

Gleanings from the Caves: Dead Sea Scrolls and Artefacts from The Schøyen Collection, edited by Torleif Elgvin, with associate editors Kipp Davis and Michael Langlois. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016. ISBN: HB: 978-0-5671-1300-9; ePDF: 978-0-5672-8571-3. 506 pp.

This is an impressive, but also highly problematic book. Impressive, because of the display and the multifaceted discussion of many fragments and artefacts purportedly from Qumran or the Judean Desert region, collected by Martin Schøyen since the 1990s, as part of Schøyen's much larger collection of ancient manuscripts. As can be read in Martin Schøyen's personal reflection (pp. 27-31), his acquisition of Dead Sea Scrolls fragments had been an ultimate challenge, starting with the purchase of artefacts from John Allegro's collection, the subsequent acquisition of the 1QSb fragment from Sarah Louis Brownlee, and that of many small pieces that had broken from the edges of Cave 1 scrolls in the possession of John Trever, and continuing with the purchase of many more fragments and some artefacts from or through William Kando. Apparently, some of those fragments were acquired by earlier collectors, and often were bought back from their heirs. Schøyen reports, that eventually the collection consisted of circa 115 fragments from around 27 different scrolls.

In this volume, indeed, a series of editors (Torleif Elgvin, Kipp Davis, Esther Eshel, Årstein Justnes, and Jan Dušek) publish fragments from around 27 different scrolls (chapters VII through XXXII; pp. 139-319), as well as a series of artefacts claimed to be from Qumran, but some more likely from elsewhere in the Judean Desert (pp. 321-466). As an introduction, we find Schøyen's reflections, Hanan Eshel's "The Fate of Scrolls and Fragments: A Survey from 1946 to the Present" (33-49),¹ an overview by Elgvin of the Judean Desert texts and artefacts in the Schøyen collection (51-60), material and palaeographical analyses of the fragments (pp. 61-128 by respectively Ira Rabin and Michael Langlois), and a case study of high quality scrolls from the post-Herodian period by Davis (129-38).

¹This is a shorter version of his article "Gleaning of Scrolls from the Judean Desert," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Contexts*, ed. Charlotte Hempel (Leiden: Brill, 2010)

The most important problem of this book is that its editors excluded without any explanation from this volume nine Dead Sea Scrolls fragments from the Schøyen collection, only notifying the reader of this decision in footnote 1 on p. 62: “The edition of some of the Schøyen fragments analyzed here has been postponed to a later publication (MS 4612/2abc, MS 4612/6, MS 4612/8, MS 4612/10, MS 4612/12, MS 5234, MS 5426).” At no point does the book disclose the identity of those fragments, or the reason for this delay of publication. Only insiders would observe that some of the famous, already preliminarily published Schøyen fragments are missing from this volume, apparently belonging to those nine fragments. This holds for MS 4612/12, the famous XQpapEnoch fragment, published by Esther and Hanan Eshel in 2005,² but despite being part of the Schøyen collection not mentioned at all in the volume, except in the overview by Hanan Eshel (p. 43). Similarly, MS 5234, the Tobit fragment, which was both featured on the Schøyen collection website, and published in *Revue de Qumrân*,³ and once described as the “most important fragment owned by Schøyen”⁴ is conspicuously missing from the volume; even the reference to it in “Gleaning of Scrolls” has been removed from “The Fate of Scrolls.” MS 5246, the famous first Dead Sea Scrolls fragment of Nehemiah (3:14-15) is not included.⁵ Finally, another Enoch fragment, MS 4612/8, partially published by Langlois, is also absent.⁶

²“New Fragments from Qumran: 4QGen^f, 4QIsa^b, 4Q226, 8QGen, and XQpapEnoch,” *DSD* 12 (2005): 134-57, esp. 146-57.

³Michaela Hallermayer and Torleif Elgvin, “Schøyen Ms. 5234: Ein neues Tobit-Fragment vom Toten Meer,” *RevQ* 22/87 (2006): 451-61.

⁴Eshel, “Gleaning of Scrolls,” 75.

⁵Published online by James H. Charlesworth, “Announcing a Dead Sea Scrolls Fragment of Nehemiah.” See <http://web.archive.org/web/20130829163116/http://foundationjudaismchristianorigins.org/ftp/pages/dead-sea-scrolls/unpub/nehemiah.html>

⁶Michael Langlois, “Un manuscrit araméen inédit du livre d’Hénoch et les versions anciennes de 1 Hénoch 7,4,” *Semitica* 55 (2013): 101–16.

One year after the publication of the Schøyen volume, the editors publicly divulged the reason for the exclusion of these nine fragments by exposing them as modern forgeries.⁷ In two different ways, this belated discussion of the authenticity of these fragments is problematic. First, because of the initial deliberate lack of transparency. Admittedly, at several places in the volume (especially in the material and palaeographical analyses) suspicious features and uncertainties about authenticity of fragments are mentioned, but at no point in this publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls fragments in the Schøyen collection it is stated that those were real concerns, since other fragments were excluded from the volume as probable forgeries. On the contrary: in the references to suspicious features (as on p. 53 and 124), the editors remain vague, and nowhere do they refer to Enoch, Tobit, or Nehemiah fragments. It is clear that only at a late stage the editor decided to exclude these fragments. For example, in spite of the fact that these nine fragments were set aside as possible forgeries, letter samples from these fragments have been used for the visual reconstruction of other fragments in the volume (cf. p. 56-60). Second, the features that cast doubt on the authenticity of those nine fragments, are also found in some of the published Schøyen fragments. In an earlier online discussion of the Schøyen volume, I described in some detail the palaeographic anomalies in both the excluded MS 5426 (the Nehemiah fragment branded as a forgery) and the included MS 5480 (1 Sam 5:10-11) which is published in the volume. Indeed, the volume itself mentions “some suspicious features that possibly cast doubt on the authenticity of” MS 4612/11, but concludes that “in spite of these observations, there is insufficient evidence to make any firm judgments about the authenticity of the text” (p. 239). Davis has described in more detail different exceptional scribal and palaeographic characteristics that appear in both the Schøyen collection and the Museum of the Bible collection (which was also published in 2016).⁸ In

⁷Kipp Davis et al., “Nine Dubious ‘Dead Sea Scrolls’ Fragments from the Twenty-First Century,” *DSD* 24 (2017). This *DSD* issue also contains other articles dealing with the new fragments, and at the SBL International Meeting in Berlin, a special session was devoted to certain and possible forgeries in those and other collections, like that of the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.

⁸Kipp Davis, “Caves of Dispute: Patterns of Correspondence and Suspicion in the Post-2002 “Dead

short, the editors may have taken the right decision not to include in the edition those fragments which clearly were forgeries. However, they failed to alert the reader that forgeries had been detected and that some of the fragments in the volume also may be forgeries.

Apart from the issue of forgeries, the volume is also problematic in assigning specific provenances to the newly surfaced fragments (“the most probable place of discovery”; p. 53), though generally accompanied with question marks. Aside from the Cave 1 fragments acquired from Brownlee and Trever, the collection contains only one fragment that can be assigned with certainty to a specific find-place, because it can be assigned to 4Q364. Elgvin and Davis assign tentatively one wad of MS 5095/1 to 11QT^a on the basis of FTIR and spectroscopic comparison of the wad which would demonstrate a Cave 11 signature. For the other fragments, the editor has taken the view that fragments written in an Hasmonean or Herodian script would most probably have been found at Qumran, and those with a post-Herodian script in the Bar Kokhba caves, probably Naḥal Hever or perhaps Murabba‘āt. (In some cases, the absence of aragonite traces on the fragments is taken to exclude a Qumran provenance.) As a result, the editor assigns, tentatively, but against other evidence, eleven unprovenanced fragments to Qumran Cave 4, one to Qumran Cave 11, and one in general to Qumran. Some of the objections against a Qumran provenance are voiced cautiously by Langlois in the volume. Because those fragments were written by naive hands on parchment with a rough surface, he suggests they were not produced in the same environment as the manuscripts written by skilled hands on a smooth surface. He concludes, “the lack of affinities with Qumran scrolls,” would suggest that “those fragments, if authentic, may well come from a previously unknown location” (124). One should also note that apart from MS 5439/1 (4Q364) none of the purportedly Cave 4 or 11 fragments can be identified with any of the more than five hundred manuscripts from Caves 4 and 11. The same holds true, to the best of my knowledge, for the other fragments of the American collections. Though the general style of the hands (“Hasmonean”; “Herodian”) corresponds to that of the Qumran fragments, none of those fragments can be assigned to any of the Qumran manuscripts. This distinguishes these newly surfaced fragments from

Sea Scrolls" Fragments," *DSD* 24 (2017) forthcoming.

other fragments that were bought by collectors, more than half of which could easily be connected to Qumran manuscripts. This holds for the 4Q78 frag. 9 which was owned by Michel Testuz (present owner not known to me); 4Q184 frag. 2 bought by Elmo Hutchison who sold it to the Chicago Oriental Institute Museum; 4Q379 frag. 1 in the Musée de la Flagellation; a 4Q418 fragment (published as XQ7), bought by a Finnish clergyman who had it donated after his death to the State of Israel; 4Q537 frag. 1a (4QTestuz) which was also owned by Testuz; the 11Q1 fragment bought by Georges Roux and now in the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary; 11Q5 frag. E, bought by Yadin from Joe Uhrig; one of the Yadin fragments has been published, though tentatively, as 11Q8 frag. 3; the 11Q19 fragment of Arnold Spaer which fits in col. 14; one of the two fragments bought by Salvatore Garofalo and now in the Vatican can be assigned to 11Q22. Admittedly, some fragments of collectors could not or not yet be assigned to any Qumran manuscript. The fragment called 4Q98 and in the possession of the Musée Bible et Terre Sainte has not been associated with any other fragment from either Qumran or Naḥal Ḥever; two other Yadin fragments, published in DJD as XQ5a and XQ5b were incorrectly identified with Cave 11 manuscripts, and are as yet not assigned to any other manuscript; XQ6, from the Spaer collection, has not been identified with any Qumran manuscript, even though Emile Puech labelled it 4Q587 frag. 1 (the fragment published as 4Q587 frag. 2 is in The Schøyen Collection, and assigned by Elgvin to Cave 11); the Hecht Museum fragment published as X3 has been mistakenly identified as 4Q401, and has not yet been identified; the other Vatican fragment previously owned by Garofalo has not yet been published.⁹ By dismissing the material and palaeographical evidence furnished by Langlois, and the dearth of identifications with Qumran manuscripts, the editor has willfully ignored other, more likely options, be they another provenance of the fragments, or the possibility of forgery.

Doubtlessly, new research and ongoing discussions will have to take place about the nature—authentic or forgery—and provenance of all the newly surfaced fragments, both the published ones of The Schøyen Collection, and the ones from American collections. On the basis

⁹A mediocre photo is included in <http://www.foglidarte.it/archivio2007-2010/155-Gerusalemme%20e%20la%20Palestina.pdf>

of various features, such as post-discovery history, identification with Qumran manuscripts, or palaeography, I am inclined to consider as authentic in this Schøyen volume: the Wadi Daliyeh fragments, all the fragmentary materials associated with Qumran cave 1, MS 5439/1 (4QRP^b), MS 5095/7 (associated with Commentary on Genesis A), MS 4612/3 (previously published by Puech as 4Q587 frag. 2), and the fragments with a skilled late or post-Herodian script (all of which Elgvin connects to Naḥal Ḥever or Murabba'āt). In his list of “skilled and confident” hands (as opposed to “naive” and “hesitant”) Langlois also includes MS 5214/2 (Deut 32), but this seems to me too generous. The stance of the strokes of letters is inconsistent, and several strokes are interrupted and written in bits and pieces (most notably the base of *bet* of בּוֹי in line 4 and the diagonal of *lamed* of תּבּל in line 5). From a palaeographical view all, or almost all, other fragments in the volume are dubious, because of what Langlois calls hesitant hands or morphological inconsistencies—even though some of the strange strokes could be the result of the course surface—and sometimes due to other scribal features, such as suspicious relation of letters and holes. In sum, I would call dubious (i.e., possibly or probably a forgery) the following eleven fragments in the volume: MS 4612/4 Gen 36:7-16; MS 4612/5 Num 16:2-5; MS 5214/1 Deut 6:1-2; MS 5214/2 Deut 32:5-9; MS 5480 1 Sam 5:10-11; MS 5233/1 2 Sam 20:22-24; MS 5440 1 Kgs 16:23-26; MS 4612/9 Jer 3:15-19; MS 5233/2 Ps 9:10-13; MS 4612/11 Prov 4:23-5:1; MS 5441 Ruth 2:1-2. Together with the nine other fragments excluded from the volume, this would amount to twenty forgeries, sixteen of which containing Biblical texts in a style reminiscent of Hasmonean or Herodian formal script.

Altogether, such a publication with a eleven possible forgeries is highly unfortunate, because of the intellectual effort put into interpreting probable modern forgeries as ancient scribal artefacts, and because the likelihood of forgeries will inevitably detract from the many important presentations and interpretations of the authentic fragments. I will therefore briefly comment on the editions of the those likely authentic fragments.

In 2011 Puech published MS 5439/1, which he reports Khalil Iskander Shahin (Kando) showed him around the mid 1970s, and which Puech identified as a fragment of 4Q1.¹⁰ In the

¹⁰Emile Puech, “Un nouveau fragment 7a de 4QGn-Ex^a = 4QGen-Ex 1 et quelques nouvelles lectures

volume Elgvin demonstrates that this identification was wrong, and that the fragment rather belongs to 4Q364. MS 4611, a second-half first-century CE manuscript with Lev 26:3-9, 33-37, had previously been published by Puech, albeit with an illegible Plate.¹¹ The present edition provides good photographs, on the basis of which Elgvin improves on Puech's reading. One of those is a new variant in Lev 23:6, וְהַשְׂמֵדְתִּי where MT has וְהַשְׁבַּתִּי (which is what Puech read). For a general discussion of the Schøyen late/post-Herodian manuscripts, including comparison with other similar manuscripts, see the survey of Davis in the volume. MS 2713 (Josh 1:9-12; 2:3-5) had already been published by James Charlesworth in DJD 38, pp. 231-39. The present edition disagrees with the pre-68 date provided by Charlesworth, who assumed it derived from Qumran cave 4, and supports this date with a C-14 dating (on p. 186 Elgvin provides the heading "Palaeography and C-14 Dating," but only refers to the latter in passing on p. 192). MS 2861 (XJudg), earlier published by Charlesworth in DJD 28, p. 231-33, is one of seven published fragments of a Judges scroll written in the second half of the first century CE, which were published and identified by various scholars in between 1994 and 2007. The present publication, by Esther Eshel, Hanan Eshel and Årstein Justnes, presents "readings and a reconstruction of all seven published fragments of XJudg more comprehensively than in previous publications." Unfortunately, however, this edition does not have a visual reconstruction of frags. 3-7. I would have expected תִּלְכִּי, which the editors place in line 11, to be actually placed at the end of line 10, just as Esther Eshel drew in her earlier figure.¹² MS 4612, a heavily damaged fragment with part of Joel 4:1-5 in late or post-Herodian script is published here for the first time. The remaining readings on the fragment show one textual variant, בִּזְרוּ for MT פִּזְרוּ, which Elgvin regards as either an Aramaism or as a phonetic variant. However, note that all the adduced examples of interchange or shift between *bet* and *pe* concerns spirantized realizations of those letters, which is not the case here, and that בִּזְרָא is used in a similar sense in 4Q174 4 5

et identifications du manuscrit 4Q1," *RevQ* 25/97 (2011): 103-11.

¹¹Emile Puech, "Un autre manuscrit du Lévitique," *RevQ* 21/82 (2003): 311-13.

¹²Esther Eshel, Hanan Eshel, and Magen Broshi, "A New Fragment of XJudges," *DSD* 14 (2007): 354-58 at 358 (fig. 2).

and 4Q371 1a-b 1. More problematic is that the editor could not resist the temptation to reconstruct in the transcription a variant not attested in any textual witness. For “considerations of space” he adds ויזנו (but in the figure he constructs ויזונה) after בזונה, and proposes, on the basis of this reconstruction, a possible textual development of the verse. Again for reasons of space, the editor reconstructs at the end of Joel 4:2 וארצי חלקו, rather than MT ואת ארצי חלקו, and then argues that “most probably the *nota accusativi* in MT was added for syntactical clarification.” However, those “considerations of space” pertain to lines that are almost in their entirety reconstructed with only very few remaining traces. Such highly hypothetical reconstructions should not lead to the construction of variants, let alone proposals about textual development. MS 1926/4a is a small wad acquired from the Trever family, preserving part of 1Q71, and adding some extra letters to Dan 2:4-5. The edition in this book provides a new edition of 1Q71. The same wad also contains a layer supplementing three lines of 1Q72, raising again the question of the historical circumstances in which these two manuscripts were physically pressed together. George Brooke’s edition of MS 1909 (the 1QSb fragment) is adapted from DJD 26, pp. 227-33. MS 1926/2 is a wad of the Cave 1 Genesis Apocryphon, according to the editors from cols. 1-4, acquired from Trever, and providing a few more letters. The photograph of the wad also contains two other fragments which the editors interpret as pieces of repair material, and which Ira Rabin interpreted as the sheet which Avigad and Yadin in their 1956 edition of the Genesis Apocryphon describe as “a sheet of thin, very smooth, white material covers the lower part of Columns x-xv.” Unfortunately, the editors do not explain how they know that these two small fragments derive from the sheet which Avigad and Yadin describe. MS 5095/7 consists of three tiny pieces, initially acquired as pieces of a leather cord, which revealed letters that, once fit together, present a few words which neatly overlap with 4Q252 (4QCommentary on Genesis A) I 8-10. MS 4612/3 is the fragment which Puech published in DJD 37, pp. 501-4, as 4QTestament^d ar frag. 2 and associated with the fragment from the Spaer collection which André Lemaire published in DJD 36, pp. 490-91 as XQOffering ar. Esther Eshel dismisses this association on the basis of the different executions of *mem* in the two fragments. Her observation seem to be valid, though one would wish a better photograph. MS 5439/2 with only a few letters in

a late Herodian script was not assigned to Qumran by the editor because of the absence of traces of aragonite. MS 4612/7 are papyrus scraps of Wadi Daliyeh texts, described by Jan Dušek.

A substantial part of the volume contains different studies of artefacts. All the artefacts with a 5095 number, i.e., the leather cord, the purported Temple Scroll wrapper and the palm fibre tool, were acquired from William Kando. Most 1655 numbers, i.e., a cylindrical jar (MS 1655/1), an incense altar, and a bronze inkwell, are from Allegro's collection, while a few potsherds (also 1655/3abcd) are from the Brownlee collection, collected from the soil at Khirbet Qumran around 1950. A second bronze inkwell (MS 1987) was bought in London. The section consists of discussions of these artefacts, material analyses of samples from the jar, the ink from Allegro's inkwell, and the substances at the top of the palm fibre tool, and C-14 dating of the assumed Temple Scroll wrapper.

Again, the problem with most of these artefacts is their claimed provenance. Five different contributions deal with the jar and the sherds, two on INAA analysis of the jar and one of the sherds (by Jan Gunneweg in cooperation with Marta Balla, comparing it with a few other jars; and by Matthew Boulanger and Michael Glascock), one on the samples from jar (Ira Rabin and Roman Schütz), a typological study by Joan Taylor to what extent the Allegro and Schøyen jars would fit in the context of Cave 1 or other caves in the area, and a general conclusion with discussion of the function of jars at Qumran by Elgvin. INAA analysis of the Schøyen jar, shows that it, just as two cooking pots found by de Vaux in Qumran, match pottery that originated in Beer Sheba, and was distributed in the eastern Negev desert. Elgvin proposes that the incense altar and bronze inkwell which Shahin sold to Allegro in 1953 as having been found together at Qumran by Bedouin before the de Vaux excavations, more probably were found in Naḥal Ḥever, and that they represent Nabatean workmanship.

Issues of claimed and proposed provenance as well as identification surround the MS 5095 items, some or all of which were claimed to be found in the purported Cave 11 Temple Scroll jar. Schøyen refers to a signed statement in which William Kando claims: "We can also confirm that the fragments from the *Temple Scroll* (MS 5095/1 and MS 5095/4) with its linen wrapper

(MS 5095/2) and a date palm leaf pen (MS 5095/3) you acquired, actually were found together with the *Temple Scroll* itself in 1956, in the jar with a lid we still have in our shop, in the cave now known as Cave 11. In 1961 we presented the fragments, wrapper and pen as a gift to our customer in Zurich." It is not clear whether the references to specific MS numbers are included in the signed statement, or were added in the quotation. Apart from MS 5095/1 through 5095/4 the edition also refers to 5095/5 (p. 53), where, however, it refers to the text elsewhere numbered MS 5439/2, and to MS 5095/6 (leather cord) and 5095/7 (fragments with text from *Commentary on Genesis A*). The earlier photographs, however, referred to MS 5095/6 and 5095/7 as MS 5095/4B and to the parts of textile as MS 5095/4A, and in some subsequent photographs the fragments with writing from MS 5095/4A were photographed together with the MS 5095/4B fragments. It therefore it not clear whether the present MS 5095/6 and 7 also were claimed to have been found in the same jar. Elgvin does not consider this possibility at all, and tentatively ascribes these fragments to Cave 4 since "nearly all the Qumran *pesharim* were found in Cave 4, and the same may be the case for MS 5095/7" (294).

Another question concerns the exact procedures and conclusions of the different scientific analyses and discussions. Thus, it is not clear to me which of the 5095 fragments was analyzed by Rabin (p. 301 suggests it was one of the 5095/1 wads, but Rabin. p. 308. refers to 5095/4, and in either case we still do not know which of the many depicted fragments was analysed). Likewise, it is not clear to me whether the analyses indicate the mineral features characteristic of Cave 11 or also a specific correspondence due to the use of gypsum with previously tested materials from the Temple Scroll. Here too, it remains unclear what exactly was tested, in spite of general references to "edge" and col. XXXVIII. Even a perusal of the earlier presentation¹³ does not solve that question. Rabin's analysis of the wrapper (MS 5095/2) presents a positive correlation with Qumran

¹³Ira Rabin et al., "Analysis of an antique alum tawed parchment," in E. Janssen et al. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Joint Interim Meeting Multidisciplinary Conservation: A Holistic View For Historic Interiors, Rome 23-26 March 2010*. Available from <http://www.icom-cc.org/54/document/analysis-of-an%20antique-alum-tawed-parchment/?id=795#.WYyoJtOGMUE>

cave 11, but also an absence of extensive contact with the floor of the cave. She concludes that this fits the information that the Temple Scroll was found in a closed jar, and supports the assertion that the linen wrapping indeed covered this scroll. It remains, unclear, however, whether the same conclusions also apply to the tested wad, which too she associates with the Temple Scroll. Na'ama Sukenik proposes that 5095/2 appears to have been used as a wrapper for the Temple Scroll, and opines, on the basis of the density, that it is likely that the textile pieces in 5095/4 were part of the same large fabric. Overall, while the identification of wrapper and wads with the Temple Scroll which was reported to have been found in the same jar is tempting and coherent, it must be stressed that the required scientific proof seems to be missing. With regard to the so-called pen which was reportedly found in the same jar (MS 5095/3), Rabin remarks that given its similarity with the wooden artefact depicted in DJD 3, pl. 7, fig. 15-4 it must be authentic. However, because the groove does not extend to the top, it is most likely not a pen, but rather a tool for mixing substances.

In conclusion: unfortunately, with both the fragments and the artefacts, we rarely have full and reliable records of discovery and post-discovery history. Throughout this book one encounters the basic tendency to take the sellers' statements as reliable, and to accept plausible scenarios, unless the evidence clearly falsifies these claims. It is commendable that eventually the editors dared to entertain the thought that some claims were wrong, and some fragments were forgeries, but one would have wished for a more open and critical approach throughout the book.

Eibert Tigchelaar

KU Leuven