

# The Profile and Character of Qumran Cave 4

Hempel, Charlotte

DOI:

[10.1163/9789004316508\\_006](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004316508_006)

License:

None: All rights reserved

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Hempel, C 2016, The Profile and Character of Qumran Cave 4: The Community Rule Manuscripts as a Test Case. in M Fidanio (ed.), *The Caves of Qumran: Proceedings of the International Conference, Lugano 2014*. STDJ, vol. 118, Brill, Leiden. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004316508\\_006](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004316508_006)

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

**Publisher Rights Statement:**

Publisher conditions checked

**General rights**

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

**Take down policy**

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

# **The Profile and Character of Qumran Cave 4: The Community Rule Manuscripts as a Test Case**

**c.hempel@bham.ac.uk**

## **1. Introduction**

The Qumran marl Cave 4 was discovered by the Bedouin in 1952 and revealed the lion's share of texts to have emerged from the caves in the vicinity of Khirbet Qumran. Scholars estimate Cave 4 to have contained almost 700 fragmentary manuscripts.<sup>1</sup> Several scholars

---

<sup>1</sup> Dominique Barthélemy, Józef T. Milik, and Roland de Vaux, *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân* (DJD 3; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 9-22 (De Vaux); George J. Brooke, *Qumran and the Jewish Jesus* (Cambridge: Grove Books, 2005), 9; 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; Józef T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (trans. John Strugnell; SBT 26; London: SCM, 1959), 16-18, 20; Mladen Popović, 'The Manuscript Collections: An Overview,' in *The T & T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. George Brooke and Charlotte Hempel; London: T & T Clark, forthcoming); Lawrence H. Schiffman *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background to Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia, Pa.: JPS, 1994), 54-56; Roland de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Schweich Lectures 1959* (Oxford: OUP; The British Academy, 1973), 52; Sidnie White Crawford, 'Qumran: Caves, Scrolls, and Buildings,' in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam* (ed. Eric Mason et al.; JSJSup 153; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 253-273, 266-267.

have suggested Cave 4 is a library<sup>2</sup> or the ‘stacks’ of a library.<sup>3</sup> Thus, Schiffman has interpreted the holes in the walls of the main chamber of Cave 4 (technically to be divided into two sub-caves) as evidence of fixtures of ancient ‘shelves’ – the wooden parts of which would not have survived the ravages of time.<sup>4</sup> Jean-Baptist Humbert envisages a carefully planned concealed library complex hollowed out in the marl terrace.<sup>5</sup> Joan Taylor, by contrast, proposes that Cave 4 was used in order to offer temporary storage for manuscripts ultimately destined for what she calls ‘preservation-burial.’<sup>6</sup>

---


<sup>2</sup> Dimant, ‘The Qumran Manuscripts,’ 36; Armin Lange, ‘The Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls – Library or Manuscript Collection?,’ in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* (ed. Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel, and Eibert Tigchelaar; STDJ 61; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 177-193, 191; Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 54-56.

<sup>3</sup> Hartmut Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998), 74; Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, ‘Old Caves and Young Caves: A Statistical Reevaluation of a Qumran Consensus,’ *DSD* 14 (2007): 313-333, 327-329.

<sup>4</sup> Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 56.

<sup>5</sup> Jean-Baptiste Humbert, ‘L’espace sacré à Qumrân,’ *RB* 101 (1994): 161-214, 194-195.

<sup>6</sup> Joan E. Taylor, ‘Buried Manuscripts and Empty Tombs: The Qumran Genizah Theory Revisited,’ in ‘Go Out and Study the Land’ (*Judges 18:2*): *Archaeological, Historical and Textual Studies in Honor of Hanan Eshel* (ed. Aren M. Maeir, Jodi Magness, and Lawrence H. Schiffman; JSJSup 148; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 269-315, 294-5.

Different explanations have been put forward to explain the many fragments that were found scattered across the floor of Cave 4. Taylor presupposes ancient disruption.<sup>7</sup> Frank [More](#)  Cross, by contrast, suggested the messy scenario went back to the circumstances associated with a hasty deposit.<sup>8</sup> Reservations about the oft repeated suggestion that the Roman army entered Cave 4 and caused considerable damage to its contents have recently been raised by Mladen Popović.<sup>9</sup>

Ever since we have been able to get a sense of the scope and nature of the contents of all eleven scroll caves from Qumran scholars have been able to fathom and describe the profile of the collection – or perhaps collections – for the first time. A number of scholars have started to conceive of a plurality of perhaps inter-related collections at Qumran raising the possibility that some caves reflect a specific sub-section of a larger library or a reader's preferences.<sup>10</sup> A similar trend has for some time characterised recent work on the

---

<sup>7</sup> Taylor, 'Buried Manuscripts and Empty Tombs,' 299; see also DJD 3: 21-22 [De Vaux] and Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery*, 20.

<sup>8</sup> Frank More Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1961), 27 followed by White Crawford, 'Qumran: Caves, Scrolls, and Buildings,' 272.

<sup>9</sup> Mladen Popović, 'Roman Book Destruction in Qumran Cave 4 and the Roman Destruction of Khirbet Qumran Revisited,' in *Qumran und die Archäologie* (ed. Frey, Claussen, and Kessler), 239-291.

<sup>10</sup> Stephen Pfann, 'Reassessing the Judean Desert Caves: Libraries, Archives, Genizas and Hiding Places,' *Bulletin of the Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society* 25 (2007): 147-170; Popović, 'The Manuscript Collections'; Stökl Ben Ezra, 'Old Caves and Young Caves,' 316 and 322-323; see also idem, 'Wie viele Bibliotheken gab es in Qumran?,' in *Qumran und die*

communities and movement behind the collection. Earlier scholarship was fairly confident we are dealing with a single community resident at Qumran alongside a wider camp movement spread across the region. More recently a number of scholars, myself included, propose to read the Rule texts as reflecting a number of inter-related communities.<sup>11</sup> My own

---

*Archäologie* (ed. Jörg Frey, Carsten Claussen, and Nadine Kessler; WUNT 1.278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 327-346, 333.

<sup>11</sup> George J. Brooke, 'From Jesus to the Early Christian Communities: Trajectories Towards Sectarianism in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,' in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture* (ed. Adolfo Roitman, Larry Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref; STDJ 93; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 413-434; John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010); Philip R. Davies, 'The "Damascus" Sect and Judaism,' in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder* (ed. John Reeves and John Kampen; JSOTSup 184; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 70-84 (reprinted in idem, *Sects and Scrolls: Essays on Qumran and Related Topics* [South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 134; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996], 163-177); Florentino García Martínez, '¿Sectario, no-sectario, o qué? Problemas de una taxonomía correcta de los textos qumránicos,' *RQ* 23 (2008): 383-394; Charlotte Hempel, *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context: Collected Studies* (TSAJ 154; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 47-62; 79-105, 293-298; eadem, 'Qumran Communities: Beyond the Fringes of Second Temple Society,' in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. Stanley Porter and Craig Evans; JSPSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 43-53; Sarianna Metso, 'Whom Does the Term Yaḥad Identify?,' in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb* (ed. Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu; JSJSup 111; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 213-235; Eyal Regev, 'Between Two Sects: Differentiating the Yaḥad and the Damascus Covenant,' in *The Dead*

previous work has argued for evidence in the Rule texts ranging from small fellowship groups that met in a variety of places to eat, pray and exchange counsel (1QS 6:1c-3a // 4QS<sup>d</sup> 2: 6b-7a // 4QS<sup>g</sup> 2a-c 1-2a // 4QS<sup>i</sup> 2b-3) to more complex communities such as those being described in the most developed portions of the text as presented by the regulations for sessions of the many (1QS 6:8b-13a // 4QS<sup>b</sup> 11:5-8 // 4QS<sup>d</sup> 3:1-3), the complex admission process (1QS 6:13b-23 // 4QS<sup>b</sup> 11:8,11-13 // 4QS<sup>g</sup> 3:1), and the penal code (cf. 1QS 6:24-7:25 // 4QS<sup>d</sup> 5:1 // 4QS<sup>e</sup> 1:4-15; 2:3-9 // 4QS<sup>g</sup> 3:2-4; 4a-b:1-6; 5a-c:1-9; 6a-e:1-5).<sup>12</sup> The complexity of the evidence is further enhanced by the presence of a large number of at times divergent copies of the Community Rule in Cave 4. This has provoked a range of interpretations. Alison Schofield and John Collins take the evidence to be indicative of a number of inter-related groups who each promulgated their own versions of the Rule and endeavoured to live by it.<sup>13</sup> By contrast, I have argued elsewhere that the textual plurality of the Rules at Qumran is analogous to the textual plurality that so surprised us in the study of the ‘biblical’ manuscripts from Qumran.<sup>14</sup> I therefore argued that the movement behind the Scrolls – and perhaps Second Temple Judaism more widely – was comfortable with producing and preserving several versions of a text side by side.

---

*Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context* (ed. Charlotte Hempel; STDJ 90; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 431-449, and Alison Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for the Community Rule* (STDJ 77; Leiden: Brill, 2009); and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, ‘The Dead Sea Scrolls,’ in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (ed. John J. Collins and Dan Harlow; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010), 163-180.

<sup>12</sup> For bibliographical details of my own contributions see note 10 above.

<sup>13</sup> Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community* and Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad*.

<sup>14</sup> Hempel, *Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, 271-284.

Ground-breaking work was pursued by Devorah Dimant with the publication of a pioneering and important paper on the profile of the library as a whole in 1995.<sup>15</sup> Dimant's particular concern was an initial comprehensive analysis of the corpus from a literary perspective, and she outlines her aims to meet "the need for a comprehensive literary description of the Qumran collection."<sup>16</sup> The issue of provenance was at the forefront of her attention, and she proposed to distinguish between non-biblical texts that attest 'Community Terminology' (CT) and those 'without Community Terminology' (NCT).<sup>17</sup>

In 2007 Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra offered another wide-ranging proposal on the profile of the contents of the Qumran scroll caves by way of an investigation of the average age of the scrolls found in a given cave which he has developed in a number of studies since. His results led him to distinguish between 'old caves' (Caves 1 and 4) and 'young caves' (Caves 2, 3, 5, 6, and 11). In order to account for the differences he suggested two deposits in 9/8 BCE and 68 CE respectively.<sup>18</sup> Stökl Ben Ezra is here building on the argument by Jodi Magness that

---

<sup>15</sup> Dimant, 'The Qumran Manuscripts.'

<sup>16</sup> Dimant, 'The Qumran Manuscripts,' 25.

<sup>17</sup> Dimant, 'The Qumran Manuscripts,' 26 passim; and more recently eadem, 'The Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts,' in *Qumran und die Archäologie* (ed. Frey, Claussen, and Kessler), 347-95.

<sup>18</sup> Stökl Ben Ezra, 'Old Caves and Young Caves;' see also Florentino García Martínez, 'Reconsidering the Cave 1 Texts Sixty Years After Their Discovery: An Overview,' in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS, Ljubljana 2007* (ed. Daniel Falk, Sarianna Metso, and Eibert Tigchelaar; STDJ 91; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 1-13; idem 'Cave 11 in Context,' in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context* (ed. Hempel), 199-209; Stökl Ben Ezra, 'Further Reflections on Caves 1 and 11: A Response to Florentino

the site of Qumran was briefly abandoned in 9/8 BCE as a result of an enemy attack.<sup>19</sup> The topic of the profile of the caves was further investigated in a series of further studies.<sup>20</sup>

One conclusion that has been reached by a number of scholars – even those that otherwise disagree with one another – is some kind of a connection between Caves 1 and 4.<sup>21</sup> Particularly tangible evidence in support of this is the fact that the same scribe apparently

---

García Martínez,’ in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context* (ed. Hempel), 211-223; and idem, ‘Wie viele Bibliotheken gab es in Qumran?’

<sup>19</sup> Jodi Magness *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002), 67-68.

<sup>20</sup> See especially Brooke, *Qumran and the Jewish Jesus*, 8-10; Devorah Dimant, ‘The Composite Character of the Qumran Sectarian Literature as an Indication of Its Date and Provenance,’ *RQ* 22 (2006): 615-630; García Martínez, ‘Cave 11 in Context;’ idem ‘Reconsidering the Cave 1;’ Lange, ‘The Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls;’ Stephen Pfann ‘Qumran,’ in *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (ed. Michael Berenbaum and Fred Skolnik; 2d. ed.; Detroit, Mich.: Macmillan, 2006), Vol. 16, 768-75; idem ‘Reassessing the Judean Desert Caves;’ Popović, ‘The Manuscript Collections;’ Stegemann, *Library of Qumran*, 58-79; Taylor, ‘Buried Manuscripts;’ Tigchelaar, ‘Dead Sea Scrolls;’ Emanuel Tov, ‘The Special Character of the Texts Found in Qumran Cave 11,’ in *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone* (ed. Esther G. Chazon, David Satran, and Ruth A. Clements; JSJSup 89; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 187-196; and White Crawford, ‘Qumran: Caves, Scrolls, and Buildings,’ 265-273.

<sup>21</sup> Dimant, ‘The Composite Character of the Qumran Sectarian Literature;’ Stökl Ben Ezra, ‘Old Caves and Young Caves;’ see also García Martínez, ‘Cave 11 in Context.’



copied 4QTestimonia (4Q175), 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSB, 4QSam<sup>c</sup> and corrected 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>.<sup>22</sup> In addition, Ada Yardeni assigned a small number of fragments from Cave 1 (chiefly New Jerusalem and perhaps Jubilees) and as many as 47 ‘apparent’ and a further 27 ‘possible’ manuscripts to the work of the same prolific individual scribe.<sup>23</sup>

As has been clearly shown by the landmark study by Devorah Dimant mentioned above Qumran Cave 4 gives the impression of lying at the very heart of the Qumran collection with many texts that are found in this cave also attested elsewhere.<sup>24</sup> The centrality of Cave 4 was already mooted in some pioneering studies, and both De Vaux and Milik held that the contents of Cave 4 belonged to the main library once found on the settlement and subsequently hastily concealed in the marl cave to protect them from the consequences of an imminent Roman attack.<sup>25</sup>

## **2. Distinctive Features of Cave 4**

---

<sup>22</sup> See Jonathan Campbell, *The Exegetical Texts* (CQS 4; London: T & T Clark, 2004), 89; Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 23; Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, ‘The Scribe of 1QS,’ in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. Shalom Paul et al.; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 439-452.

<sup>23</sup> Ada Yardeni, ‘A Note on a Qumran Scribe,’ in *New Seals and Inscriptions, Hebrew, Idumean and Cuneiform* (ed. Meir Lubetski; Hebrew Bible Monographs 8; Sheffield: Phoenix, 2007), 287-298; see also White Crawford, ‘Qumran: Caves, Scrolls, and Buildings,’ 267.

<sup>24</sup> Dimant, ‘The Qumran Manuscripts.’

<sup>25</sup> Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery*, 20; de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 105.

Dimant's initial assessment of the central position of Cave 4 has withstood the test of time. My own recent contribution to this debate emphasized that alongside important connections to the contents of Cave 1 in particular, the texts from Cave 4 display some important distinctive features which are best accounted for by considering them to represent a learned and eclectic medley of materials and data that were in all probability reserved for a more restricted readership than the contents of the remainder of the library.<sup>26</sup> My proposal that the contents of Cave 4 testify to a scholarly and eclectic sub-collection accessible to the highest tiers of community members is based on the following features which characterise Cave 4:

- All but one of the cryptic texts hail from Cave 4 – the single exception being the unidentified text 11Q23.<sup>27</sup>
- The majority of references to the Maskil, a figure also associated with the cryptic material (cf. 4Q298 Words of the Maskil to the Sons of Dawn which after an unencrypted title continues in the cryptic script), are attested in Cave 4 texts:

*The Maskil in CD and at Qumran*

CD	Cave 1	Cave 4	Cave 11
----	--------	--------	---------

<sup>26</sup> Hempel, *Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, 303-337. Talmon suggested different readers for various calendrical materials ranging from general membership to a priestly audience, see Shemaryahu Talmon, Jonathan Ben-Dov, and Uwe Glessmer, *Qumran Cave 4.16: Calendrical Texts* (DJD 21, Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 14.

<sup>27</sup> For the three small fragments of 11Q23 preserving seven letters see Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11.2: 11Q2 – 18, 11Q20 – 31* (DJD 23; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 419-420 and Plate 48.

x 2	x11	x26	x1
-----	-----	-----	----

It is important to stress that the prominence of the Maskil in Cave 4 goes beyond the number of attestations since the figure is linked not only to the significant block of cryptic texts found almost exclusively in this cave, but also to calendrical learning as I will argue below.

- Cave 4 is the home of the bulk of technical calendrical materials from Qumran. In fact, the only exception is 6Q17, a small parchment fragment published by Baillet in DJD 3<sup>28</sup> that has often been erroneously described as a papyrus fragment since it was photographed on a plate alongside a number of papyrus fragments. The full publication of the rich calendrical material from Qumran has led to some major re-assessments of the place of the calendar in the movement behind the Scrolls. The full evidence now in front of us paints an intricate and difficult picture many aspects of which are still being debated. Thus one of the editors of the calendrical texts, Jonathan Ben-Dov, refers to “multiple 364-day calendar traditions.”<sup>29</sup> The complexity of the evidence is apparent already in what I have labelled the “transient nature” of the designations assigned to the calendrical corpus with many a Calendrical Text being re-labelled Mishmarot and vice versa. Other texts previously labelled Mishmarot are

---

<sup>28</sup> DJD 3: 132-133.

<sup>29</sup> Jonathan Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years: Astronomy and Calendars at Qumran in Their Ancient Context* (STDJ 78; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 11, cf. also DJD 21: 1, 14 (Talmon); James C. VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time* (Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls; London: Routledge, 1998), 69, 86; also Uwe Glessmer, ‘Calendars in the Qumran Scrolls,’ in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam Leiden: Brill, 1999), Vol. II, 213-278, 268.

now called Historical texts in order to emphasize their interest in particular historical events or figures placed in a framework of priestly courses.<sup>30</sup> A number of compositions reach as far back as the creation of the luminaries in Genesis 1:14-16 attesting to the far reaching divine scheme that guides time and history.<sup>31</sup> Most important for my own argument in favour of the eclectic character of Cave 4 is the important conclusion to have emerged from the full publication of the calendar texts of a lack of a unified ‘calendar position.’ In place of a clear party line that privileges the solar calendar, Cave 4 contained an array of technical calendrical learning.<sup>32</sup>

We noted above the explicit association of the Maskil with the cryptic Qumran corpus in the title of 4Q298 (Words of the Maskil to the Sons of Dawn) and already alluded briefly to an association of the Maskil with calendrical issues. A connection of the Maskil to matters calendrical, especially liturgical aspects of the calendar, is suggested by the Final Hymn attested in several manuscripts of the Community Rule and rightly commonly associated with the Maskil.<sup>33</sup> The Hymn includes a liturgical calendar in 1QS 10:1b-8 // 4QS<sup>b</sup> 19:1-6 // 4QS<sup>d</sup> 8:11b-9:7a // 4QS<sup>f</sup> 2:1-5. Moreover both heavenly luminaries and annual festivals feature in the Songs of the Maskil (see 4Q511 2 i). A connection between the cryptic texts and the topic

---

<sup>30</sup> See Stephen J. Pfann and Philip S. Alexander et al., *Qumran Cave 4.26: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD 36; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 275-289, cf. also DJD 21:2.

<sup>31</sup> See Sacha Stern, ‘Qumran Calendars and Sectarianism,’ in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Timothy Lim and John J. Collins; Oxford: OUP, 2010), 232-253, 242.

<sup>32</sup> See, e.g., Steven D. Fraade, *Legal Fictions: Studies of Law and Narrative in the Discursive Worlds of Ancient Jewish Sectarians and Sages* (JSJSup 147; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 255 -283.

<sup>33</sup> Manfred Weise, *Kultzeiten und Kultischer Bunderschluss in der “Ordensregel” vom Toten Meer* (SPB 3; Leiden: Brill, 1961), 3.

of calendrical lore is evident, finally, by eight currently identified cryptic texts dealing with calendrical matters.<sup>34</sup> In sum, we witness a confluence of the three facets of Cave 4 outlined thus far: the transmission of material in cryptic script, calendrical lore, and the sphere of influence of the Maskil. While the Maskil is clearly not exclusive to Cave 4, this confluence strengthens the suggestion that the contents of this cave chime particularly with what we know of the sphere of influence of this figure.<sup>35</sup>

- Cave 4 is further characterised by having contained the largest number of works in multiple copies with 21 compositions attested in 5-9 copies; 5 in 10-14 copies; and Isa, Deut, and Psalms represented in 15 or more copies.<sup>36</sup>
- Furthermore, a significant number of texts from Cave 4 appear less finessed, a characteristic which I have described as the “workaday quality” of a number of Cave 4 texts.<sup>37</sup> Thus, Cave 4 revealed a considerable number of anthologies of various kinds such 4Q265 Miscellaneous Rules; 4Q159 Ordinances<sup>a</sup>; the calendrical anthologies 4QOtot; 4Q320 Calendrical Document and 4Q329 Mishmarot G; 4Q176

---

<sup>34</sup> For details see Hempel, *Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, 312-17.

<sup>35</sup> For an insightful recent study of this figure see Judith H. Newman, ‘Speech and Spirit: Paul and the Maskil as Inspired Teachers of Scripture,’ in *The Holy Spirit, Inspiration, and the Cultures of Antiquity: Multidisciplinary Perspectives* (ed. Jörg Frey and John R. Levison with the collaboration of Andrew Bowden; Ekstasis 5; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014) 243-266.

<sup>36</sup> See Hempel, *Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, 330.

<sup>37</sup> Hempel, *Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, 332.

Tanḥunim, an anthology on the theme of divine comfort;<sup>38</sup> 4Q174 Florilegium an exegetical collection<sup>39</sup> as well as 4QTestimonia which Steudel suspects to be the personal notes ('Handzettel') of the compiler.<sup>40</sup> Cave 4 also contained a relatively large proportion of papyri and what I have called "raw data" in the form of calendrical rosters and registers. I contrast the workaday quality of a significant proportion of Cave 4 with evidence of refinement in Cave 1 as indicated by the most developed form of documents such as the Community Rule, the War Scroll, and the Hodayot emerging from Cave 1.<sup>41</sup> I summed up my discussion on this issue as follows,

One almost gains the impression that large parts of Cave 4 constitute the laboratory of a learned group where data, texts, and ideas are collected and experimented with over against the show room quality of Cave 1.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> See Campbell, *The Exegetical Texts*, 78-87 and Johann Maier, 'Tanḥumin and Apocryphal Lamentations,' in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam; New York: OUP, 2000), Vol II, 915.

<sup>39</sup> See George J. Brooke, 'Florilegium (4Q174),' in *Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, 646-647, 647.

<sup>40</sup> Annette Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat<sup>a,b</sup>): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung, traditionsgehistorische Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 178-181.

<sup>41</sup> See Dimant, 'The Composite Character of the Qumran Sectarian Literature.'

<sup>42</sup> Hempel, *Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, 335.

### 3. The Community Rule as a Test Case for the Character of Cave 4

In what follows I will reflect on this picture with a particular focus on the *Serekh* tradition which is one of the most amply attested compositions that spans across perhaps as many as four caves.

#### 3.1 Multiple Copies

The Community Rule is represented by up to twelve compositions of the *Serekh*, ten of which hail from Cave 4, a tally that may increase as we refine our assessment of very fragmentary compositions.<sup>43</sup>

#### 3.2 Cryptic Script

4Q259 (S<sup>c</sup>) contains two phrases written in cryptic letters in successive lines. A rather difficult passage in 4Q259 S<sup>c</sup> 2:3 (par. 1QS 8:12) was first deciphered by Milik as reading ‘in Israel’ written in cryptic letters, a reading more recently discussed and substantiated at some length by Emile Puech.<sup>44</sup> What makes this passage more difficult is that the cryptic writing

---

<sup>43</sup> See Jutta Jokiranta and Hanna Vanonen, ‘Multiple Copies of Rule Texts or Multiple Rule Texts: Boundaries of the S and M Documents,’ in *Crossing Imaginary Boundaries: The Dead Sea Scrolls in the Context of Second Temple Judaism* (ed. Mika S. Pajunen and Hanna Tervanotko; Helsinki: Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society, forthcoming).

<sup>44</sup> See Józef T. Milik, ‘Le travail d’édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumrân,’ *RB* 63 (1956): 60-62, 61 and Émile Puech, ‘L’alphabet cryptique A en 4QS<sup>c</sup> (4Q259),’ *RevQ* 18 (1998): 429-35. See also Elisha Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2010), Vol. 1, 225 and Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 205-6. For reservations about the identification of cryptic script see Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.26: Serekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (DJD 26;

goes back to a second hand correcting the earlier unencrypted reading ‘in the community (*yaḥad*).’ A further complication is the fact that the last two cryptic letters (*alef* and *lamed*) of *b<sup>e</sup>yiśrael* are written above the line.<sup>45</sup> Puech draws attention to the occurrence of same word ‘Israel’ unencrypted in 4Q259 1 ii 13 (1QS 8:4-5) and partially preserved in 2:18 (1QS 8:9).<sup>46</sup>

In the immediate context of the cryptic phrases we note a pronounced concern with threatening elements within or on the periphery of the community. Thus 1QS 8:11b-12a // 4QS<sup>d</sup> 6:5b-6a // 4QS<sup>e</sup> 3:2 refers to fear of a renegade spirit, and 1QS 8:13 // 4QS<sup>d</sup> 6:7 // 4QS<sup>e</sup> 3:3b-4a returns to the issue of distancing community members from the people of injustice already familiar from 1QS 5:10b-18a // 4QS<sup>b</sup> 9:8b-11 // 4QS<sup>d</sup> 1:7b-10. The concern with rebutting opponents is a possible motive already identified by Prof. Puech as lying behind the cryptic notes.<sup>47</sup> To this we may add the repeated occurrence of the verb ‘to hide.’ The notion of concealed knowledge is referred to in the context of affairs hidden from Israel which, if found by the scholar, the latter is instructed not to hide, cf. 1QS 8:11-12 // 4QS<sup>d</sup> 6:5-6 // 4QS<sup>e</sup> 3:2. However, the tenor of what is being said is rather nuanced: while promoting an esoteric framework in referring to matters hidden from Israel, the particular emphasis admonishes the

---


Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 145-46. See also Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 53-54. Recently published multi-spectral images support the readings of Milik and Puech, see The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library, images B-295966 and B-314657.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. DJD 26:145-46; Milik, ‘Le travail d’édition;’ Sarianna Metso, ‘The Primary Results of the Reconstruction of 4QS<sup>e</sup>,’ *JJS* 44 (1993): 303-308; eadem, *Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*, 53-54; and Puech, ‘L’alphabet cryptique A en 4QS<sup>e</sup>.’

<sup>46</sup> Puech, ‘L’alphabet cryptique A en 4QS<sup>e</sup>,’ 433; see also DJD 26: 146.

<sup>47</sup> Puech, ‘L’alphabet cryptique A en 4QS<sup>e</sup>,’ 435.



scholar *not* to hide his insights from the sub-group within Israel, in a sense encouraging more internal openness.<sup>48</sup> This again is somewhat counter-balanced by the use of cryptic letters at two key points in the text of 4QS<sup>e</sup> and – on Prof. Puech’s analysis already its *Vorlage*  which left our first copyist baffled and necessitated the second more expert hand to step in and first correct and then supplement the space left for the second phrase in cryptic script. Equally disingenuous is the introduction of the cryptic phrases in 4QS<sup>e</sup> when a much older manuscript such as 1QS already contains the crucial words in standard script, and an earlier occurrence of the phrase “when these exist in Israel” is preserved in standard script in both 1QS 8:4 and 4QS<sup>e</sup>. As I have argued in detail elsewhere the material on the council of the community in 1QS 8:1-16a // 4QS<sup>d</sup> 6:1-8a // 4QS<sup>e</sup> 2:9b-3:6a has clearly evolved over time, in my view successively expanding the earliest core in 1QS 8:1-7a // 4QS<sup>d</sup> 6:1 // 4QS<sup>e</sup> 2:9b-16a.<sup>49</sup> Several stages in the successive growth of this section are attested materially both in the form of superlinear additions in 1QS 8 as well as the large portion of text corresponding to 1QS 8:15-9:11 not found in 4QS<sup>e</sup>.<sup>50</sup> In other words, a sense of sending mixed messages, scribal supplementation, and repetition is already present in 1QS 8-9. The complex sub-plot that seems to unfold behind the cryptic phrases in 4QS<sup>e</sup> is thus part of a pattern in a particularly complex tale of literary development.

### 3.3 The Presence of Technical Calendrical Learning

While several copies of the Rule testify to the important link between the creation of the luminaries and the timely performance of festivals and prayers in the final hymn, especially

---

<sup>48</sup> See also Charlotte Hempel, ‘Interpretative Authority in the Community Rule Tradition,’ *DSD* 10 (2003): 59-80, esp. 68-9.

<sup>49</sup> See Hempel, *Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, 85-92.

<sup>50</sup> See DJD 26:148 and further literature cited there.

in the opening lines of 1QS 10 // 4QS<sup>b</sup> // 4QS<sup>d</sup>. 4QS<sup>e</sup> is the only manuscript of the *Serekh* that incorporates a technical roster (or collection of rosters) of calendrical data in the form of 4QOtot.

### **3.4 The Place (Prominence) of the Maskil**

In 1QS the Maskil features in the heading to the Teaching on the Two Spirits and twice in column 9 where two headings introduce material in 9:12 and 9:21 that deals at some length with this figure. The heading of the Teaching on the Two Spirits is not preserved in any of the Cave 4 manuscripts. The two headings found in 1QS 9 are attested in 4QS<sup>d</sup> and 4QS<sup>e</sup> and in the case of 1QS 9:12 also in CD 12:21 // 4QD<sup>a</sup> 9 ii 7-8. What sets apart the Cave 4 copies is the occurrence of Maskil also in the title of 4QS<sup>d</sup> and at a major juncture in 4QS<sup>b</sup> where 1QS 5:1 begins with a *Serekh* heading. Thus, overall we have equivalence of Maskil references in Cave 4 manuscripts of the Rule that preserved material where he figures in 1QS alongside two important additional references to the Maskil at a key juncture in 4QS<sup>b</sup> and in the title of 4QS<sup>d</sup> respectively.

### **3.5 The Workaday Quality of Cave 4 Specimen: Papyrus; Possibility of Early Drafts**

We certainly have two representatives of the *Serekh* tradition in Cave 4 that are early papyrus manuscripts (4QS<sup>a</sup> and 4QS<sup>c</sup>). It has even been suggested by several scholars including the editors of DJD 26 that with 4QS<sup>a</sup> we may be dealing with a draft of the *Serekh* copied roughly on the back of another text – 4QS<sup>a</sup> being an opisthograph with 4Q433a Hodayot-like text.<sup>51</sup> Given both early papyrus manuscripts do not preserve any text corresponding to material after 1QS 4, I have argued elsewhere that,

---

<sup>51</sup> See George J. Brooke, 'Between Scroll and Codex: Reconsidering the Qumran Opisthographs,' in *On Stone and Scrolls: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies* (ed. J. K.

It is at least worth considering the possibility that with 4Q255 we are dealing with an early draft of what we now find in the opening columns that was produced with the intention of supplementing existing Serekh material such as is preserved at the start of the short text in 4Q258 (S<sup>d</sup>).<sup>52</sup>

#### 4. Conclusion

To conclude, it seems to me that the complex evidence of the S manuscripts from Cave 4 is compatible with several features that span across the nature of Cave 4 more widely. Moreover, of the ten Cave 4 manuscripts of the Rule 4QS<sup>e</sup> (4Q259) emerges as the most learned and ‘avant-garde’ exemplar of the Community Rule<sup>53</sup> containing an anthology of calendrical data (4QOtot) as well as a number of words written in Cryptic A script. In several respects, 4QS<sup>e</sup> seems to be particularly representative of the distinctive aspects of the character of Cave 4. Finally, the concept of a tiered system of access to knowledge is well attested in ancient Jewish texts<sup>54</sup> including the book of Daniel where access to knowledge privileges those who have it, 4QInstruction, and 4 Ezra 14 to name but a few examples. In the Community Rule in particular the idea is explicit in passages such as those that admonish the

---

Aitken, K. J. Dell, and B. A. Mastin; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 123-138, 123; Milik, ‘Le travail d’édition,’ 61; Eileen Schuller, ‘4Q433a. 4QpapHodayot-like Text B’, in *Qumran Cave 4. XX. Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (ed. E. Chazon *et al.*; DJD 29; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 237-245, 237 and n. 4; and Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 68-73.

<sup>52</sup> See Charlotte Hempel, ‘The Long Text of the *Serekh* as Crisis Literature,’ *RQ* forthcoming.

<sup>53</sup> Hempel, *Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, 327.

<sup>54</sup> See Samuel I. Thomas, *The “Mysteries” of Qumran: Mystery, Secrecy, and Esotericism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (EJL 25; Atlanta, Ga.: SBL, 2009).

Maskil to exercise discretion in his dealings with the people of the pit and the people of injustice, cf. 1QS 9:16b-17a // 4QS<sup>d</sup> 8:1b-2a // 4QS<sup>e</sup> 3:13b-15a. Moreover, a fundamental hierarchical principle laid out in the Rule permits access to deliberations only to full members, cf., e.g., 1QS 6:21b-23 // 4QS<sup>g</sup> 3:1. My suggestion is that in what was clearly a tiered system of access to knowledge Cave 4 was the place where a large proportion of – if not all – the most restricted material was stored.