed

> de abandoner los esfuerzos de clasificación anacrónicos de los manuscritos de la colección qumránica como textos 'bíblicos o no bíblicos' y 'sectarios o no sectarios', y … de considerar el conjunto de la colección como un conglomerado de textos religiosos más o menos autoritativos para el grupo que los recogió, los conservó y, en determinados casos, los compuso.[79]

In his proposal to abandon the sectarian/nonsectarian dichotomy, García Martínez critically evaluated all earlier attempts to classify the Qumran literature. He convincingly demonstrates that Dimant's classifications are too simplified to do justice to the complexity of Qumran.[80] According to García Martínez, the abandonment of classifications in terms of sectarian or nonsectarian would help us to appreciate how a specific group within its original historical setting in the Second Temple period handled religious texts and managed their own unique collection of manuscripts. However, in this new proposal the idea of a Qumranic sectarian library, a meaningful collection that can be tied to one community or group, is maintained.

1.3. Moving the Foundation Stone: Sectarianism as a Second Temple Phenomenon?

The concept of sectarianism is commonly used to describe the fragmentation within Jewish society in the Second Temple period. The use of the term "sect," which originated in (Christian) Western sociology, was enhanced by translations of Josephus's description of group divisions, which he labeled "philosophies" or *haereseis*. Consequently, various groups with diverse legalistic and socioreligious ideas were scaled on the basis of their perceived tension with a common Judaism and—to a lesser or larger extent—classified as sects. Also within the field of Qumran studies, the terms sect and sectarianism are frequently employed. The existence of sociological

---

78. García Martínez, *Qumranica Minora I*, 9.

79. García Martínez, "Sectario, No-Sectario," 393.

80. For instance, in the case of the Aramaic Levi Document, the Qumran text demonstrates differences from the documents found in the Cairo Genizah. Hence, classification of such a document as sectarian/nonsectarian would be difficult.

sects within the Second Temple period and, more specifically, the sectarian character of the Qumran community are more or less presupposed. However, in the employment of these terms, their actual meaning is by no means clear. For instance, Schiffman defines a sect as "a religious ideology that may develop the characteristics of a political party in order to defend its way of life."[81] Baumgarten, however, defines sect as "a voluntary association of protest, which utilizes boundary making mechanisms—the social means of differentiating between insiders and outsiders—to distinguish between its own members and those otherwise normally regarded as belonging to the same national or religious entity."[82] Schofield, who clearly acknowledges the complexity of Second Temple society, holds that a characteristic tenet of sects is that they are simultaneously part of and antagonistic to a larger religious community. She reaches the following definition: "A sect is a group which identifies with and simultaneously sets up ideological boundary markers against a larger religious body."[83] Joseph Blenkinsopp attempts to assign certain characteristics to the notion of sect: "the well-known sects … including the Qumran *yaḥad* … deviated from generally accepted social norms, some of them shared common space, and all of them obeyed a charismatic leader." However, on the basis of sociological notions of sectarianism, he argues that "being set apart"-ness is the most decisive aspect in identifying a sect.[84] Davies defines a sect as "a social group of like-minded persons that lies within a larger social entity but which, as opposed to a party, does not understand itself as belonging within that larger group, but outside it. Its boundaries exclude members of the larger group and there is no overlap."[85] The commonality in all these definitions is their sensitivity to the sect's tension with the outside world. However, the various definitions differ rather extensively with regard to the degree of tension, separation, and isolation.

---

81. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 72–73.

82. Albert I. Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation*, JSJSup 55 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 7.

83. Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yaḥad,* 28.

84. Joseph Blenkinsopp, "The Qumran Sect in the Context of Second Temple Sectarianism," in Campbell, Lyons, and Pietersen, *New Directions in Qumran Studies*, 11.

85. Davies, "Sects from Texts," 70. Davies's definition is heavily influenced by Bryan Wilson's work on sects, e.g., Bryan Wilson, *Religious Sects: A Sociological Study*, World University Library (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1970).

Jutta Jokiranta has recognized the variety of terminology and criticized the indiscriminate use of the terms *sect* and *sectarianism* for different designations in different contexts.[86] Hence, while some scholars consciously choose elaborate definitions, containing all sorts of inherent problems, others have used the term sect casually, presupposing that any reader will implicitly understand what is meant by the employment of the term.[87] Broadening definitions, in which the term sect can easily equal the terms "group," "movement," or "faction," run the risk of losing their explanatory power altogether, as they complicate the identification and quality of a specific group phenomenon, such as a Qumran community. Stricter definitions, which contain the sense of "being set apart"-ness from wider society are equally problematic: first, because of their often pejorative connotations (stemming from the term's Christian roots), and, second, because they implicitly presuppose a unified socio-religious outside world, that is, a "church."[88] Hence, by ascribing terms like sect and sectarianism to the social phenomenon of group formation or societal fragmentation, one also opens the door to all sorts of confusion with regard to the diverse semantic fields of these terms.

Partly this confusion is fueled by the development of the sociological field of the study of sectarianism itself. Within the sociological field, critique has been uttered about various aspects of the usage of models of sect and sectarianism: models are supposed to be anachronistic and

---

86. "Thus, for the same groups, one may call them 'parties' or 'factions,' the other separates between 'reform movements' and 'sects,' and a third may speak of 'reformist sects' and 'introversionist sects' … and we can only guess how readers of Qumran Studies in different countries and cultures understand the term" (Jokiranta, "Sociological Notes," 224).

87. This tendency started even before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, when the Damascus Document was discovered in the Cairo Genizah; see Solomon Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, Documents of Jewish Sectaries 1 (Cambridge: University Press, 1910); see also Ginzberg, *Unknown Jewish Sect*.

88. The first notion of the term sect can be found in the work of sociologist Max Weber. Weber's thoughts on sects can be found throughout his work, but he is nowhere specific. His most important contribution might be *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1925). Weber's student, Ernst Troeltsch, the German sociologist and theologian, placed the terms church and sect in a dichotomous relationship and created an ideal-type of church and an ideal-type of sect, identifiable through oppositional characteristics; see Ernst Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, trans. Olive Myon (New York: Macmillan, 1931).

ethnocentric; that is, they were designed with specific cultural, socio-economic, and historical settings in mind. Also, models reflect a specific philosophical history, which limits their compatibility and commensurability in cross-cultural analyses. Furthermore, it is often stated that models are oversimplifications that tend to block out dissonant data.[89] Pieter Craffert argues that "once within the framework of a particular model, it is difficult, if not impossible, to consider viewpoints which do not belong to that framework."[90] Therefore, what he calls a model's "goodness of fit" is difficult to establish. Even though there might be a fit between the model and the empirical data, in itself this "is not necessarily a confirmation that it is either a good model or an appropriate model for that set [of data]."[91]

Moreover, typologies and models of sect and sectarianism depend heavily upon antagonistic dependencies and as such on the oppositional concept of the outside world—a sect's social environment. In describing the Qumran texts as a coherent sectarian library and the Qumranites as sectarians, the notion of sectarianism not only drives the perception, classification, and interpretation of its contents, but it also presupposes a social context that reflects a diversified or contrasting common Judaism. Even if one wants to cling to the idea of a sectarian Qumran community and its library, research on group formation has shown that although socioreligious groups in tension tend to perceive the outside world ideologically as a monolithic stronghold of evil, the sociohistorical reality is that these groups develop "as intensified versions of a shared mainstream culture and not as alien movements imported into it."[92] Moreover, in environments where sects are dominant, a binary typological structure seems to lose

---

89. See Pieter Craffert, "An Exercise in the Critical Use of Models: The 'Goodness of Fit' of Wilson's Sect Model," in *Social Scientific Models for Interpreting the Bible: Essays by the Context Group in Honor of Bruce J. Malina*, ed. John J. Pilch, BibInt 53 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 23. See further Stephen Barton, "Early Christianity and the Sociology of the Sect," in *The Open Text: New Directions for Biblical Studies?* ed. Francis Watson (London: SCM, 1993), 144.

90. Craffert, "Exercise in the Critical Use of Models," 23.

91. Ibid.

92. Maxine Grossman, "Cultivating Identity: Textual Virtuosity and 'Insider' Status," in García Martínez and Popović, *Defining Identities*, 1–11; see also Frederik Barth, *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference* (Propect Heights, IL: Waveland, 1998).

much of its analytical power and explanatory strength with regard to the cultural complexity of society as a whole.[93]

Thus having evaluated the sociohistorical theories of the history of the Qumran community, the classification theories with regard to its library, and its underlying ideological framework of sectarianism, we now need to address what we know of the historical world within which Qumran functioned. This historical world, or at least what we can reconstruct of it, will be discussed in broad strokes in the next section.

1.4. Judea and Judaism in Second Temple Times: Power, Privilege, and Fragmentation

In order to understand the Qumran situation and its place within the larger contemporary society, we need to obtain information about its larger socioreligious and political context. As we now know, with the help of advanced techniques of carbon-14 testing, AMS testing, paleography, archaeology, and the historical allusions in the Scrolls,[94] all Qumran documents, with the exception of the Copper Scroll (3Q15) from Cave 3, can be dated between the late-third/early-second century BCE and the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE. Hence, if we can take these dates as a point of departure, we would have to focus on Judaism in the Hellenistic, Maccabean, and Roman periods. However, we might also want to consider the historical background against which Jewish groups came into existence. Davies, who considers Judaism multiform in nature, has argued that Jewish group formation has its roots in exilic times and became manifest in the early Persian period.[95] Similarly, Lester Grabbe holds that "sects and movements have a long history in Judaic religion, perhaps going back to preexilic times but most likely being present already in the Persian period."[96] Even though Grabbe admits that such a preexilic origin of

---

93. See Jokiranta, "Sociological Notes," 31; Barton, "Early Christianity and the Sociology of the Sect," 158; Craffert, "Exercise in the Critical Use of Models," 24.

94. For a general overview of these methods, see, e.g., James VanderKam and Peter Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity* (London: T&T Clark, 2002), 3–55.

95. Philip Davies, "Sect Formation in Early Judaism," in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*, ed. David Chalcraft (London: Equinox, 2007), 143–44.

96. Lester Grabbe, *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh* (London: Routledge, 2000), 207.

sectarianism is hard to prove, Blenkinsopp argues that biblical records of the time of the kingdoms contain evidence for group formation within ancient Israel.[97] Here, he finds evidence for the "existence of distinctive subgroups" in the models of charismatic leadership as provided in the description of Elijah and Elisha.[98] With respect to a Persian origin, Blenkinsopp, like Davies, provides more certainty, by pointing to the insider/outsider terminology in Ezra-Nehemiah. Hence, a brief overview of Qumran's socioreligious and political context needs to reckon with preexisting influences from at least the Persian period (538–332 BCE).

Richard Horsley has researched the origins of the Judean temple-state under Persian rule.[99] He finds that the Persian imperial politics of the rebuilding of the temple and reinstating the high priesthood was decisive in the foundations of the political-religious struggles that eventually led to the coming into being of multiple Jewish sects. He names basically four conflicts that contributed to the rise of Jewish sectarianism:

(1) The division between those who remained in the land after the Babylonian conquest and those who returned from exile, encouraged and reinstated by the Persian ruler;
(2) The division between the peasantry and the Jerusalemite aristocracy, who were centered around the high priesthood;
(3) Conflicts between various priestly fractions; and
(4) Power struggles between local magnates and between local magnates and the Persian ruler.[100]

Horsley concludes that, even though the high priesthood might have perceived itself as the functional ruler of the Judean temple state, in effect they represented a "political-economic as well as a religious institution that served as the instrument of imperial rule in Judea."[101]

---

97. Blenkinsopp, "Qumran Sect in the Context of Second Temple Sectarianism," 10–25.

98. Ibid., 10–11.

99. Richard Horsley, *Scribes, Visionaries and the Politics of Second Temple Judea* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007).

100. Ibid., 22–31. Horsley clearly follows Lenski's theory of agrarian society; see Gerhard Lenski, *Power and Privilege: A Theory of Social Stratification*, McGraw-Hill Series in Sociology (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), 190–296.

101. Horsley, *Scribes, Visionaries, and the Politics*, 32.

Grabbe is very critical of historical reconstructions concerning the Persian era, simply because the sources are not always reliable, sometimes skimpy and problematic, and, during certain centuries, almost nonexistent (especially 465–404 BCE).[102] He does, however, acknowledge that the Persian era has sown the seeds of a decisive religious outlook (including angelology, demonology, and eschatology) and has brought about an early formation of what later would become a Jewish canon of scripture.

The Hellenistic period (332–63 BCE) provides much more information and a much clearer view of the rise of Jewish factions. After Alexander the Great's death in 323 BCE, rivalries between the Seleucid and Ptolemaic empires left Judea in a constant state of war and chaos. Judea was mainly exploited for taxes and Hellenistic influences were considerable. Greek language was widespread and some of the Jerusalemite aristocracy seemed to have evaluated this hellenization of Jewish culture favorably.[103] However, the reign of the Seleucid ruler Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175–164 BCE) and his hellenizing program initially split the nation into two opposing parties: (1) the Hellenists among whom were many from the educated and aristocratic classes, and (2) the Devout/Hasidim, who were considered to represent the traditional views of the scribes. It was only Antiochus's attempt to abolish Jewish religion altogether that turned not only the small group of the Hasidim but also the majority of the people against hellenization and ultimately resulted in the Maccabean revolt.

In his study of Jewish society in the Second Temple period, Baumgarten positions the emergence of Jewish sectarianism in these Maccabean times, and he basically identifies five "decisive factors" responsible for the flourishing of sects: (1) the encounter with Hellenism; (2) the rising literacy levels; (3) urbanization and the loss of "reference"; (4) the inherent eschatological tension within Judaism and its search for redemption; and (5) priestly reform resulting in a renewed emphasis on the correct observance of the law.[104] Baumgarten evaluates sectarianism as a relatively

---

102. Lester Grabbe, *Yehud: A History of the Persian Province of Judah*, vol. 1 of *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period*, LSTS 47 (London: T&T Clark, 2004).

103. See Emil Schürer, *History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C–A.D. 135)*, ed. Géza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Martin Black, rev. and enl. ed. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2004).

104. Baumgarten, *Flourishing of Jewish Sects*, 7. Grabbe considers Baumgarten's "decisive factors" for the rise of sectarianism merely hypothetical.

minor phenomenon (sects supposedly made up 6 percent of the total population). Accordingly, he claims that society's low literacy levels demonstrate that sects were elitist.[105] Moreover, he does not associate these sects with high boundaries, as he asserts a certain openness: people were able to check out several sectarian groups before making a choice for one of them.[106] Finally, Baumgarten postulates that sects were not very different but artificially "blew up" their legalistic differences in order to attract potential members.[107] In a recent article, Davies—somewhat in line with Baumgarten—has argued that the reasons for sectarianism lay in politics, disguised and legitimized by (religious) ideology.[108] This is certainly true for the Maccabean position. While Mattathias and Judas Maccabeus initially fought for the preservation of Jewish religion against the hellenizing program of Antiochus IV, Judas's quest changed after Antiochus V Eupator had guaranteed the rights of the Jews in 162 BCE.[109] Now, politics and internal struggles for power between the high priesthood and the political leader(s) became more pronounced, as did the wish to expand the land. Rulers and high priests sought for alliances with foreign powers to secure their positions over against one another.[110] In 143/142 BCE, Simon managed to achieve Jewish freedom in return for his loyalty to the Syrian king

---

105. Baumgarten's estimates depend heavily on Josephus and Philo and are to be addressed with caution. Moreover, there seems to be some tension within Baumgarten's reasoning, as he, on the one hand, presumes the rise of literacy levels to cause sectarianism, while, on the other hand, he presumes that low literacy levels cause sectarian groups to be relatively small and elitist.

106. This observation is based on Josephus, who, according to Baumgartner, "learned all there was to learn from all schools and sources" (Baumgarten, *Flourishing of Jewish Sects,* 52). Baumgarten emphasizes a sect's voluntary character and downplays one of the main characteristics of a sect, i.e., the existence of high social boundaries between insiders and outsiders. However, an example of the existence of such social boundaries can be found in the Rule of the Community's entrance requirements; see Matthias Klinghardt, "The Manual of Discipline in the Light of Statutes of Hellenistic Associations," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects*, ed. Michael O. Wise et al., ANYAS 722 (New York: The New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 251–70.

107. According to Baumgarten, legal authority and the explanation of the law were not decisive for sectarianism, neither were calendar and legal practice; Baumgarten, *Flourishing of Jewish Sects,* 79–80.

108. Davies, "Sect Formation in Early Judaism," 136.

109. See Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*, 125–242.

110. Ibid., 175–88.

Demetrius. At this time the Jews started their own chronology: "Documents and treatises were dated according to the years of Simon, High Priest and Prince of the Jews."[111] But, Simon wanted more, and on 18 Elul 140 BCE a popular decree was ordered: Simon should be high priest, military commander, and ethnarch of the Jews, and he should be "their leader and high priest forever until a trustworthy prophet should arise" (1 Macc 14:41).[112] Hence, the formerly hereditary post of high priest was transformed into "a high-priestly and princely dynasty, that of the Hasmoneans."[113]

Gerhard Lenski has researched agrarian societies and their way of dealing with power and privilege.[114] The reign of the Hasmoneans demonstrates an especially high degree of congruency with Lenski's findings. Not only do agrarian societies tend to be conquest states,[115] but they also tend to turn to internal struggles if struggles with foreign enemies—mainly over the possession of the land—are lacking. Internally, conflicts can persist between (1) the ruler and the governing classes, (2) governing classes among themselves, (3) the governing classes and the retainer class, and (4) the retainer class and the peasant class.[116] Horsley finds that imperial struggles between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids already gave rise to Judean power struggles between aristocratic groups. And after the foundation of the independent Hasmonean state, these internal tensions between social groups within Jewish society became even more evident. Now, an even closer link between religion and politics was established, since for a period, the high priest and the political leader were one and the same person. Accordingly, Lenski finds that in most agrarian societies religion is "a matter of concern to state authorities."[117] Like Baumgarten and Davies, he points out that power struggles were hardly ever over principles or religious matters, "rather they were struggles between opposing factions of the privileged classes, each seeking their own special advantage,

---

111. Ibid., 190; see 1 Macc 13:33–42, 14:27.

112. Ibid., 193.

113. Ibid., 194.

114. Lenski, *Power and Privilege*, 190–296.

115. "Social units formed through the forcible subjugation of one group by another" (ibid., 195).

116. Ibid., 190–296, with regard to this social stratification, especially fig. 1, 284. The retainer class is considered to be "a small army of officials, professional soldiers, household servants and personal retainers, all of whom served them [the ruler and the governing classes] in a variety of more or less specialized capacities," 243.

117. Ibid., 209.

or, occasionally, a small segment of the common people seeking political advantage and preferment for themselves."[118] Hence, the state in itself can be seen as the "supreme prize for struggle," since "gaining power and control over the state was to win control of the most powerful instrument of self-aggrandizement found in agrarian societies."[119] Also, Lenski finds a natural basis for symbiosis between political rulers and the priestly class: only the priestly blessing would secure and legitimize an abusive political system that took the greater part of the common people's revenues for the elite's enrichment. Since literacy levels were relatively low, the priestly class was often influential in matters of administration and education, in other words, in all matters that required scribal qualities. However, Horsley argues that "power struggle between factions of the Jerusalemite aristocracy [priestly and non-priestly] would have adversely affected the relative positions of Levites, ordinary priests, temple singers, 'scribes of the Temple' and others involved in and dependent on the operation of the temple-state."[120] Hence, political and economic objectives were often religiously legitimized, since identification with the right political and religious group became an individual's resource or obstacle to advancement in society.[121]

Thus, the Hasmoneans played an ambivalent role in these power struggles: They started out on the side of the most devout, but their later political aspirations made them close ranks with the influential nobility (mainly Sadducees), who had a more worldly focus. John Hyrcanus (135/134–104 BCE) even broke with the Pharisees, a break that became even more severe under Alexander Jannaeus (103–176 BCE), as he neglected his high-priestly duties in favor of his worldly rule. His political successor, his wife Alexandra (76–67 BCE), restored the bond with the Pharisees. After her predominantly peaceful reign, her sons Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II fought one another for the rule of the Jewish state, which led to the Roman general Pompey's interference: the independent Jewish state came to an end (63 BCE) as Palestine was controlled by the Roman governor of Syria. Only the care of the temple was left to Jewish (Hasmonean) control. The time between Pompey's arrival in Jerusalem and the end of the Bar Kokhba revolt (63 BCE–135 CE) can mainly be

---

118. Ibid., 211.
119. Ibid., 210.
120. Horsley, *Scribes, Visionaries, and the Politics*, 51.
121. Lenski, *Power and Privilege*, 285.

characterized by struggle for influence, power, and privilege. In 57–55 BCE, Judea was divided into five Roman districts, each with its own Sanhedrin. Finally, it was Herod who seized power (37–4 BCE) by defeating and disposing of his enemies. Herod's allegiance to Rome and Hellenistic culture was strong. Even though he officially did not interfere with the powerful Pharisaic party and seemed to have respect for the temple cult, in reality he appointed and dismissed high priests to his liking, built a number of pagan temples throughout Palestine, took away most of the Sanhedrin's power and virtually murdered what was left of the Hasmonean family.

Undoubtedly the seeds for Jewish factionism/sectarianism were planted in exilic and Persian times, but its flourishing is closely connected to external imperial power struggles, to its economic consequences for Jewish society, and to internal struggles that were far more complex than initially thought. Next to the obvious disputes over legal matters, societal divisions, which eventually led to the formation of factions and groups, were also the result of social tensions between ethnic groups, between classes, between city-dwellers and peasants, and between aristocratic and priestly groups struggling for power. Hence, I would like to work from the idea that Judaic society in Second Temple times was a multifaceted and fragmented disunity in a complex cultural area, during a time and age which in modern terms we would call globalizing, a time, in which internally and externally based threats contributed to an already existing socioreligious identity crisis, which forced Judaism to renegotiate its boundaries of self-understanding. These negotiations were influenced by internal and external social, historical, political, and economic factors and ultimately led to an increasing power base for scriptural centrality over against the diminishing power of the temple cult.

It is in this complex and dynamic world that the documents of Qumran find their home. Theories about the meaning and function of Khirbet Qumran and the socioreligious world of the Qumran documents must reckon with this broader societal complexity.

1.5. The Qumran Paradigm: A Persistent Phenomenon?

The preceding sections have discussed the prevalent perceptions of the Qumran inside world and the sociohistorical situation of the outside world of Second Temple society. Within these settings, Qumran scholarship has found its theoretical niche in coming to terms with the textual and

material evidence found at Khirbet Qumran. Over the last few decades, the Qumran paradigm, that is, the consensus view of a Qumran Essene-like sectarian community that set itself apart from others, has been called into question. Under the influence of the almost complete publication of the scrolls, interdisciplinary research, and our better understanding of the history of Judaism, the scholarly field of Qumran studies has questioned the early parameters of the Qumran paradigm in all sorts of ways and in all sorts of areas. The areas on which these questions are focused can be broadly divided into five recognizable clusters:

(1) Archaeological questions, such as: Is the original archaeology technically correct, and do its results allow for the conclusions drawn by de Vaux? Does the archaeological evidence reflect a segregated Qumran Essene-like sect? How do the texts and the archaeological evidence relate? Are the texts and the site connected? What is the significance of the cemetery?

(2) Ideological questions, such as: Are the Qumranites identical to Josephus's Essenes, and what is the evidence? Are there women in Qumran? Is there such a thing as Qumran theology? To what degree do the texts have a sectarian outlook? How to determine a sectarian text? Is sect useful as a sociological term? What are the specific characteristics of Qumran sectarianism? How does Qumran sectarianism build its identity and self-definition? Is the concept of dualism a core characteristic of Qumran theology? Does dualistic thinking occur in all sectarian texts, and if so, is the dualistic framework identical in all these texts?

(3) Literary questions, such as: How do CD and 1QS relate to one another? How do we assess the occurrence and relationship of the Hebrew and Aramaic Qumran corpus? Does the difference in language signify a different sociohistorical provenance? Can the Qumran texts be categorized? Do these categorizations aid or obstruct the analysis? Are there alternative ways to evaluate the texts? What is the relation between the various categories of texts within the Qumran library? Why does the library contain so many parabiblical works? Do they make a coherent and constructive unity? How do we deal with the oppositional views among the texts?

(4) Sociohistorical questions, such as: What is the meaning of the Qumran library? Are all the texts produced at Qumran? What

is the sociohistorical origin of the Qumran community? Can we read for history and social location in the sectarian texts? What do we know about the organizational structure of the Qumran situation on the basis of the texts we have? Do the texts give us a clear view of Qumran's social reality? Do the Qumranites reside in Qumran only, or is there a bigger movement?

(5) Methodological questions are all those questions that relate to how clusters 1–4 work together. But also: Can we use social scientific, particularly sociological models of sect, to open up the texts and broaden our knowledge of Qumran? If we use social scientific methods, which ones work and which ones do not? How do we read for history in the Qumran sectarian texts?

Many of these questions that critically reassess the first theories about Qumran have recently been asked, and I have listed them here in an attempt to implicitly gather together the problems that can be identified on the basis of the discussions on the previous pages of this introduction. These questions, which address the difficulties and discussions regarding various aspects of the parameters of the Qumran paradigm and its adjustments, have at least awakened us to the complexity of Qumran. However, these critical questions are often asked and answered from within the boundaries of the Qumran paradigm itself.[122]

The cause for the occurrence of this self-fulfilling prophecy of the Qumran paradigm and its adjustments might be found in the fact that many of the question marks that have surfaced in recent scholarship relate to theses that have been mirror-reading ideology onto sociologically definable groups. The foregoing discussion regarding the various approaches to Qumran has demonstrated enough problems to cast doubt on the assumption that ideas in texts have to be equated with sociological groups. In this book, I will attempt to question such mirror reading between ideology and social identity and to explore whether it would be possible to answer these

---

122. A good example of this is Edna Ullmann-Margalit's book *Out of the Cave: A Philosophical Enquiry into the Dead Sea Scrolls Research* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), which attempts to evaluate Qumran scholarship's methods, attitudes, evaluations, and theorizations. Meant as a critical evaluation of DSS scholarship and posing numerous interesting methodological questions, the book functions within the paradigm and therefore leads to conclusions that do not fundamentally challenge the interpretative circle that upholds the paradigm in the first place.

questions (and other questions of this sort) from another vantage point and hence put Qumran in a different perspective.

The chapters that follow reckon with the possibility that too much weight might have been put on specific peculiarities within a number of Qumran texts in order to identify a group that mirrors these peculiarities sociologically. This study questions whether we have not all too easily retrieved from these texts distinguishing features in order to read into them a sociological reality of a radical minority group, a distinctive self-marginalized Qumran sect that (1) segregated itself from others and did not partake (any longer?) in the vigorous socioreligious negotiations of its time, (2) had significantly more extreme or more peculiar ideas than contemporary others, (3) was placed or placed itself at the margins of Judaism, and, therefore, (4) cannot be considered to be a representative of the ideological and sociological discourse that redefined the boundaries and parameters of Judaism in this period.

To put it differently: To what degree do the distinguishing features found among the Qumran texts necessitate the postulate of a sectarian community that segregated itself socioreligiously, ideologically, and maybe even geographically from others? The material that I will cover in the next chapters explores, in different ways, certain aspects of such a mirror reading connecting ideology and social reality, with this background question in mind.

Chapter 2 explores the way in which scholars have classified and categorized the collection of Qumran texts. It focuses on the most influential proposals for the literary and sociohistorical classifications of texts and questions whether and to what extent such classifications influence and determine the positioning of certain texts in light of a sectarian paradigm. A deeper look into these classification systems is warranted, because, for all the differences in their approaches, similar textual material emerges as critical to their frameworks. Moreover, one of the critical side effects of these classification systems is the notion that these texts—implicitly or explicitly—need to be placed within a framework of chronological development. Therefore, this chapter also explores the implications of this notion of chronology and its relation to the Qumran paradigm.

Chapter 3 is a test case with regard to our analysis of the classification systems and its concept of chronological development, as it reevaluates the text of 4QMMT and its prevalent provenance as a foundational document of the Qumran sect. As 4QMMT is an example of a text which has played a major, but difficult, role in both literary and sociohistorical classifications

of Qumran, this document makes an excellent test case to identify possible problems with classification systems in general and mirror reading of ideology and sociology in particular. Moreover, this chapter identifies and reevaluates those peculiar and unique elements within 4QMMT on the basis of which scholars have argued for the text's important provenance. As such, it is interested in the question whether the peculiarities within the text point towards a sectarian or *yahadic* provenance or whether they also allow for a wider scale of possible interpretations.

Chapter 4 explores another aspect that has proven to be an important contributor to the sustainability of the Qumran paradigm, that is, the notion of a recognizable ideological coherence among certain Qumran texts. This chapter explores the ideological outlook from a theoretical perspective: it questions the definition, boundaries, and Qumran-specific evaluation of the concept of dualism. An analysis of the theoretical foundation for the identification of dualism is a first step in evaluating theories about Qumran dualism. Hence, this chapter provides the groundwork for questions about the relation between a Qumran-specific evaluation of ideological coherence and the prevalent Qumran paradigm, which will be discussed in chapter five.

In chapter 5, the Treatise of the Two Spirits (1QS III, 13–IV, 26) is explored as a test case for the ideological peculiarities of Qumran dualism. It asks whether and to what extent the Treatise and other dualistically evaluated sectarian texts might be interrelated on the basis of their dualistic outlook and what the function of such an ideological link might be. Even though the provenance of the Treatise as the zenith of Qumran theology has changed over time and some scholars no longer take the text to be the pivotal expression of the sect's dualistic outlook, the dualism in the Treatise is commonly taken as an important representative of one of the ideological boundary-markers of the Qumran community. As such, this text is worth evaluating in light of its dualistic features and its position and function within the Qumran paradigm.

Thus, the main thread of this study, namely, the questioning of the close alliance between ideology and sociology, is signified by the special focus on two test cases, 4QMMT and the Treatise, both of which scholars have regarded as foundational documents, one for the sociohistorical blueprint of the Qumran sect's theology and the other for the ideological basis of the Qumran sect's cosmology and anthropology. While these documents have been considered decisive in distinguishing specific characteristics of the Qumran community, neither of these texts mentions a

connection to a *yahad* or uses *yahadic* terminology. Nevertheless, scholars have domesticated these texts within the realm of a sectarian paradigm.

This study is primarily focused on methodological questions on the metalevel of Qumran scholarship and explicitly does not want to be an exegetical study. The analyses of 4QMMT and the Treatise must be seen as illustrative to the main attempt of this monograph to investigate methodological issues and difficulties in mirror reading ideology and social identity, with special attention to the influence of the Qumran paradigm. This study explicitly wants to leave room for other and more fundamentally revisionist propositions with regard to the provenance of certain Qumran texts, while stabilizing the validity of certain aspects of the paradigm for other specific texts. Therefore, the final chapter will propose that we approach the prevalent Qumran paradigm with more revisionist scrutiny and content ourselves with the possibility that the Qumran manuscripts might not deal with an isolated community but with one that actively participated within the shaping of ideas and traditions of Judaism in this period. As such, we might reconsider these texts from a different vantage point, namely, from the perspective that they have something to contribute to our understanding of the shaping of Jewish traditions as a whole in the first centuries BCE and CE.