

# **THE JERUSALEM THEORY OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AUTHORSHIP: ORIGINS, EVOLUTION, AND DISCUSSIONS**

**Vitaly CHERNOIVANENKO**

National University of “Kyiv-Mohyla Academy” (Ukraine)  
chernoiivanenko@gmail.com

## **Introduction**

The aim of this article is to demonstrate that the current Jerusalem origin theory of the Dead Sea Scrolls did not come out of nowhere, but rather had a long theoretical background and origins. The history of this theory has not undergone serious examination by Qumranist historiography scholars, excepting stand-alone mentions in introductory overviews of the field or critical remarks; thus, this article is the first integrated and contextual attempt to study the history of this theory.

The Jerusalem origins theory of the Dead Sea Scrolls is one of the leading theories of contemporary Qumran studies, and at the same time it is one of the possible answers to the question of the origins of the famous manuscripts. This theory is nearly the only viable alternative to the “standard” Qumran-Essene theory authored by Eleazar Lipa Sukenik, Roland Guérin de Vaux, Yigael Yadin, André Dupont-Sommer, Frank Moore Cross, and others. The crux of the Qumran-Essene theory is that Qumran was the center of the Essene movement (or, according to some authors, the proto-Christian Essene movement), and had a community that penned these important manuscripts. As this theory held a number of serious theoretical contradictions, this naturally provoked a counter reaction in the form of criticism by “independent scholars”<sup>1</sup>. All of this took place in the late 1970s – early 1980s.

The first critic to be heard widely by scholars of ancient manuscripts was *Norman Golb*, the Ludwig Rosenberger Professor in Jewish History and Civiliza-

tion at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. He earned his PhD at the Johns Hopkins University, and wrote his thesis on Qumran material and relevant material from the Cairo Geniza. Having many years of experience in his sphere, he took up a research project to check the paleographic dating of scrolls done by Frank Cross during his participation in an international team of scholars that studied the manuscripts. To confirm his first hypotheses, Golb needed to see the famous original texts, which were made inaccessible by the international group. The scholar had only photographic facsimile to work with, yet still formulated his own theory of the authorship of these manuscripts, even before the monopoly of the international research group on the manuscripts collapsed.

Golb's first paper on Qumran, *The Problem of Origin and Identification of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, was published in February 1980 in the *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* (volume 124, number 1). During the period of 1980–1994, he published about ten articles<sup>2</sup>, and his research peaked in his book *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?: The Search for the Secret of Qumran*, published in 1995 in New York. By 1998, it was already translated into five languages.

Notably, initially Golb was a proponent of the Qumran-Essene theory, and noted this in his aforementioned book<sup>3</sup>. When the Sorbonne scholar André Dupont-Sommer's book *Les Écrits esséniens découverts près de la mer Morte* (The Essene Writings from Qumran) was published at the end of the 1950s and finally convinced most scholars of the correctness of the Qumran-Essene theory, Golb firmly stood by its postulates and taught them to his students during seminars<sup>4</sup>.

It should be noted that the Jerusalem origin of the Dead Sea Scrolls was not Golb's unique discovery. First such assumptions were voiced when the first alternative, if often very marginal visions in Qumran studies (e. g., the hypotheses of Cecil Roth, Godfrey Driver, Henri del Medico) appeared. Among them was a hypothesis by Münster University Professor **Karl Heinrich Rengstorf**, formulated in the early 1960s. Rengstorf published two very small books on Qumran, in English and German, in 1960–1963. He was the first scholar to connect the origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls with Jerusalem<sup>5</sup>. Even though he did not read the Copper Scroll, which is important in many ways, but he at least believed that this scroll describes the treasures of the Temple. Accepting this explanation and not knowing that the scroll actually described other scrolls that were hidden with the treasures, Rengstorf nonetheless came to the conclusion that all Qumran manuscripts were

from the library of the Jerusalem temple<sup>6</sup>. While he considered the statement that the Essenes wrote or copied hundreds of books in the “scriptorium” themselves “quite absurd”, the scholar assumed that the library had been hidden “in view of some serious danger threatening it”<sup>7</sup>. Rengstorf also noted that the idea of the Temple as the origin of the manuscripts is supported by the fact that the ancient Near East temples were often used “to preserve archives and libraries,” in particular, stipulated by the reforms instituted by king Josiah of Judah<sup>8</sup>.

Golb was familiar with the studies and initial hypotheses that came before him, in particular with Rengstorf’s hypothesis, of which he learned, however, much later than it actually appeared – only in 1970s. That year, Golb received a letter from the curator of the Shrine of the Book (a place in Jerusalem where the some of the Dead Sea Scrolls are held), Magen Broshi, who, among other things, asked him, “Did you know that professor Rengstorf had suggested the theory that the manuscripts were written in Jerusalem?”<sup>9</sup> Golb almost immediately took up Rengstorf’s hypothesis, analyzed it, and gave it a mostly positive review, even though he also noted some of its faults. One of them was that the hypothesis was concentrated exclusively on the Temple, practically excluding that other Jerusalem libraries, which were just as endangered during the Great Revolt, could have been taken out of the city and hidden<sup>10</sup>.

Undoubtedly, the formulation of the key postulates of Golb’s theory takes prior experience into account. However, the attempt of the Chicago professor, unlike the attempt of his predecessor, was able to transcend being a simple hypothesis and become a breakthrough in re-thinking the possible authorship of the manuscripts. The Jerusalem theory might not have been created, for it was merely a response to the discrepancies of the Qumran-Essene theory. On the other hand, as Golb notes, if the discrepancies connected with the Qumran finds had become known in time, the Essene origin theory might not even have appeared<sup>11</sup>.

Golb’s theory was mostly centered on discussing the following questions:

- the problem of Essenic celibacy (ascribed by an antique author);
- purpose and nature of Qumran objects, including the so-called scriptorium;
- the status of the “Qumran library”;
- interpretation of the Copper Scroll and the Masada finds;
- problem of textological interpretation of the meaning of Qumran manuscripts.

The main positions of the Jerusalem theory can be summarized as follows:

1) the Dead Sea Scrolls were not written/re-written by one, but by several groups of the Jewish community from the time of the Second Temple;

2) the most likely place where most of the manuscripts had been before being moved to Qumran is Jerusalem, because of its importance as a center of Jewish literacy. In particular, they were likely in the libraries of Jerusalem, where sacred texts were being preserved.

Now let us examine Golb's main criticisms and arguments against the standard Qumran-Essene theory.

### **Vow of chastity**

One of the central points of discussion was the well-known idea of the vow of chastity the Essene monks supposedly took, as witnessed by, for example, Pliny the Elder. According to him, the Essenes were a secluded, peace-loving, chaste community which was "without women" and "renouncing love entirely"<sup>12</sup>. This statement became the main characteristic of the Essene community and its outlook<sup>13</sup>. However, the excavation in Khirbet Qumran has shown that not only men, but women were also buried there. Second, neither the *Community Rule* nor any other manuscript mention anything about sexual restraint, which was a central tenet of the Essene teaching according to antique authors.

Golb notes that, instead of revising an established theory, influential archaeologists and paleographers decided to look for additional confirmation in Josephus quotes, believing that they could be interpreted as "most" Essenes taking a vow of chastity, but not all<sup>14</sup>. Frank Cross of Harvard, a follower of the Qumran-Essene theory, tried to solve this contradiction by proposing that an older community, which held to a vow of chastity, later mixed with others, or that a less important group of Essenes with families lived next to the chaste sect, whose members were bound from marriage<sup>15</sup>. This is also similar to the thoughts of Igor Tantlevskiy, St. Petersburg University Professor. He believes that the community first consisted only of men, judging by the men's burials in the main necropolis, and thus marriages were naturally not a concern. The women's and children's burials, found in two small burial grounds, could have been from a later time<sup>16</sup>.

Golb believed that such an interpretation did more to undermine the Qumran-Essene theory than to support it, for it was entirely based on Pliny's evidence that a community of chaste Essenes lived near Ein Gedi<sup>17</sup>. Moreover, the theory stressed that Qumran was not just an abandoned Essene town, but the spiritual center of the entire Essene movement, the "laura", "motherhouse"<sup>18</sup> where the movement's main doctrines were formed and where its rules were written. Golb believed that it would be strange to think that the members of this "think-tank" would violate the principle and oath that would be the most original trait of their entire doctrine<sup>19</sup>. Archeologist Yizhar Hirschfeld<sup>20</sup> agrees with him, noting the innumerable number of stone finery, combs, cosmetics found in Qumran – all of those artifacts which give away the presence of women in the settlement<sup>21</sup>.

### **Function and character of Qumran objects**

During the early 1950s, the Qumran settlement itself was excavated. Pliny the Elder wrote in his *Natural History* (5, 17, § 73) that the Essenes did not know money and lived among palm trees<sup>22</sup> – in other words, that they had an ascetic way of life. However, the dig showed something quite different from a poor cenoby. A completely ordered settlement had been found, complete with cisterns, pools, and reservoirs to hold water, as well as with a complex of buildings that included a refectory and a kitchen, livestock pens, a pottery, and a tower next to a building of unknown purpose. This placed certain archaeologists into a tight spot, and some of them, like de Vaux in his *Archaeology and Scrolls of the Dead Sea* and Cross in his *Ancient Qumran Library* proposed a hypothesis that the Essenes themselves lived in caves or huts above the main settlement, which served exclusively administrative purposes.

Even though certain caves did hold signs of being used as temporary dwellings, according to Golb it is difficult to believe that the Qumran settlement was just a gathering of cave hermits. First of all, it is much too orderly, and second, there are too many signs of completely military fortifications. The excavations unearthed not only the remains of a fortress wall, but signs of significant stores of food and water, as well as many traces of battles, confirming that a numerous regiment of Jewish warriors was deployed at Qumran, and that they held lengthy battles with Roman legionnaires somewhere near 70 CE, after the conquest of Jerusalem. Evidence of these severe battles includes destroyed walls, traces of a

large fire, and an endless number of arrowheads<sup>23</sup>. The approximate date of the battle was determined by the dated Roman coins found in the ruins<sup>24</sup>. And even though Flavius Josephus brings up an Essene named Yoḥanan, who participated in battles against the Romans<sup>25</sup>, Philo of Alexandria characterizes the Essenes as the most peaceful people, noting that among them there is “no one, in short, attending to any employment whatever connected with war”<sup>26</sup>. And we have no testimonies in general that the Essenes have ever protected their fortress from the Romans or led severe battles against them<sup>27</sup>.

### **Criticism of the so-called scriptorium hypothesis**

The Qumran excavation had been largely finished before 1956. The attribution of “Essene authorship” rather quickly received a number of theoretical arguments, and was on the verge of becoming a school of scholarly thought in itself. The archaeologists who worked in Qumran were more inclined to look for new confirmations of the connection between the manuscripts and the settlement than to produce any new hypotheses. It was extremely important for the authors of the Qumran-Essene theory to answer the question of where the texts from the Essene settlement might have been written<sup>28</sup>. This is the reason that when three plastered tables and two small “inkwells” were unearthed in the ruins of Qumran, the room where they once had been was immediately dubbed “the scriptorium”, as it was presumed that this was where the manuscripts later hidden in the caves were written. Before the fall of the fortress, this room was on the second floor of the building on unknown purpose near the tower. It seems that during the conquest of Qumran the second floor was destroyed, and everything within it fell through to the lower room. And since these items included tables and “inkwells”, archaeologists came to the conclusion that a “scribe room” or a “scriptorium” existed. De Vaux and other scholars decided that after receiving news of the impending Roman attack, the Essenes quickly collected the scrolls that had been being prepared at the moment in the room, took them to the caves underneath the settlement, and left them there in special clay pots or in cloth bags<sup>29</sup>.

Golb finds at least two contradictions in this line of thought. First of all, all ancient descriptions show that scribes never worked on tables, but wrote sitting on benches with manuscripts on their knees. Second, considering the mere mass

of the wreckage that buried the ruins of Qumran, it would be expected that much more would have remained from the so-called “scriptorium”, if it truly existed – not just two “inkwells”, but many more objects connected to the work of the *sofer*, the copyist, like reed quills, scrolls of blank parchment, and scissors to cut them. However, not one such object had been found among the wreckage, nor one slip of parchment<sup>30</sup>.

All of these facts, according to Golb, show that the room had likely not been a scriptorium, but just a small room where military or civil gatherings had been held, and where certain supportive writings of an official, not a literary character had been made. Professor Golb believes that no particular evidence is required to presume that such a room had in fact existed in a fortress, and the room itself was near a watchtower, in the very center of a complex of stone buildings<sup>31</sup>.

Granted, one detail seems to be in favor of the hypothesis that the manuscripts were in fact written in Qumran: the clay pieces found near the manuscripts in the caves are identical to the shards found in the ruins of the settlement. This fact, and the roughly coinciding age of the pieces and shards convinced archaeologists to consider that both the crockery and the manuscripts are of Qumran origin, and that the manuscripts were placed in clay vessels before being hidden in the caves. This was the view proposed by de Vaux’s<sup>32</sup>, which was supported by a number of important scholars<sup>33</sup> and remains the most widely spread point of view.

Of course, the vessels found in the caves could have been of Qumran origin, but Golb states that this is no cause to believe that the manuscripts were written in Qumran, as well. He believes that the military character of the settlement and absence of all signs of manuscripts being copied there are more likely to be evidence against such an assumption.

### **Originals or standard copies?**

#### **Critical notes on the concept of the “Qumran library”**

By the spring of 1956, manuscripts had been found in eleven caves in slopes in a two mile radius from the Qumran settlement. A Jerusalem group of researchers headed by de Vaux and Lancaster Harding continued studying them. Only a few manuscripts were undamaged, and some had disintegrated into thousands of pieces.

This made precise calculations impossible, but it was obvious that the initial number of manuscripts was no less than 600, or even 700–900<sup>34</sup>.

It became obvious that the scrolls held a wide spectrum of literary topics and genres. The texts included psalms and religious songs, commentaries to books of the Bible and hitherto unknown apocryphal books like the *Words of Moses* (1Q22) or the *Book of Mysteries* (1Q27). There were teachings of wise men and messianic prophecies, and even horoscopes – in other words, every kind of literature that might have been read among Palestinian Jewry in 1<sup>st</sup> century CE<sup>35</sup>. Only some of these texts held Essene doctrine, and many of them even contradicted the testaments of Josephus and Philo about the Essenes.

One such text – 1QSa (probably an addition to the Community Rule) was dedicated to determining the “age of consent”<sup>36</sup>. Another – the so-called *Psalm Scroll* (11Q5–11Q9) from cave 11 – expressed views that could not be called anything other than Hellenistic and directly anti-Essene<sup>37</sup>.

The Qumran-Essene theory, which was created, in essence, to explain only the first seven scrolls, could not, Golb believed, explain the origins of this extraordinarily wide and diverse literary heritage. Nonetheless, its creators and their students continued to insist on its correctness, Golb criticized this position, because instead of admitting that all these texts could have been written by different authors and not by a small and isolated group of hermits, adherents of the traditional theory tried to widen their interpretation of Essenism<sup>38</sup>. Dupont-Sommer, in his aforementioned book *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, published in 1959 (and in English in 1961 and 1973) already stated that the Essenes obviously formed a numerous and widely-spread brotherhood, and that their teachings could have undergone a lengthy evolution<sup>39</sup>. This hypothesis did not meet with any objections, even though, according to Philo, there was no more than four thousand Essenes in 1<sup>st</sup> century Palestine, and the dig in Qumran in no way confirmed the presence of a central Essene cenoby. But the scholars already saw the Essenes as a big and important group, and Qumran as the main center of Essene literary activity.

All of this pan-Essenism, Golb thought, did not give an extensive explanation to the facts, because it was opposed not only by the number and diversity of the texts, but the specifics of how they were written. Archaeologists are not usually overly concerned whether the texts they find are originals or copies, or whether they have a documentary or a literary character, as a Bible studies scholar

does not really care whether a parchment was written by the hand of a prophet or the hand of a scribe – she is most interested in the meaning of the text, the original of which she might never see. It is, however, a different matter for textologists and paleographers, who study this exact matter on the necessary level. However, the Jerusalem group that studied these scrolls did not have such professionals in its team. For this reason, all of the fine points necessary to determine the authorship of the manuscripts were left out of focus.

Originals or so-called “autographs” are usually rough drafts full of inserts and crossing-outs, while copies made by scribes are determined by a careful adherence to margins, sophisticated calligraphy, and an almost complete absence of corrections. If the traditional theory is correct and Qumran was the spiritual center of Essenism, if the Qumran hermits were not just copyists, but original thinkers, whose works inspired their followers throughout Palestine, and if they had to quickly hide their works in caves because the Roman army had been nearing, we would have logically had scrolls that look like original texts in different stages of completion. However, out of several hundred scrolls there is only one autograph. All others are copies of previously-written texts<sup>40</sup>.

The fact that out of hundreds of extremely diverse texts only one is an original work obviously shows that the “writer’s room” (the so-called scriptorium) is not the origin point of the texts. Their points of origin are different libraries<sup>41</sup>, from whence the manuscripts came with some other personal belongings of their owner – for example, the phylacteries<sup>42</sup>. Golb believes that some of the adherents of the Qumran-Essene theory, feeling the logical irrefutability of this conclusion, believed that Qumran had not only a “scriptorium” but a “monastery library”. And since the excavations did not find even a single trace of such a library. They made the assumptions that it – as the monks themselves – was located beyond the settlement, in the very caves where the manuscripts had been found<sup>43</sup>.

The libraries of the time were used to preserve completed texts, and not crude manuscripts. Golb also believes that it is very difficult to imagine that such a small, isolated desert dwelling as Khirbet Qumran had such a large library. Still, it is even harder to imagine that the Qumran Essenes, having a whole complex of stone buildings, would want to climb steep slopes to their caves each day to read or do other kinds of study. Finally, the scholars adhering to the Qumran-Essene theory had to admit that a “scriptorium” would have

held not only copies, but original works, as well. This is why they attempted to find a way out through the existence of a library (the aforementioned work of Cross is even titled *The Ancient Library of Qumran*). Having met with the fact that the Qumran settlement did not seem to have a library, the traditional theory began looking for such a library in the caves<sup>44</sup>.

Nonetheless, Golb believed that even if the hypothesis of the Qumran library is credible, it cannot save the traditional theory, for a different question inevitably rises: if the Qumran settlement was such an important religious center, why did its residents leave us with only literary works? The study of other ancient Dead Sea settlements leaves us no doubt that the Jews of Roman times preserved numerous other documents. When archaeologists excavated the Wadi-Murabba'at caves, 11 miles south of Qumran, they found letters dated up to 132 CE, written by hand and containing precise toponyms and names, as well as a great number of diverse acts and contracts of a legal character. If Qumran was the administrative center of a big religious communities, it would have to have kept correspondence and other archival records like the ones found in Wadi-Murabba'at – not just literary scrolls<sup>45</sup>. In an absence of such finds, an assumption could be made that the Qumran Essenes for some reason kept their archives apart from the literary scrolls, and time spared only the latter, completely destroying the former, or to believe that the Essenes, unlike their closest neighbors, did not place any value on civil, personal, and administrative writings and did not preserve even a single trace of them, at the same time carefully keeping the literary texts. Such assumptions have the right to exist, but in light of the aforementioned facts and considering the day-to-day realities of that time and place they sound rather unconvincing, and, moreover, could not be taken at face value.

### **Copper Scroll (3Q15)**

When the Copper Scroll's two thin, brittle copper sheets rolled into a tube were first found in 1952, in the third cave, it was so brittle that it was impossible to unfurl. But the scholars could understand even from the marks showing through the reverse of the scroll that it held the description of treasures in hidden places. It took four years to unfurl the Scroll in a special laboratory with all precautions, and then to decipher it. However some scholars did not wait for the publication of its text,

but made statements that doubted the authenticity of the find. They said that the valuables, the locations of which were named in the Copper Scroll, were simply made up. “It is difficult to understand”, their statement read, “why the Essenes of Qumran were so much concerned with these stories of hidden treasure, and especially why they saw fit to engrave them on copper, which at that time was a costly metal. . . . At all events, this guide to hidden treasure is the most ancient document of its kind to have been found, and is of interest to the historian of folklore”<sup>46</sup>.

However, after the full text of the Copper Scroll was published in the early 1960s<sup>47</sup>, it became obvious that the scroll is absolutely unrelated to any kind of folklore. As Golb notes, unlike most other Qumran scrolls, “the Copper Scroll – and maybe it alone – held absolutely clear indications of its own history. Its text was not written by the elegant hand of a professional scribe, but in the untidy and quick style in which original drafts of documents are written”<sup>48</sup>. It held a dry and concise account of different valuables, including written documents, hidden in numerous caches in the Judean Desert. The text even includes a note that “a copy of this text” can be found “in the tunnel... to the North of Kohlit”<sup>49</sup>. It is impossible to determine today where exactly Kohlit was, as it is impossible to determine whether any of the caches from the Copper Scroll coincide with present day Qumran. However, many of the caches are written to be located, like Qumran, in the intermountainous *wadi*, meaning the dried out valleys of desert rivers to the south and east of Jerusalem. The text mentions, for instance, a cache near Jericho, where ancient books were indeed found in the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> centuries<sup>50</sup>.

The usage of numerous toponyms (Jericho, Kohlit, Milham, Beth ha-Kerem, and others), both known and unidentified, the character of the writings, the way it was all listed, the mention of a copy, and the fact that the scroll was engraved in copper, and not written on parchment – all of these traits were believed by Golb to be proof of the scroll’s authenticity. It describes not just a one-time cache of several hundred manuscripts in a particular group of caves, but an extraordinary campaign to spread books and other valuables throughout the Judean Desert, creating a web the center of which Golb believed to be not Qumran, but Jerusalem. The fact that this manuscript was preemptively – long before its publication and consideration of its true value – consigned to “folklore” can be explained only by a desire to protect the initial traditional theory from being debunked at any cost<sup>51</sup>.

### Masada

During the early 1960s, while excavating Masada, the fortress of Herod the Great, which is 30 miles south of Qumran, archaeologists found the last stronghold of the Jewish resistance to the Romans after Jerusalem fell in 70 CE. Fragments of 14 more manuscripts of biblical and apocryphal texts were found. These manuscripts were similar in date and character of writing to the Qumran scrolls, and they also held a fragment of one of the texts found earlier in Qumran – the religious hymn *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (11Q17). Upon finding this Qumran poetic text in Masada, archaeologists attributed it (and all of the other texts found there) to “Essene monks”<sup>52</sup>.

However, Golb believes that this find points to a completely different origin<sup>53</sup>. In his opinion, it would be foolish to assume that the manuscripts found in Masada were written there. The place in the ruins where the find was made shows that the manuscripts belonged to the defenders of the fortress who were running from the Roman invasion. The defenders held only one part of the fortress, and it was here, among traces of battle, that the manuscripts were found. And since most of those running were from Jerusalem, it would be logical, according to Golb, to assume that the manuscripts they had were brought from Jerusalem, along with all of the other property they were able to take out of the sieged capital. Jerusalem had been the biggest center of Palestinian Jewry at the time, and up to the Roman siege it had been a vibrant center of its spiritual and cultural life. When the defenses of the city were finally breached, the stream of refugees could have gone in any direction, including the southeast, towards Masada<sup>54</sup>.

The adherents of the Qumran-Essene theory did not object to these facts, but they believed that the manuscript of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* was not brought to Masada by refugees from Jerusalem, but by Essenes of Qumran. When Y. Yadin first put forward this hypothesis in his book *Masada: Herod's Fortress and the Zealots "Last Stand"* (1966), he circumnavigated the question of where the other Masada manuscripts came from<sup>55</sup>.

One of the reasons of this silence, Golb believes, could be that the very mention of Jerusalem was capable of seriously undermining the traditional theory, for if one assumes that 13 manuscripts came from Jerusalem, it becomes much harder to state that the 14<sup>th</sup> for some reason was of another origin. And if all of the

Masada manuscripts were from Jerusalem, then why couldn't the Qumran manuscripts have been written there, as well. The Masada manuscripts do not differ in any significant way from the Qumran manuscripts: they are almost from the same time and are written in the same manner. This is why Golb believes it is more rational to assume that the Qumran manuscripts were also brought to the desert by denizens of the capital during and after it had been besieged<sup>56</sup>.

It should be noted that a distinctive “*concept of the escape*” became an important part of Golb's Jerusalem theory. In his article *Small Texts, Big Questions*, he proposed a possible detailed view of the escape. Citing Josephus (in particular, his famous testament that there were two main streams of Jews running from Jerusalem, to the south and to the east), Golb states that the ultimate goal of the first stream of refugees, moving through Beit Lechem (Bethlehem), Irodion, and wadi Ein Gedi, was Masada, while the second stream, moving to the east, towards another mountain fortress – Machaerus, on the east shore of the Dead Sea, in Transjordan. This last stream could have split into two – some people moved around the Dead Sea by land, while others waded through it or swam through at the nearest possible place. This nearest place must have been Qumran. This is why here, readying to continue their journey by water, the refugees left behind the valuable cargo they took from Jerusalem, each with his own scrolls that he did not want to leave for Roman plunder. This is where the unusual amount of scrolls in the Qumran caves comes from. Some refugees continued their flight to Machaerus, some remained in Qumran. Those last refugees soon perished at the hands of the Romans, who followed their trail and destroyed the fortress of Qumran. In due course perished those who were hoping to hide in Machaerus, and then – those who defended Masada.

Golb built his theory on how effectively he was able to answer each particular contradiction of the Qumran-Essene theory. Of course, the adherents of the old theory did not make their opponent wait long for a response, and clearly showed their categorical aversion of Golb's theory. The opponents (Joseph Fitzmyer, Florentino Martínez, and others) believed the main defect of the Jerusalem theory to be the low probability of manuscripts (first and foremost those that came from sects) in the libraries of Jerusalem, moreover, in the temple library, if these manuscripts were oppositional to the ruling elite and the beliefs of the Jewish community of the time<sup>57</sup>.

However, there are modern scholars who adhere to Golb's theory (Lena Cansdale, Ian Hutchesson), especially among Israeli archaeologists, including those who excavated Qumran (e. g., Yitzhak Magen and Yuval Peleg). While they disagree with Golb on Qumran being a fortress (each of them has their own view on the matter), they in general support the Jerusalem (or generally Judaic) origin of the scrolls.

For example, Magen and Peleg<sup>58</sup> note that anyone could have brought the scroll to Qumran, including refugees hiding from Romans. Some of them took the costly scrolls with them, but later, after traversing the Judean Hills and coming to the necessity of making their way by the seashore, decided not to take them, and decided to hide the scrolls. Thus, these aren't sect writings, nor are they Essene, Sadducean, or temple literature – this is Judaic literature as a whole, the literature of the time of the Second Temple<sup>59</sup>. Y. Hirschfeld also agrees with them<sup>60</sup>.

Cansdale, as her mentor Alan Crown, also believe that the Essenes did not populate Qumran. They believe it had been erected for purposes of commerce and trade, as it is located hypothetically on one of the main trade routes of the region<sup>61</sup>.

Hutchesson's theory is that all of the manuscripts in the caves of Qumran were hidden and disposed in 63 BCE, in context of the arrival of Pompey. Hutchesson first proposed this theory in 1997, and two years later published an article on it in the *Qumran Chronicle*. Hutchesson believes that the Qumran manuscripts were hidden because of the Roman invasion of 63 BCE (as opposed to 66 CE). In favor of this hypothesis he cites the fact that all of the scrolls scrolls (excepting the Copper Scroll, which is the subject of a separate discussion) were already written by the middle of 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE<sup>62</sup>. Hutchesson also connects the manuscripts with the Sadducees (and thus calls his of theory "the Sadducean theory") of the time of Aristobul II, who controlled the territory of Qumran up until the invasion of Pompey, and also that this was the end of the most important period of Qumran's colonization. According to Hutchesson's theory, those who actually hid the scrolls were killed in Jerusalem during Pompey's invasion, and the manuscripts were never found by their true owners<sup>63</sup>. Hutchesson does not believe neither that the Essenes had anything to do with the manuscripts or with their dissemination, nor that Qumran was the place Pliny meant<sup>64</sup>. Hutchesson recognizes the extensive contribution of Golb, meaning the Jerusalem origin of the texts, which Hutches-

son, as a whole, supports, but makes an accent first and foremost on events that happened a century earlier.

Considering everything said above, we can summarize: 1) the Jerusalem theory was objectively formed as a response to the contradictions of the Qumran-Essene theory; 2) the precursor of this theory was K. Rengstorff's hypothesis of the Jerusalem origins of the Qumran scrolls; 3) the final phase in the formation of this theory were the studies of N. Golb; 4) this theory has both constructive ways to solve the problem of the authorship of the Dead Sea Scrolls and certain defects; 5) the Jerusalem theory is a valuable attempt to give a new answer to old challenges in contemporary Qumran studies.

---

<sup>1</sup> Baigent M., Leigh R. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception*. New York, 1993. P. 115.

<sup>2</sup> The most important of these are: Golb N. *Who Hid the Dead Sea Scrolls?* // *Biblical Archaeologist*. 1985. № 48. Pp. 68–82; Golb N. *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* // *The Sciences*. 1987. № 3. Pp. 40–49; Golb N. *The Dead Sea Scrolls – A New Perspective* // *The American Scholar*. 1989. № 2. Pp. 177–207; Golb N. *Khirbet Qumran and the Manuscripts of the Judaean Wilderness: Observations on the Logic of their Investigation* // *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*. 1990. № 2. Pp. 103–114; Golb N. *The Qumran-Essene Hypothesis: A Fiction of Scholarship* // *Christian Century*. 1992. № 36. Pp. 1138–1143; Golb N. *Scrolls Origins: An Exchange on the Qumran Hypothesis (Response to J. A. Fitzmyer)* // *Christian Century*. 1993. № 10. Pp. 329–332; Golb N. *The Major Anomalies in the Qumran-Sectarian Theory and their Resolution* // *The Qumran Chronicle*. 1993. № 3. Pp. 161–182.

<sup>3</sup> Golb N. *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?: The Search for the Secret of Qumran*. New York, 1996. P. 150.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* P. 50.

<sup>5</sup> Lim T. *Pesharim*. London, 2002. P. 7.

<sup>6</sup> Golb N. *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?: The Search for the Secret of Qumran*. P. 157.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> Rengstorff K. *Hirbet Qumran and the Problem of the Dead Sea Caves*. Leiden, 1963. Pp. 19–21; Golb N. *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* Pp. 157–160.

<sup>9</sup> Golb N. *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* P. 157.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* Pp. 159–160.

<sup>11</sup> Golb N. *Zagadka svitkov Mertvogo moria [The Mystery of the Dead Sea Scrolls] / Zagadki evreiskoi istorii*. Jerusalem, 1990. P. 80 (in Russian).

- <sup>12</sup> Teksty Kumrana [The Qumran Texts]. Vol. 1 / Perevod s drevneevreiskogo i arameiskogo, vvedenie i kommentariy I. Amusina. Moscow, 1971. P. 339 (in Russian).
- <sup>13</sup> It is notable that the very concept of chastity is absolutely foreign to Judaism. There is not a single mention of someone being celibate in the Bible. The only Talmud adherent of chastity is Shimon ben Azzai (Yevamoth 63b), and he explained his choice through special feelings for the Torah. We do not know of any celibate Jewish religious authority from the Middle Ages, either. There was no requirement of chastity in Nazorean acts self-renunciation, nor in any of the special restrictions connected with the rank of high priest or any servant of the temple. Even Josephus believed that the chastity characteristic of the Essenes was a separate trait, connected with their status as a sect.
- <sup>14</sup> Golb N. Zagadka svitkov Mertvogo moria. P. 79.
- <sup>15</sup> Cross F. The Ancient Library of Qumran (3<sup>rd</sup> ed). Sheffield, 1995. P. 82; De Vaux R. Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls. London, 1973. Pp. 45–48.
- <sup>16</sup> Tantlevskiy I. Istoriia i ideologiya Kumranskoi obschiny [History and Ideology of the Qumran Community]. Saint Petersburg, 1994. P. 41 (in Russian).
- <sup>17</sup> Golb N. Zagadka svitkov Mertvogo moria. P. 79.
- <sup>18</sup> Golb N. Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? P. 55.
- <sup>19</sup> Golb N. Zagadka svitkov Mertvogo moria. P. 79; Tantlevskiy I. Istoriia i ideologiya Kumranskoi obschiny. P. 41.
- <sup>20</sup> See also: Hirschfeld Y. Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence. Peabody, Mass., 2004; Hirschfeld Y. Qumran in the Second Temple Period. Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence // *Liber Annus LII* (2002). Pp. 247–296; Hirschfeld Y. Kumran bi-tkufat beit sheni – ha-arakha mekhudeshet shel mimtsaei ha-khafira [Qumran during the Second Temple Period: Re-evaluating the Archaeological Evidence] // *Cathedra* 109 (2004). Pp. 5–50 (in Hebrew).
- <sup>21</sup> See: Hirschfeld Y. Early Roman Manor Houses in Judea and the Site of Khirbet Qumran // *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*. 1998. № 3. Pp. 161–189.
- <sup>22</sup> Teksty Kumrana. Vol. 1. P. 339.
- <sup>23</sup> Golb N. Zagadka svitkov Mertvogo moria. P. 79.
- <sup>24</sup> About Qumran coins, see also: Magness J. Debating Qumran: Collected Essays on Its Archaeology. Leuven, 2004; Meshorer Y. Ancient Jewish Coinage. New York, 1982; Sharabani M. Monnaies de Qumrân au Musée Rockefeller de Jerusalem // *Revue Biblique*. 1980. № 2. Pp. 274–284.
- <sup>25</sup> Iosif Flaviy. Iudeiskaia voina [The Jewish War]. Moscow–Jerusalem, 1999. Pp. 171, 184 (in Russian).
- <sup>26</sup> See also: Teksty Kumrana. Vol. 1. Pp. 341–347.
- <sup>27</sup> Golb N. Zagadka svitkov Mertvogo moria. P. 80.
- <sup>28</sup> Golb N. Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? P. 55.
- <sup>29</sup> Golb N. Zagadka svitkov Mertvogo moria. P. 80.
- <sup>30</sup> Ibid. P. 81.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid.

<sup>32</sup> He wrote in the book *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*: “Certainly manuscripts were copied in the *scriptorium* of Qumran, and in the case of several manuscripts it is possible to discern the hands of the same scribes. We can also suppose, even before studying their content, that certain works were composed at Khirbet Qumran” (De Vaux R. *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. P. 104).

<sup>33</sup> For example: Cross F. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. P. 64.

<sup>34</sup> VanderKam J., Flint P. *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity*. San Francisco, 2002. P. ix.

<sup>35</sup> See for more: Tantlevskiy I. *Istoriia i ideologiia Kumranskoi obschiny*. Pp. 18–23.

<sup>36</sup> *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*. Vol. 1 / Ed. by F. Martínez and E. Tigchelaar. Leiden – New York – Köln, 1999. P. 101; *Teksty Kumrana [The Qumran Texts]*. Vol. 2 (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) / *Vvedenie, perevod s drevneevreiskogo i arameiskogo i kommentarii* A. Gazova-Ginzberga, M. Elizarovoi i K. Starkovoi. Saint Petersburg, 2009. P. 155 (in Russian).

<sup>37</sup> See: *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*. Vol. 2. Pp. 1172–1183.

<sup>38</sup> Golb N. *Zagadka svitkov Mertvogo moria*. P. 83.

<sup>39</sup> See for more: Dupont-Sommer A. *The Essene Writings from Qumran*. Gloucester, Mass., 1973. Pp. 39–67.

<sup>40</sup> Golb N. *Zagadka svitkov Mertvogo moria*. P. 84; Collins J. *The Scepter and the Star*. New York, 1995. P. 12.

<sup>41</sup> Libraries among Jews were just as widely spread in antiquity as among other ethnic and religious groups in different parts of the Mediterranean region.

<sup>42</sup> Golb Norman. *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* Pp. 147–148.

<sup>43</sup> Golb N. *Zagadka svitkov Mertvogo moria*. P. 84.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid. P. 85; Collins J. *The Scepter and the Star*. P. 11.

<sup>46</sup> From the recollections of Dupont-Sommer: Dupont-Sommer A. *The Essene Writings from Qumran*. P. 381; Golb N. *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* P. 121.

<sup>47</sup> The Copper Scroll was published by Manchester University Professor John Allegro. See more on the Copper Scroll: Allegro J. *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*. London, 1960; Wolters A. *History and the Copper Scroll / Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects*. New York, 1994. Pp. 285–298; Wolters A. *The Copper Scroll: Overview, Text and Translation*. Sheffield, 1996 etc. About the authenticity of the text and its historical value, see: McCarter K. *The Copper Scroll Treasure as an Accumulation of Religious Offerings / Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects*. New York, 1994. Pp. 133–148.

<sup>48</sup> Golb N. *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* P. 121; Golb N. *Zagadka svitkov Mertvogo moria*. P. 85.

<sup>49</sup> *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*. Vol. 1. P. 239.

- <sup>50</sup> Golb N. *Zagadka svitkov Mertvogo moria*. P. 85; Golb N. *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* P. 127.
- <sup>51</sup> Golb N. *Zagadka svitkov Mertvogo moria*. P. 85.
- <sup>52</sup> For more, see: *Masada: the Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965, Final Reports*. Vol. 1 / Ed. by Y. Yadin, J. Naveh, Y. Meshorer. Jerusalem, 1989.
- <sup>53</sup> Golb N. *Zagadka svitkov Mertvogo moria*. P. 85.
- <sup>54</sup> Golb N. *Zagadka svitkov Mertvogo moria*. P. 87.
- <sup>55</sup> Golb N. *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* P. 134.
- <sup>56</sup> *Ibid.* P. 163.
- <sup>57</sup> Fitzmyer J. *Scrolls Origins: An Exchange on the Qumran Hypothesis* // *Christian Century* 10 (1993). P. 329; Martínez F., Van der Woude A. “Groningen” Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History / *Qumranica Minora I: Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism*. Leiden–Boston, 2007. P. 39–40.
- <sup>58</sup> The Israeli archaeologists Y. Magen and Y. Peleg dug in Qumran in 1993–2004, and came to believe after finding new artifacts that it was a center of pottery industry.
- <sup>59</sup> Magen Y., Peleg Y. *The Qumran Excavations 1993–2004: Preliminary Report*. Jerusalem, 2008. P. 65; Magen Y., Peleg Y. *Back to Qumran: Ten Years of Excavation and Research, 1993–2004 / Qumran – The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates*. Leiden–Boston, 2006. P. 109–113.
- <sup>60</sup> Hirschfeld Y. *Qumran in the Second Temple Period – A Reassessment / Qumran – The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates*. Leiden–Boston, 2006. P. 239.
- <sup>61</sup> Crown A., Cansdale L. *Qumran: Was It an Essene Settlement?* // *Biblical Archaeology Review*. 1994. № 20. Pp. 24–36, 73–78.
- <sup>62</sup> In fact, the discussion, which was mostly between de Vaux (who believed that all Qumran finds belong to the Hellenistic period, meaning up to 63 BCE) and Dupont-Sommer (who believed the finds to be early Roman, after 63 CE), was correlated by 1950s finds and the according paleographic and archaeological studies for a wide period of time: 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE – 1<sup>st</sup> century CE (Vermes G. *An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*. London, 1999. P. 3). Even though recently a number of scholars see a certain bias in said correlation, a desire to put the manuscripts and Jesus on one timeline, trying to prove the historicity of Jesus, especially considering that the Teacher of Righteousness of the scrolls has some similarities to the figure of Jesus. Thus, Greg Doudna, summarizing all of the discussions on the dating of the manuscripts, comes to the conclusion that they were all written not later than 1<sup>st</sup> century CE (Galor K., Zangenberg J. *Qumran Archaeology in Search of a Consensus / Qumran – The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates*. Leiden–Boston, 2006. P. 5; Doudna G. *Redating the Dead Sea Scroll Deposits at Qumran: the Legacy of an error in Archaeological Interpretation* (June 2004). Online source: [http://www.bibleinterp.com/articles/Doudna\\_Scroll\\_Deposits\\_1.htm](http://www.bibleinterp.com/articles/Doudna_Scroll_Deposits_1.htm); see also: Doudna G. *Redating the Dead Sea Scrolls Found*

at Qumran: the Case for 63 BCE // *Qumran Chronicle*. 1999. № 4. Pp. 1–96). Michael Wise, who analyzed hidden hints in the texts of the manuscripts, discovered that six such hints are to people and events that happened or existed in 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE, 26 – to people and events of 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE, and that there are none that refer to an event or person later than 37 BCE. Because of this Wise concludes that nearly 90% of all Qumran manuscripts were written or re-written in 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE, and 52% – between 45 and 35 BCE (Wise M., Abegg M., Cook E. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. San Francisco, 1996. P. 14; see also: Wise M. *Dating the Teacher of Righteousness and the Floruit of His Movement* // *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 2003. № 1. Pp. 53–87).

<sup>63</sup> See: Hutchesson I. 63 BCE: A Revised Dating for the Deposition of the Dead Sea Scrolls // *Qumran Chronicle* 8 (1999). Pp. 177–194.

<sup>64</sup> See: Hutchesson I. *The Essene Hypotheses After Fifty Years: An Assessment* // *Qumran Chronicle* 9 (2000). Pp. 17–34.

### **Abstract (Ukrainian)**

Стаття присвячена проблемі походження та історії розвитку єрусалимської теорії авторства рукописів Мертвого моря, її перевагам і недолікам та місцю, що вона займає в сучасній кумраністиці. На підставі аналізу досліджень автор доходить висновку, що єрусалимська теорія об'єктивно сформувалася як відповідь на суперечності кумрано-есеїської теорії; предтечею теорії стала гіпотеза К. Г. Ренгсторфа щодо єрусалимських витоків кумранських рукописів; завершальною фазою у формуванні теорії стали дослідження Н. Голба; зазначена теорія містить як конструктивні шляхи вирішення проблеми авторства рукописів Мертвого моря, так і певні недоліки; єрусалимська теорія являє собою цінну спробу по-новому відповісти на старі виклики в сучасній кумраністиці.



Qumran. Photo of 2008. Courtesy of Vitaly Chernoiivanenko



Qumran. Cave 4 where the most of the scrolls were found.  
Photo of 2008. Courtesy of Vitaly Chernoiivanenko



Masada. Photo of 2008. Courtesy of Vitaly Chernovianenko



The Shrine of the Book, a museum in Jerusalem where the some of the Dead Sea Scrolls are held. Photo of 2008. Courtesy of Vitaly Chernovianenko