



Charlesworth, James H., ed.

The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins

Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2006. Pp. xxxii + 319; vi + 491; vi + 734 (3 vols.). Hardcover. \$199.95. ISBN 1932792341.

Matthew Goff
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls is a massive compilation of authoritative scholarship on the contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to our understanding of the Hebrew Bible, Second Temple Judaism, and Christian origins. This large three-volume set contains articles authored by fifty-three scholars, many of whom are senior figures with international reputations. They presented papers at the Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins. James Charlesworth, the editor of the volumes, writes that the articles reflect “the high level of discoveries and new perceptions that have emerged after fifty years of research focused on the Dead Sea Scrolls” (1:xxiii). These three volumes attest “a team of world-class scholars announcing a ‘paradigm shift’ in the study of Early Judaism (or Second Temple Judaism),” produced by the discovery of the scrolls, that acknowledges the centrality of Early Judaism for understanding Jesus and the emergence of Christianity, which in this period should not be considered an entity separate from Judaism (1:xxix).

Volume 1, subtitled *Scripture and the Scrolls*, contains the following articles: James H. Charlesworth, “The New Perspective on Second Temple Judaism and ‘Christian Origins’” (xxiii–xxx); James H. Charlesworth, “The Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Discovery and Challenge to Biblical Studies” (1–23); James A. Sanders, “The Impact of the Judean Desert

Scrolls on Issues of Text and Canon of the Hebrew Bible” (25–36); Gabriele Boccaccini, “Qumran and the Enoch Groups: Revisiting the Enochic-Essene Hypothesis” (37–66); Frank Moore Cross, “The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran and the Canonical Text” (67–75); Eugene C. Ulrich, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hebrew Scriptural Texts” (77–99); Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “The Formation and Re-formation of Daniel in the Dead Sea Scrolls” (101–30); Sidnie White Crawford, “The Rewritten Bible at Qumran” (131–47); Ronald S. Hendel, “Qumran and a New Edition of the Hebrew Bible” (149–65); Donald W. Parry, “4QSam^a (= 4Q51), the Canon, and the Community of Lay Readers” (167–82); Håkan Bengtsson, “Three Sobriquets, Their Meaning and Function: The Wicked Priest, Synagogue of Satan, and the Woman Jezebel” (183–208); Philip R. Davies, “The Biblical and Qumranic Concept of War” (209–32); Peter W. Flint, “Psalms and Psalters in the Dead Sea Scrolls” (233–72); J. J. M. Roberts, “The Importance of Isaiah at Qumran” (273–86); and George J. Brooke, “Biblical Interpretation at Qumran” (287–319).

Limitations of space prevent this review from discussing each of these contributions in detail. The focus of volume 1 is “the search for ways to improve, understand, translate, and explain the Hebrew and Aramaic documents collected into” the canon of the Hebrew Bible (xxvi). Charlesworth’s introductory “The Dead Sea Scrolls” surveys how research on the scrolls “is revolutionizing scholars’ recreation of Second Temple Judaism and the understanding of our biblical texts” (23). The scrolls shattered the old model of pre-70 C.E. Judaism as *Spätjudentum* (late Judaism), a term that implied that Judaism was old and dying as Christianity was emerging. The literature of Qumran attests the variety and vitality of the literature of Second Temple Judaism (8). The scrolls also improve our knowledge of the biblical text. For example, one scroll (4QSam^a) includes a lengthy passage after 1 Sam 11:1 that is not present in modern Bibles (14).

James A. Sanders’s essay focuses on “what study of the scrolls has done for understanding concept and method in the study of Jewish and Christian canons of scripture” (25). The biblical texts found at Qumran and other Judean sites such as Masada indicate “a stage of limited fluidity” with regard to the canonical status of the text (31). This is evident from texts such as the great Psalms Scroll from Cave 11 (11QPs^a), which Sanders edited, a collection of hymns that contains material found in the biblical Psalter along with non-masoretic compositions. The pluriform nature of the Qumran biblical texts has reshaped the task of textual criticism and suggests that scribes and translators did not have a rigid devotion to a fixed and stable text but were rather “free to make Scripture comprehensible to the communities they served” (30).

Gabriele Boccaccini summarizes his view that the origin of the Dead Sea sect should be understood as a “parting of the ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism” (49). He decided not to update his paper, written in 1997, but chose to include it as “a precious

testimony of the first steps of a fortunate hypothesis” (66). He does, however, append a January 2005 addendum that takes into consideration recent assessments and criticisms of his widely publicized views (59–66). He contends that recent scholarship has affirmed many of his opinions, such as the thesis that “Enochic Judaism” was “a nonconformist, anti-Zadokite, priestly movement of dissent” (61). He also admits that his Enochic-Essene hypothesis could benefit from a clearer distinction between “intellectual movements” and “social groups” (64).

Loren T. Stuckenbruck argues that “the Dead Sea Scrolls provide evidence for the making and remaking of what people would soon recognize as biblical tradition [the book of Daniel]” (130). Eight manuscripts of the book have been found at Qumran (1Q71–72; 4Q112–116; 6Q7pap) (121). 4QFlorilegium and 11QMelchizedek cite the book of Daniel; other texts, such as the War Scroll, reflect significant influence from the book. Some manuscripts, such as the so-called Pseudo-Daniel texts (4Q243–244), resemble parts of Daniel but with notable differences, suggesting that scribes were utilizing Danielic traditions before the book developed a fixed, canonical form (115).

Sidnie White Crawford examines “Rewritten Bible” texts, or compositions, the content of which resembles a biblical text that has been modified, with material altered, omitted, or added, when compared to the Bible. The term *Rewritten Bible*, while still a useful category for modern readers, is problematic in that there was no “Bible” at Qumran in the sense of a single, fixed text (132). Examples of this category include the Temple Scroll, which is a unique presentation of biblical laws, especially those of Deuteronomy, that contains material not found in the Pentateuch, such as stipulations regarding a festival of new wine and one of new oil (136). Other Rewritten Bible texts the author examines include the book of Jubilees, 4QReworked Pentateuch, and the Genesis Apocryphon. Crawford argues that these texts not only exhibit similar interpretative strategies but also attest a common tradition (147). The Temple Scrolls and Jubilees, for example, both advocate a 364-day solar calendar and may have drawn on 4QReworked Pentateuch as a source.

Ronald S. Hendel provides a useful discussion of how the Qumran scrolls improve our understanding of the biblical text. He examines one passage from several biblical books, from Genesis to Kings, each of which produces a better reading than the one available in the Masoretic Text. His first example is from Gen 1:9. The Septuagint’s version of this verse contains a statement not found in the Masoretic Text: “and the waters below heaven gathered into their gathering place and dry land appeared” (151). 4QGen^k (4Q10) supports the Septuagint reading of Gen 1:9, suggesting its plus was not added by the translator but reflects a Hebrew *Vorlage* that differs from the Masoretic Text. Hendel calls for a new critical edition of the Hebrew Bible that incorporates the full contribution of the

biblical texts from Qumran (165; he is now undertaking this effort in the Oxford Hebrew Bible project).

J. J. M. Roberts includes a valuable overview of the material from Qumran that relates to the book of Isaiah. Numerous manuscripts of the biblical book are attested, including the famous Isaiah scroll (1QIsa^a) that helped create excitement about the Qumran scrolls when they were first discovered in the 1940s (274). There are ample Qumran texts that cite Isaiah, including five pesharim (commentaries) that are devoted to this biblical text (4Q161–165) (277). There are several instances in which “the Qumran interpreters reinterpreted the biblical texts to make them refer to events of their own time” (279). For example, pap4QpIsa^c (4Q163) interprets a reference to enemies that march to Jerusalem as the “Kittim,” which often in the pesharim signifies Rome (281). The authors of this material were drawn to the book of Isaiah, Roberts suggests, because of its powerful theological message that “Those who lift themselves up against God will in time be cut down, and God’s people can continue to trust in God as the source of their security” (286).

Volume 2 is devoted to *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community*. The overall conclusion of this book is that “there was not just one theology at Qumran”; the people who produced the scrolls had a range of ideas and beliefs on many topics, including messianism, purity, dualism and resurrection (1:xxvii). Volume 2 contains twenty-two papers: Keith T. Knox, Roger L. Easton Jr., and Robert H. Johnston, “Digital Miracles: Revealing Invisible Scripts” (1–16); David Noel Freedman and Jeffrey C. Geoghegan, “Another Stab at the Wicked Priest” (17–24); Shemaryahu Talmon, “What’s in a Calendar? Calendar Conformity and Calendar Controversy in Ancient Judaism: The Case of the ‘Community of the Renewed Covenant’” (25–58); Moshe Weinfeld, “The Covenant in Qumran” (59–69); John J. Collins, “What Was Distinctive about Messianic Expectation at Qumran?” (71–92); Joseph M. Baumgarten, “The Law and Spirit of Purity at Qumran” (93–105); Brent A. Strawn, “Excerpted Manuscripts at Qumran: Their Significance for the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible and the Socio-religious History of the Qumran Community and Its Literature” (107–67); John R. Levison, “The Two Spirits in Qumran Theology” (169–94); Elisha Qimron, “Dualism in the Essene Communities” (195–202); Henry W. Morisada Rietz, “The Qumran Concept of Time” (203–34); Magen Broshi, “Predestination in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls” (235–46); Émile Puech, “Resurrection: The Bible and Qumran” (247–81); Sarianna Metso, “Qumran Community Structure and Terminology as Theological Statement” (283–300); Dennis T. Olson, “Daily and Festival Prayers at Qumran” (301–15); James H. Charlesworth and James D. McSpadden, “The Sociological and Liturgical Dimensions of *Psalm Peshar 1* (4QpPs^a): Some Prolegomenous Reflections” (317–49); Jacob Cherian, “The Moses at Qumran: The מורה הצדק as the Nursing-Father of the יחד” (351–61); Ephraim Isaac, “Enoch and the

Archangel Michael” (363–75); Paolo Sacchi, “Qumran and the Dating of the Parables of Enoch” (377–95); Randall D. Chesnutt, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Meal Formula in *Joseph and Aseneth*: From Qumran Fever to Qumran Light” (397–425); Joseph L. Trafton, “The Bible, the *Psalms of Solomon*, and Qumran” (427–46); Devorah Dimant, “Old Testament Pseudepigrapha at Qumran” (447–67); and James C. VanderKam, “The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha at Qumran” (469–91).

The article by Shemaryahu Talmon is a lengthy and learned investigation of calendrical disputes in early Judaism. Conformity to a common calendar is important for the promotion of the “internal cohesion of a society,” and in that sense it is not surprising that sectarian divisions throughout the history of Judaism have often had a calendrical dimension (25). Differences persist today, for example, between the Samaritan lunar calendar and that used in other types of Judaism (29). Talmon argues for the antiquity of the solar calendar in Israel and that the calendrical views of the Dead Sea sect were influenced by the book of Jubilees, which was in turn shaped by 1 Enoch, especially the Book of Heavenly Luminaries (1 En. 72–82) (52–53). Talmon (writing in 1951) was one of the first scholars to recognize the importance of calendrical disputes, particularly with regard to the Day of Atonement, for understanding the origins of the Dead Sea sect (see 1QpHab 11:4–8) (55). 4QMMT represents an earlier stage of the movement when dialogue with other groups regarding calendrical issues was still possible. Over time their differences would sharpen to the point that the sect would cut itself off completely from “mainstream” groups (see CD 4:10–12) (56).

Joseph M. Baumgarten examines legal texts from Qumran with an eye toward their consideration of eschatological and spiritual concerns. 4QMMT contains a series of halakic statements, and its author believed that he was living in “the end of days” (95). The Community Rule establishes that lustration with water is efficacious “only when coordinated with inner receptivity for the divine holy spirit” (98). Such material illustrates that ritual purification was regarded by the sect “as the means by which the holy spirit restores the corporate purity of Israel” (104).

John R. Levison offers a study of the well-known Treatise of the Two Spirits (1QS 3:13–4:26). A core question in this text is the meaning of the term “spirit,” which occurs sixteen times in the unit (169). Scholars often understand the two spirits in the composition to have both cosmic and anthropological aspects, and there has been extensive speculation regarding the background of the text’s dualism, including whether this theme should be attributed to Zoroastrian influence or not (184–85). Levison emphasizes a position advocated in earlier scholarship regarding the role of exegesis of the good and evil spirits mentioned in 1 Sam 16:14 for understanding the dualism of the two spirits of the Treatise (185, 194).

Émile Puech incorporates the evidence from Qumran into ancient Jewish conceptions of resurrection. Important texts in this regard are Isa 26, Dan 12, and 2 Macc 7. There are writings from Qumran that attest a belief in resurrection. One of the best examples is 4Q521, entitled 4QMessianic Apocalypse. Puech understands this text as “very important evidence concerning Essene eschatology,” but it is not apparent that the work was composed by the Dead Sea sect (268). Regarding the undisputedly sectarian writings, Puech views the group as affirming the resurrection of the body as part of the final judgment in a manner compatible with Hippolytus’s account of Essene eschatology (279). It should be noted, however, that, while members of the sectarian movement clearly envisaged life after death for the elect, few scholars see any unambiguous reference to bodily resurrection in the texts composed by members of the group.

Ephraim Isaac offers a useful survey of the figure of Enoch in Jewish writings. He is a minor character in the Hebrew Bible, appearing only in Gen 5:18–24 (363). But in early Jewish and some rabbinic literature he is quite prominent. Isaac focuses on the reception of the figure of Enoch. He does more, for example, with 3 Enoch than 1 Enoch. He is interested in Metatron, who is associated with both Enoch and the archangel Michael (369–70). There is no unambiguous identification of Enoch with Michael in Qumran literature, but Isaac speculates that 4QThe Words of Michael (4Q529) could be easily attributed to Enoch (372). He concludes with the realization that there are numerous postbiblical accounts of Enoch: “He is at once a heavenly traveler, a prophet, a seer, a priest, an ascetic, a scribe, a mediator, a Jewish proselyte, and an eschatological judge” (375).

Paolo Sacchi argues that the Similitudes of Enoch (also known as the Book of Parables; 1 En. 37–71) was written around 30 B.C.E. (395). There is a great deal of interest in dating the book because it refers to a heavenly figure with the title “Son of Man” (378). The absence of this book from the Aramaic Enoch texts from Qumran has led to the view that the Similitudes was written after 68 C.E. Sacchi attributes its nonpresence at Qumran to the fact that it was written after the Essenes split off from Enochic Judaism (drawing on the work of Boccaccini) (390–91). A reference to the Parthian invasion of 40 B.C.E. in 1 En. 56:5–7 establishes the *terminus a quo* of the composition (381, 386). The Gospel of John uses the phrase “Son of Man” less often than Mark, from which one can infer that the title was falling out of use by the end of the first century C.E., also suggesting an earlier date for the composition (389).

Joseph L. Trafton observes that, before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Psalms of Solomon was one of the few Jewish texts that could be reasonably dated to the first century B.C.E. (427). The opponents mentioned in the collection have often been understood as Sadducees; hence scholars have traditionally identified the Psalms of

Solomon as a Pharisaic text (p. 429). The Dead Sea Scrolls complicate the issue, and there are broad parallels between the circles responsible for the Psalms of Solomon and the Dead Sea sect. Both groups, for example, exhibit hope for a Davidic messiah that relies on exegesis of Isa 11 and are critical of the temple priesthood (431, 437–38). Trafton argues that “the Pss. Sol. attest to an anti-Hasmonean Jewish sentiment that had affinities with both Pharisaism and Essenism, but which cannot be identified with either” (434). The author also examines the contribution of the Psalms of Solomon to the study of the New Testament, which attests a concept of a Davidic messiah as well (437).

Volume 3 of *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* is on *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*. The contributors of this book “indicate how and in what ways the ideas found in the Dead Sea Scrolls may have influenced the thinking of many first-century Jews, including John the Baptizer, Jesus, Paul, and others” (1:xxvii). This volume includes sixteen articles: James H. Charlesworth, “John the Baptizer and the Dead Sea Scrolls” (1–35); Richard A. Horsley, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Jesus” (37–60); Donald H. Juel, “The Future of a Religious Past: Qumran and the Palestinian Jesus Movement” (61–73); Craig A. Evans, “The Synoptic Gospels and the Dead Sea Scrolls” (75–95); James H. Charlesworth, “A Study in Shared Symbolism and Language: The Qumran Community and the Johannine Community” (97–152); Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, “The Impact of Selected Qumran Texts on the Understanding of Pauline Theology” (153–85); James D. G. Dunn and James H. Charlesworth, “Qumran’s *Some Works of Torah* (4Q394–399 [4QMMT]) and Paul’s Galatians” (187–201); Harold W. Attridge, “How the Scrolls Impacted Scholarship on Hebrews” (203–30); Adela Yarbro Collins, “The Dream of a New Jerusalem at Qumran” (231–54); Loren L. Johns, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Apocalypse of John” (255–79); Enno E. Popkes, “About the Differing Approach to a Theological Heritage: Comments on the Relationship between the Gospel of John, the *Gospel of Thomas*, and Qumran” (281–317); Gordon M. Zerbe, “Economic Justice and Nonretaliation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Implications for New Testament Interpretation” (319–55); Paul Garnet, “Atonement: Qumran and the New Testament” (357–80); Gerbern S. Oegema, “‘The Coming of the Righteous One’ in *1 Enoch*, Qumran, and the New Testament” (381–95); Krister Stendahl, “Qumran and Supersessionism—and the Road Not Taken” (397–405); and Jörg Frey, “The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation: Proposals, Problems, and Further Perspectives” (407–61). This volume also contains a lengthy bibliography and a set of indices that cover all three volumes (463–734).

Richard A. Horsley suggests that “knowledge of a contemporary Judean protest-and-renewal (of Israel) movement parallel to the early communities of Jesus’ followers is the primary significance of the DSS for our understanding of the historical Jesus” (39). The sectarian movement associated with the Teacher of Righteousness can help illuminate the

movement centered around Jesus of Nazareth. The Dead Sea sect evinces clear opposition to the temple and high priests in Jerusalem, repeatedly referring to a Hasmonean high priest as the “Wicked Priest” (e.g., 1QpHab 9:5–12) (47). Its members imagined their community to serve as the true temple over and against the physical one in Jerusalem (1QS 8:5–7). Jesus, according to the Gospels, similarly condemned the temple and delivered oracles that announced the “(re)-building of a temple ‘not made with human hands’” (Mark 14:58) (48). Horsley concludes that the scrolls “flesh out the prophetic script of a restored covenantal Israel in a way that gives us greater confidence in identifying many of Jesus’ teachings and exhortations ... as part of a new or renewed covenant pattern” (60).

Harold W. Attridge comprehensively reviews how the scrolls have shaped the study of this New Testament text. The Letter to the Hebrews is a homily that exhorts its addressees to exhibit a renewed sense of faith by focusing on the figure of Jesus Christ (203). There are several intriguing parallels between Hebrews and the scrolls. The concept of a new covenant prophesied by Jeremiah is prominent in Hebrews (e.g., 8:7–13) and recalls the phrase “community of the renewed covenant” in the Damascus Document (CD 6:19) (205–6). Hebrews 7 draws on the figure of Melchizedek to explain the nature of Jesus’ high priesthood, and he is also a major actor in the eschatological scenario according to 11Q13 (11QMelchizedek) (218). Hebrews 10:37–38 cites Hab 2:3–4, a passage that is interpreted at length by the Habakkuk Peshier (1QpHab 7:3–8:3) (225). These parallels do not support the thesis that Hebrews is directly reliant on any Qumran text, but “The scrolls have ... enormously enriched the material relevant to the Jewish heritage of Hebrews” (230).

Adela Yarbro Collins “attempts to synthesize ideas about Jerusalem expressed in the nonbiblical manuscripts [from Qumran] and consider to what extent these various ideas are compatible with one another” (231). The Community Rule, by envisioning the sectarian community symbolically as an atoning temple, relies on a notion of a “new Jerusalem” (238). The Temple Scroll offers a “normative and ideal” framework for the restoration of the temple (241). A fragmentary composition from Cave 11 (11QNew Jerusalem) contains a first-person account of a visionary receiving a tour of Jerusalem by an angel (246). Visions of a new Jerusalem are also prominent in the New Testament book of Revelation (chs. 21–22) (253). Yarbro Collins argues that the scrolls attest three different but related visions of a new Jerusalem—the image of the community as a new temple, blueprints for an ideal temple, and an eschatological temple, “a glorious and everlasting city and temple brought into being by God” (254). Texts in which these types are attested include, respectively, the Community Rule, the Temple Scroll, and the New Jerusalem text.

Loren L. Johns defends the value in comparing Revelation with the scrolls while pointing out the limitations of such analysis (256). As Yarbrow Collins also stresses, the vision of a heavenly Jerusalem at the end of Revelation has affinities with the Qumran New Jerusalem text, which has been called a “missing link” in understanding the development of traditions that shape the final chapters of Revelation (266). One important difference, however, is that in the New Jerusalem of Revelation there is no temple, for “its temple is the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb” (Rev 21:22) (267). Both Revelation and Qumran texts include negative sobriquets as a rhetorical strategy. The Habakkuk Peshet, for example, refers to factions that used to be part of the Dead Sea sect as Ephraim and Manasseh, and the author of Revelation chastises one group as “the synagogue of Satan” (272–73). A major topos in Revelation and Qumran literature is the final eschatological battle. In this section Johns does surprisingly little with the War Scroll (1QM), which provides the most detailed account of eschatological war in the Dead Sea Scrolls (274). While the traditional Jewish “symbol systems” upon which Revelation draws are better illuminated by the Dead Sea Scrolls, “no comparison of the Apocalypse with the Dead Sea Scrolls can afford to ignore what happens to symbols when one views them in light of understanding Jesus as Messiah” (277).

Krister Stendahl observes “that the driving force behind supersessionism is the claim to the true, authentic, and only legitimate continuity to the inherited history” (397). Such a mindset, evident in the scrolls, puts Christian supersessionism in sharper relief. The rigid, intolerant statements in Qumran literature (as in 1QS 9:21–22) remind Stendahl “that we are heirs to traditions that have—it seems—in their very structure the negation if not the demonization of the other” (401). Stendahl also finds in the biblical tradition the resources for a posture toward the other that is not exclusivistic or hostile. The goal, he asserts, is to reassess the Enlightenment ideal of universalism in favor of “faithful particularity,” which “is the key to religious existence in an irreducibly plural world” (403). Stendahl writes: “To know oneself to be—at best—a light to the world, leaving universalism to God, in whose eyes we are all minorities, is the humility that behooves all who have been touched by God” (403–4). This is the “road not taken”—to be a “light to the world” in this model means not to transform the rest of the world to conform to one’s own version of religious truth but rather to view oneself and be viewed by others as one particular group among many. Krister Stendahl was a wise and compassionate human being, and his absence is a genuine loss. Scholars and students, however, can still learn much from him through his cogent and penetrating writings.

The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls is a genuine achievement in terms of both quality and quantity. Its editor Charlesworth, who also authored several contributions to the volume, deserves credit for assembling in this trilogy the assessments of leading scholars of the Dead Sea Scrolls. One should note, however, that the symposium that produced these

papers convened in 1997. Several articles mark the fiftieth anniversary of the discovery of the scrolls (e.g., 2:104, 3:39), while last year we celebrated the sixtieth. While some papers were revised, more could have incorporated more post-1997 scholarship. For example, two papers that discuss the New Jerusalem text (Yarbro Collins and Johns) do not use the official edition of the key Cave 11 fragments of that text (see 3:246, 264), which appeared in 1998 in DJD 23. Stuckenbruck's article on Danielic literature cites the preliminary edition of 4Q112–116 (1:121), but the official edition of these fragments was published in 2000 in DJD 16. While the volumes give extensive treatment to how the scrolls impact our understanding of Christianity and its origins, with a few exceptions (e.g., Baumgarten), the contributors do relatively little with rabbinic Judaism and how it can be illuminated by the scrolls. These critiques do not detract from the overall quality and significance of the articles or *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* as a whole. Its volumes contain a wealth of knowledge and expertise that comprises a notable contribution to the study of the Hebrew Bible, early Judaism, and the origins of Christianity.