

it has not even been founded by men. "Something," says Père Audet, "has dictated in a positive way the unity of Hermas' theological thought, and something must also have determined its quality." This something is a Judaic, not a Christian tradition, but a Judaic tradition of a particular kind that now for the first time becomes recognizable. Hermas mentions the *Didaché*, which is evidently one of the sources of his "Mandates"; and you find again in the *Shepherd* the Way of Darkness and the Way of Light that lead to salvation or perdition, and, again, the two angels assigned to them. You find the atonement by baptism, and this is the only kind of atonement mentioned. As for the Holy Spirit, we have seen, in the passage just quoted from the Manual, that a Holy Spirit was associated with the ritual of cleansing by baptism, and this seems to be the same Holy Spirit that twice figures in the Zadokite fragments as something that must not be defiled. Now, Hermas tells us that he lived in Rome, and that he had been at one time a slave. The guess has been hazarded by Père Audet that his father had been a Jew who belonged to the Dead Sea sect, and that, after the descent of the Romans in 70 A.D. (when the monastery was probably destroyed), he brought the boy to Rome and sold him. ("He who brought me up," writes Hermas, "sold me to a certain Rhoda at Rome.") The son would eventually have become a Christian, but would already have been so deeply imbued with the doctrine in its older form that he would never have really assimilated the theology elaborated by the Christians.

WHAT WOULD RENAN HAVE SAID?

AS SOON AS one sets out to study the controversies provoked by the Dead Sea scrolls, one becomes aware of a certain "tension." "During the past three years," wrote Dr. Albright in 1951, "there has been a debate about the chronology of the scrolls which has at times attained the status of a veritable *guerre des savants*. It is an astounding chapter in the history of learning, in some ways without parallel." But the tension does not all arise from the at first much disputed problems of dating, and the contention about the dating itself had, perhaps, behind it other anxieties than the purely scholarly ones.

The elements of the situation, of which I was already though vaguely aware, were pointed up for me in a poignant manner by an evening I spent in Israeli Jerusalem with a distinguished Jewish scholar from Prague, Mr. David Flusser. I had just read, in the *Israel Exploration Journal*, an interesting paper by Flusser, connecting still another apocryphal book, the so-called *Ascension of Isaiah*, with the Dead Sea literature. In examining the section of this book known as *The Martyrdom of Isaiah*, which is supposed to be pre-Christian, Dr. Flusser was led to suspect that the Old Testament prophet had here been made to stand for the Teacher of Righteousness. The opponent of Isaiah here is Belial, the Angel of Lawlessness, whom—since Belial, as we have seen, is the char-

acteristic name given, in this group of writings, to the ruler of the forces of evil—Flusser identifies with the Angel of Darkness, ruler of “all the sons of lawlessness,” who figures in the Manual of Discipline; as well as with the Angel of Darkness and Evil of the Two Ways of the *Didachē*. This Isaiah is sawed in two by the human agents of Belial for saying that he has seen God—which Moses had expressly said it was impossible to do and live—and that he now knows more than Moses. (The Habakkuk Commentary asserts that God had made known to the Teacher of Righteousness “all the secrets of the words of his servants the prophets.”) But just before Isaiah’s martyrdom, he has spoken to his followers and told them to “flee away” to the region of Tyre and Sidon: “For me only has God mixed the cup.” There is no mention in the Bible or elsewhere of a flight to Tyre and Sidon; but Flusser calls attention to the following passage in the Zadokite fragments: “All those who turned back were delivered to the sword, and those who held fast escaped into the land of the north.” Damascus and Tyre and Sidon were all to the north of Jerusalem, and all, in both Seleucid and Roman times, belonged to the same department of imperial administration. It is Flusser’s conjecture that the author of *The Martyrdom of Isaiah* “took part in the controversy over this departure” and “tried to prove by the authority of the prophet Isaiah that the departure was prefigured according to the Divine Will.”

This theory, though not implausible, is hardly supported by such evidence as seems to be quite conclusive in tying together the other documents. But Flusser is a learned and intelligent man, who is very much worth listening to on the subject of the scrolls, with which, though this is not his field, he has recently been occupying himself. I had met him in the library of the University and asked him to come to see me, and he arrived at the

King David Hotel, precipitately, abruptly, hatless, with his briefcase in his hand, and the moment we sat down in the lobby, quite without a conventional opening—since he knew that I was looking for light on the subject—he began to talk about the scrolls. He was dynamic, imaginative, passionately interested. I had heard about his absorption in ancient texts—which he seems always to carry about him—while waiting in queues for his marketing. The important thing, he said at once, was not the polemics about the dates, but what was implied by the contents of the manuscripts. He started in English but asked if he could speak French. His English was bad, he said; and few people understood Czech. (I had the impression that German was not often spoken in Israel.) Hebrew he had learned, he added, rather late in life; “My best language here is really medieval Latin.” I knew that he was primarily a student of medieval subjects, but asked him with whom he spoke Latin. “With the Jesuits,” he replied. I had been told that if you asked him a question, it would take him three hours to answer, and I could see now what people meant, but he was neither a bore nor garrulous. On the contrary, I have rarely known a scholar who expressed himself—with all his material at his fingertips—so brilliantly and so much to the point. He would give me, to each of my questions, a full and closely reasoned answer, and stop when he had covered the ground. All the texts that were needed he had brought in his briefcase, and he handed me a Greek Testament for me to follow the Pauline Epistles while he held before me the Hebrew texts and translated them fluently into Greek, demonstrating that not only the doctrine but the language itself was exactly the same. I do not remember now the passages he read, but one of them must have been the description of baptism from the Manual of Discipline, quoted above, which might well have been juxtaposed to the Epistle to Titus, 3:5: “Not by works of right-

eousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewal in the Holy Spirit." On the doctrine of Election, of salvation by grace, that is implied in such a statement and that dominates the Pauline Epistles, Mr. Flusser talked with much animation. "For the doctrine of Election," he said, "we have now a new genealogy: the Teacher of Righteousness, Paul, Spinoza, Calvin, Hegel, Marx—one of the most disastrous of human ideas, the doctrine of pre-destination!" Such were the pressure and tempo of Mr. Flusser's talk that he was carried at one point to lengths that had no parallel in my experience of even the most enthusiastic talkers. Not only did he raise his voice, when some insight had taken possession of him, quite oblivious to the people sitting near us and as if he were lecturing in a classroom, but when, at the climax of one of his arguments—though we had tried to get away from the orchestra by going to the farthest corner—the music impinged on our conversation, my companion, caught up by a familiar tune, actually sang a few bars of his exposition, as if it were part of an opera; then pulled himself up and returned to prose, as he put his text back in the briefcase.

I was already beginning to realize the explosive possibilities of the subject, and I now heard these described with candor. "*Les chrétiens sont dérangés*," Mr. Flusser declared. "*Les juifs sont dérangés aussi. Moi, je ne suis pas dérangé!*" It had already been made very clear to me at the Hebrew University that the sect had "grown up in side Judaism, but had nothing to do with Judaism," and I had seemed to note, also, on the Christian side, a certain reluctance to recognize that the characteristic doctrines of Christianity must have been developed gradually and naturally, in the course of a couple of hundred years, out of a dissident branch of Judaism. This was what was upset-

ting to the scholars, who were mostly, on the Christian side, either Anglican divines, Roman Catholic priests or Presbyterian or Methodist ministers, and, on the Jewish side, if not Orthodox Jews, at least specialists in the literature of Judaism, who approached it with a certain piety. An independent scholar like Flusser, not committed to any religion, had no reason for being upset. "*C'est très désagréable pour tout le monde*," he said to me on another occasion,—"sauf pour ceux qui s'occupent des *apocalypses*—ils sont contents." He seemed even to regard it as a little risky to come to grips publicly and boldly with the implications of the scrolls; but he enjoyed his informed detachment, and there were moments when I almost felt that the Devil had sent him to Jerusalem to make the most of the situation. Mr. Flusser is a short stocky man, with sharp little cold green eyes that glint behind rimless glasses, under modestly Mephistophelian eyebrows, and red hair that stands straight up from his forehead. And he delights in deadpan humor, which, if one does not show signs at once of appreciating his ironic intent, he underlines with a harsh dry laugh. I have seen him disconcert other scholars by insisting that the errors in sacred texts and the ignorant misreadings of them were really the constructive element in the history of civilization, since the religious ideas that have had most success have mainly been founded upon them. Yet Flusser is much respected, and his scholarly work is quite sober; nor has he anything of the polymath's blase-ment. I joined him, when we later removed to the bar, in a toast to what he called "*le vrai saint esprit*"—the *πνεῦμα ἄγιον* and *רוח הקדש*—that had been fitting about our corner of the lobby—that humanity carries with it. And he talked to me with admiration of the character of the Teacher of Righteousness, of which he felt he had been able to form some idea through reading the whole of the text

of the then still unpublished *Thanksgiving Hymns*: a courageous man, he believed, who had lived his defeat with dignity. There was nothing of Jesus, said Flusser, in the morality of the Teacher of Righteousness, for Jesus had taught people to love their enemies, and the Teacher felt nothing but hatred for his and expected the Lord to avenge him. Nor was there anything, he pointed out, in the doctrine of the Teacher's followers, of the Christian idea that salvation is to be gained by believing in Jesus, who will take all our sins away.

I later attended with Flusser and two younger Israeli scholars an evening session of lectures devoted to the Dead Sea scrolls. At dinner, he provoked a protest by announcing that, since the function of apologetics was fundamental to science, he did not object to apologetics. He went on, disregarding objections, to explain that, in spite of this, he always distrusted people, who, like one of the speakers on the program, invariably began by explaining that his opinions were quite objective and did not represent special pleading. This session on the scrolls was interesting. The speeches, which were all in Hebrew, were translated to me by one of my other companions. The inhibitions of the Jews in regard to the scrolls were brought out by a well-known Israeli scholar, Mr. A. M. Habermann, who said that the Jewish scholars had sometimes been shy of these documents, for fear of their destroying the authority of the Masoretic text of the Bible, and that they sometimes took the attitude—which the speaker regretted—that the subject was of less interest to Jews than to Christians. Yet the large auditorium was packed. It was the Passover holidays, and this evening session was merely one feature of a week of lectures especially given for teachers, many of them from out of town, who seemed to attend these sessions in preference to other entertainment. They began at, I think, half past eight in the morning

and went on till eleven at night. All were on Biblical subjects. I had the impression that these talks on the scrolls were of special interest to the audiences; and when Flusser, who had also spoken, came back at the end to join us, he exclaimed, in a terrific pun—*megillot* is the Hebrew word for scrolls: "*Tout le monde est mégillotmane!*"

The next morning I crossed over to Jordan, where I stayed, in Old Jerusalem, at the American School of Oriental Research. Dr. Frank M. Cross, Jr., of the McCormick Theological Seminary in Chicago, who was working on the new material, was Annual Professor at the School; and the resident director was Dr. James Muilenburg of Union Theological Seminary, who had been studying some new fragments of Ecclesiastes, and had come to the conclusion that this pessimistic and rather sophisticated book cannot have been written so late as has been supposed by some, but must belong to the third or fourth, rather than to the second, pre-Christian century. These last years—with their findings of Egyptian tombs, the excavations of Paestum, Pompeii and Athens, the plumbing of the millennial layers of Jericho and the deciphering at last of the Minoan script—have been a heyday for archaeologists; and the excavation of the monastery, the reading of the Dead Sea manuscripts, have been followed with intense eagerness. It seemed to me very regrettable that the barrier between Israel and Jordan should be cutting off from one another the two groups of Semitic scholars who—in the Jordan Museum in Old Jerusalem and at the Hebrew University in New—have been working on, respectively, the new harvest of fragments and the three Sukenik manuscripts. The people at the University know nothing of de Vaux's discoveries except what they learn at long intervals from the reports in the *Revue Biblique* (a quarterly published in Paris, but edited by de Vaux from Jerusalem), and they must wait for the texts to be brought out

in instalments—which will mean a matter of years—by the Oxford University Press. At the same time, till the very recent publication of the Hebrew University texts, the Christian scholar had no access to them. In Israel, at the session the night before, I had listened to an expert in rabbinics, a tall, lean, black-bearded man, wearing a flat-topped black cap, who looked like a rabbi himself, explaining—from a study of the photographs of the complete Isaiah scroll, then in the United States—that it showed every evidence of having been executed in strict conformity with rabbinical rules. But no scholar with this kind of competence can examine the newly found manuscripts, for no Jew is admitted to Jordan and no Jew known to be such is left there. Thus the enmity between Jew and Arab is contributing to the obstacles and touchiness of this curious situation, which has also been a little affected by the rivalry between Jews and Christians. You sometimes find Jewish scholars implying that their Gentile opponents do not really know Hebrew well enough to arrive at a sound opinion, and, on the other side, non-Jewish Hebraists taking a lofty and offhand tone on the value of rabbinical studies.

The moment of maximum strain in the discussion of the Dead Sea documents may, perhaps, be fixed on the day—May 26, 1950—when M. Dupont-Sommer, Professor of Semitic Languages and Civilizations at the Sorbonne and Director of Studies at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes, read before the French Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres a paper on the Habakkuk Commentary. Dr. W. H. Brownlee, writing of this in the *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* of December, 1953, refers to Dupont-Sommer as “the very original French orientalist,” calls the paper “dramatic,” and says that it “caused a sensation.” “What evoked the most astonishment,” Dr.

Brownlee continued, “was his disclosure that the Teacher of Righteousness, founder of the sect of the scrolls, was in some respects an exact prototype of Jesus, particularly as a martyred prophet, revered by his followers as the suffering Servant of the Lord in Deutero-Isaiah.” (Second Isaiah, the unknown author of the later chapters of the Book of Isaiah.)

(Let us turn to Dupont-Sommer's own statement of his views in his book *Aperçus Préliminaires sur les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (translated under the title *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey*), published the same year that the paper was read.)

“Everything in the Jewish New Covenant,” says M. Dupont-Sommer, “heralds and prepares the way for the Christian New Covenant. The Galilean Master, as He is presented to us in the writings of the New Testament, appears in many respects as an astonishing reincarnation of the Teacher of Righteousness. Like the latter, He preached penitence, poverty, humility, love of one's neighbor, chastity. Like him, He prescribed the observance of the Law of Moses, the whole Law, but the Law finished and perfected, thanks to His own revelations. Like him, He was the Elect and the Messiah of God, the Messiah redeemer of the world. Like him, He was the object of the hostility of the priests, the party of the Sadducees. Like him, He was condemned and put to death. Like him, He pronounced judgement on Jerusalem, which was taken and destroyed by the Romans for having put Him to death. Like him, at the end of time, He will be the supreme judge. Like him, He founded a Church whose adherents fervently awaited His glorious return. In the Christian Church, just as in the Essene Church, the essential rite is the sacred meal, whose ministers are the priests. Here and there, at the head of each community, there is the overseer, the 'bishop'. And the ideal of both

Churches is essentially that of unity, communion in love—even going so far as the sharing of common property.

"All these similarities—and here I only touch upon the subject—taken together, constitute a very impressive whole. The question at once arises, to which of the two sects, the Jewish or the Christian, does the priority belong? Which of the two was able to influence the other? The reply leaves no room for doubt. The Teacher of Righteousness died about 65-53 B.C.; Jesus the Nazarene died about 30 A.D. In every case in which the resemblance compels or invites us to think of a borrowing, this was on the part of Christianity. But on the other hand, the appearance of the faith in Jesus—the foundation of the New Church—can scarcely be explained without the real historic activity of a new Prophet, a new Messiah, who has rekindled the flame and concentrated on himself the adoration of men."

These conclusions, Dr. Brownlee continued, "aroused much opposition, partly inspired by the fear that the uniqueness of Christ was at stake, but securely grounded upon a careful study of the texts adduced by Dupont-Sommer himself and proving the tenuousness (if not impossibility) of the constructions that he had placed upon them."

Indeed, if one examines the two passages of the Habakkuk Commentary upon which M. Dupont-Sommer mainly bases his theory that the Teacher of Righteousness was martyred—I have given them, in the section above, in Dupont-Sommer's own translation—one finds that they do not necessarily imply this interpretation. In the one case, Habakkuk 2:7, there is a gap of two lines, where the bottom of the manuscript has been broken off, and it is the translator who has filled this in with, "he [the Wicked Priest] persecuted the Teacher of Righteousness." The context seems to make it more probable that—as other

translators have assumed—it is the Wicked Priest himself upon the "body" of whose "flesh" the "odious profaners committed horrors and vengeance." (It should be noted, however, that one of the leading British Biblical scholars, Professor H. H. Rowley of Manchester University, believes that "the language" here "seems to favor" Dupont-Sommer's view.) In the case of the other passage, Habakkuk 2:15, the words that Dupont-Sommer translates, "Thou hast dared to strip him of his clothing" may mean also "intended him to go into exile" (Brownlee), "desired his exile" (de Vaux). These points were immediately made by Père de Vaux in the *Revue Biblique*, in a review dated Jerusalem, March, 1951; and de Vaux believes also that the words of the Commentary translated by Dupont-Sommer as "he appeared to them all resplendent" do not imply a transfiguration on the part of the Teacher of Righteousness, but that the subject of the verb is the Wicked Priest, and he shows that the verb itself has also been found in a sense—that of merely revealing oneself—quite remote from its original meaning of causing oneself to shine.

It would seem that Dupont-Sommer has here overplayed his hand. Yet the Teacher of Righteousness was persecuted, he does seem to have been regarded as a Mesiasiah; and the French scholar, in his second volume, *Nouveaux Aperçus sur les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte*, published in 1953 (and now translated as *The Jewish Sect of Qumrân and the Essenes*), is able to support his thesis by pointing to the following passage from *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, a late apocryphal work which has already been mentioned above as connected with the doctrine of the sect and fragments of which have been found in the caves: "And now I have learnt that for seventy weeks ye shall go astray, and profane the priesthood, and pollute the sacrifices. And ye shall make void the law, and

set at nought the words of the prophets by evil perverseness. And ye shall persecute righteous men, and hate the godly; the words of the faithful shall ye abhor. [And a man who reneweth the law in the power of the Most High, ye shall call a deceiver; and at last ye shall rush (upon him) to slay him, not knowing his dignity, taking innocent blood through wickedness upon your heads.] And your holy places shall be laid waste even to the ground because of him. And ye shall have no place that is clean; but ye shall be among the Gentiles a curse and a dispersion until he shall again visit you, and in pity shall receive you [through faith and water].” When R. H. Charles edited the *Testaments*, he regarded this part of it as “unintelligible,” and in his translation he put certain passages in brackets, as I have left them in the extract above, in order to indicate that he assumed them to be Christian interpolations. But there is now no need thus to exclude them, and the passage seems perfectly appropriate if one applies it to the Teacher of Righteousness. The “Christos” of the Greek text, who figures also in other passages, is translated by Charles as “Christ”; but since “Christ” is merely the Greek for the Hebrew word “Messiah,” both meaning “Anointed One,” this does not imply that the references are not to the Teacher of Righteousness; and, if they are, it would appear that the Teacher did actually die at the hands of his enemies. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is, besides this, full of ideas and language that are similar, on the one hand, to the literature of the sect and, on the other, to that of Christianity. *Two Ways* here turns up again; and Dr. Charles, writing forty years ago, clearly showed that “many passages of the Gospels exhibit traces” of the *Testaments*, and that “St. Paul seems to have used the book as a *vade mecum*.” “There are over seventy words,” it seems, “which are common to the *Testaments* and the Pauline Epistles, but

which are not found in the rest of the New Testament.” The most striking parallel, perhaps, is that between *Matthew* 25:35-36 and a passage from the Testament of Joseph I: 5-6. It is impossible to doubt that the former is an imitation of the latter or that both were derived from a common source.

I was sold into slavery, and the Lord of all made me free:

I was taken into captivity, and His strong hand succored me.

I was beset with hunger, and the Lord Himself nourished me.

I was alone, and God comforted me:

I was sick, and the Lord visited me:

I was in prison, and my Lord showed favor to me;

In bonds, and he released me. . . .

TESTAMENTS

For I was hungry and you gave me food,

I was thirsty and you gave me drink,

I was a stranger and you welcomed me,

I was naked and you clothed me,

I was sick and you visited me,

I was in prison, and you came to me. . . .

MATTHEW

And the promises of the Sermon on the Mount are anticipated in several places: “And they who have died in grief shall arise in joy; and they who were poor for the Lord’s sake shall be made rich; and they who are put to death for the Lord’s sake shall awake to life.” The gospel of forgiveness is all through the *Testaments*; and there occurs here the first known conjunction—which was to be

repeated in Mark 12.19-21—of the precept of Deuteronomy 6.5 to “love the Lord thy God with all thine heart,” etc. and that of Leviticus 19.18 to “love thy neighbor as thyself.” (The injunction to love one’s “neighbor” or “brother” turns up also in The Book of Jubilees and the Zadokite fragments; and the great rabbi Hillel of the Talmud, who flourished in the first century B.C. and thus belongs to the same general period, is supposed to have said to a Gentile who had come to him and challenged him to convert him by teaching him the whole of the Torah during the time that he, the Gentile, could stand on one foot: “What is hateful to thee, do not unto thy fellow; this is the whole law.” The conversation reported by Mark has a certain resemblance to this.)

Dr. Brownlee, in the paper already quoted, still maintained, that though Dupont-Sommer had succeeded in his second book in “laying the foundation of his view somewhat more securely,” he had “failed to bring it to rest safely upon incontrovertible proof texts.” But he goes on to say that “Dupont-Sommer often has an uncanny knack for being ultimately right (or nearly so), even when his views are initially based on the wrong texts! So also in the present case there is a doctrine of a suffering Messiah in the scrolls, but not (so I believe) where Dupont-Sommer found it. This is found in a passage of the Manual of Discipline not then published, and in a passage not yet discussed in this connection.” Now, one of the most impressive pieces of evidence that can be adduced from the Old Testament in support of the claim of the Christian that the advent of Jesus as Messiah had been prophesied in the ancient text is, of course, the chapter (53) of Second Isaiah which speaks of a Suffering Servant, “despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows,” who has been “wounded for our transgressions,” and yet by whose “stripes we are healed.” If this is not Jesus, the

Christians have asked, who can it possibly be? The scholars have proposed Israel, the unknown Second Isaiah himself, the real Isaiah and Jeremiah. None of these seems satisfactory; and Dupont-Sommer had suggested that Second Isaiah may date from a period as late as that which is dealt with in the literature of the sect. These later chapters of Isaiah had long been assigned to the Babylonian Exile, two hundred years later than the original Isaiah, and it had already been admitted that still later additions were possible. Why, now asks Dupont-Sommer, could these passages not have been written after the death of the Teacher of Righteousness? And “now that the alert has been sounded,” he says, “many passages of the Old Testament must be examined with a fresh eye. Wherever it is more or less explicitly a question of an Anointed One or of a Prophet carried off by a violent death, how is it possible to avoid asking whether the person indicated is not precisely our Teacher of Righteousness?” He mentions certain passages from Daniel, Zechariah and Psalms; and he says of the passages in Second Isaiah called “Songs of the Servant of Yahweh,” “For twenty centuries people have been asking who was this gentle and humble Prophet, this suffering righteous man whose agony has saved multitudes; the truth is that, apart from Jesus, the Christian Messiah, only one such is known in the whole of Jewish history—and this one has only been known for a very short time. It is the pious Master who was martyred by Aristobulus II. It is not a single revolution in the study of Biblical exegesis that the Dead Sea documents have brought about; they will mean, one begins to foresee, a whole torrent of revolutions.”

It is impossible for the layman to estimate the value of this hypothesis. Let us simply return to Brownlee, who has been working, in connection with Second Isaiah, on an interesting line of his own. What Brownlee calls “a star-

tingly new reading" of Isaiah 52.14 has been found in the complete Isaiah scroll discovered in the first cave. The addition in this text of a single letter changes the accepted meaning from "his appearance [that of the 'Servant'] was so marred beyond semblance," to "I so anointed his appearance beyond anyone (else)," and this for the first time makes plausible the beginning of the following verse, a passage over which editors have always stumbled. The new Revised Standard Version makes this, "So that he startled many nations," but the more obvious meaning of the verb would be, "so shall he *sprinkle* many nations" (it is so translated in the King James Version). But if the Suffering Servant of the Lord was *anointed* instead of *marred*, it would be natural that he should, in turn, have the mission of sprinkling the nations. Whoever was responsible for this variant, it seems plain that a definite Messiah is meant by the scribe of the Dead Sea scroll, and Dr. Brownlee, like Dupont-Sommer, associates this passage with the Messianic references in Zechariah and Daniel (9.24-27: the "Anointed One," who is to be "cut off"). Dr. Brownlee does not commit himself to the theory that this Messiah is the Teacher of Righteousness; but he does try to connect the *refining* and *sprinkling* referred to in the Manual of Discipline and associated with giving the adepts an "insight into the knowledge of the Most High," as well as the statement in the Manual that "God has chosen them to be an eternal covenant," with the language of Second Isaiah in the chapters on the Suffering Messiah. This would seem to make it probable that Jesus "intended to give his life [as] a ransom for many in fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy"—prophecy which, if it did not derive from, was cherished and elaborated in the literature of the sect. It would appear, in other words, that Jesus may well have found prepared for him, by the teaching of the Dead Sea sect, a special Messianic

↑
Look

role, the pattern of a martyr's career, which he accepted, to which he aspired.

When the Manual of Discipline was first discovered, the purgations by sprinkling that appear in it made the scholars at once think of John the Baptist, and there was even, at first, some idea that he might be the Teacher of Righteousness. John the Baptist is supposed to have been born—perhaps in Hebron—not very far away from the monastery; "the word of God" came to him, says Luke, "in the wilderness," which must have meant the bald and sub-sea-level mountains that stand between the monastery and civilization; and his ministry, according to Luke, was in "all the regions about the Jordan." He not only had the practice of baptism in common with the members of the sect, but he seems to be following their principles (Luke 3.11) when he preaches to "the multitudes" who have come to be baptized by him: "He who has two coats, let him share with him who has none; and he who has food, let him do likewise." Like the sect, he expects the Messiah, and like the sect—as Mr. Brownlee reminds us—he invokes, in this connection, the Second Isaiah: "The voice of one crying in the wilderness: Prepare the way of the Lord." But the sect lived together in this wilderness, whereas John, in the Gospels and Josephus, always appears as a lonely ascetic, like Bannus, the desert saint at whose feet Josephus had sat. What, then, was John the Baptist's relation to the sect? Dr. Brownlee suggests that John may have been one of those "other men's children" that Josephus says the Essenes adopted and "molded in accordance with their own principles." "And the child grew," says Luke (1:80), "and became strong in spirit, and he was in the wilderness till the day of his manifestation to Israel." This would give us an explanation of the otherwise rather unaccountable circumstance that John's childhood was spent in the desert. I

have nowhere seen it suggested that John was at odds with the sect; but, in connection with his desert diet of locusts and wild honey, one remembers the expelled Essenes, who resorted to living on grass because they had sworn an oath never to eat any food not prepared by the brotherhood.

But what was the relation of Jesus to the ritual and doctrine of the sect, which the Gospels so persistently echo? Could he have been actually a member of the sect during those early years of his life when we know nothing about him—where he was or how he occupied himself—or was his contact with it, as Albright believes, chiefly by way of John the Baptist? We must remember that Bethlehem itself is not very far from the monastery. The Bedouins were on their way there when they found the scrolls in the cave. Now, John and Jesus, according to Luke, were relatives on their mother's side. Jesus, in his late twenties and hardly younger than John, came down, we are told, from Galilee in order to be baptized by John, and fasted forty days in the wilderness. Not very long afterwards, apparently, John was arrested by Herod, and then the ministry of Jesus began. We know very little, of course, about the first thirty years of Jesus' life—what he had read or by whom he had been influenced. We can feel behind the pages of his followers the fire and dynamic force, the power to melt and to magnetize, of an extraordinary personality. But we know also that the rites and the precepts of the Gospels and Epistles both are to be found on every other page of the literature of the sect. Some scholars believe, in the light of the scrolls, that the Gospel according to John, which hitherto was thought to have been written late and under the influence of the movement—part Persian, part Platonic—that goes by the name of Gnosticism, must actually have come out

of the sect and be the most, instead of the least, Jewish of all the Gospels. You have, at the very beginning of John, the conflict between Light and Darkness, and thereafter many such phrases as "the spirit of truth," "the light of life," "walking in the darkness," "children of light," and "eternal life," which occur in the Manual of Discipline. And you have also, in the Manual, a passage that parallels almost exactly the description of the Logos ("Word") which stands at the beginning of John and which has hitherto been thought to derive from the Gnostics. Manual 11:11 reads, "And by his knowledge everything has been brought into being. And everything that is, he established by his purpose; and apart from him, nothing is done." John 1:2-3: "He was in the beginning with God; and all things were made through him, and without him was not anything made that was made."

What, finally, is the evolution that leads from the morality of the sect—which imposes fraternal forbearance among the members of the order itself and which insists upon charity to the poor, yet condemns and declares war on an enemy who is trying to crush it—to the later morality of Jesus, which is marked by occasional flashes of pugnacity ("I have come not to bring peace, but a sword") yet is dominated by the principle of forgiveness? How reconcile *The War of the Children of Light*, which is full of soldierly weapons, with Philo's first-century statement that the Essenes do not make weapons, or its mention of animal sacrifices with Josephus's so positive assertion that the Essenes had given these up?

The answer is, no doubt, that we are dealing here with the successive phases of a movement. Did the return of the sect from its exile—which the earliest of the coins of the second long sequence found by de Vaux in the monastery seems to date about 4 B.C.—begin a new phase of its life,

yes

of which Jesus and John, with their itinerant ministries, are somehow symptomatic or characteristic? One can, in any case, plausibly explain the defiance of the Teacher of Righteousness, the pacifism of Philo's Essenes, and the turning of the other cheek of Jesus as marking successive stages of the adjustment of the Jews to defeat. We can see clearly in the Bible how the Jewish God has been modulated from the savage and revengeful Jehovah, who is feared and propitiated in the Pentateuch, to the God of mercy and love who begins to be conceived by the later prophets. In *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*—assigned by Charles to the end of the second pre-Christian century—meekness and mercy are emphasized almost to the same degree that they are in the Gospels themselves. Is it that here the resentment of defeat is already giving way to resignation, the resignation of political helplessness; that neither Jews nor sectarians can hope to prevail, and that he who believes himself to be, or is believed by his followers to be, the desperately expected Messiah can preach only a moral salvation through faith in a non-militant God, and the righteousness of the individual? The sword that Jesus is bringing, in the quotation from Matthew (10:34) above, is the zeal for his own gospel, which will set the son against the father and make "a man's foes those of his own household." Yet in all this there seems still some conflict between, on the one hand, forgiveness and renunciation of the world and, on the other, combativeness and worldly ambition. In the language of the Sermon on the Mount, there is what seems a strange vacillation between promising, on the one hand, to "the poor in spirit" "the kingdom of heaven," and, on the other, to "the meek" that "they shall inherit the earth." In the supposedly much earlier *Testaments*—in the passage already quoted, which seems obviously a prototype

of the Sermon on the Mount—the "poor" are to be made "rich."*

If, in any case, we look now at Jesus in the perspective supplied by the scrolls, we can trace a new continuity and, at last, get some sense of the drama that culminated in Christianity. We can see how the movement represented by the Essenes stood up for perhaps two centuries to the coercion of the Greeks and the Romans, and how it resisted not merely the methods of Rome but also the Roman ideals. We can guess how, about a half century before its refuge was burned together with the Temple of the Jewish God, this movement had inspired a leader who was to transcend both Judaism and Essenism, and whose followers would found a church that was to outlive the Roman Empire and ultimately be identified with Rome herself. Under the goading of these agonizing centuries, the spirit of the Essene brotherhood, even before its expulsion from its sunken base, had already thus made itself free to range through the whole ancient world, touching souls with that gospel of purity and light to which the brotherhood had consecrated itself, and teaching the contempt of those eagles which they had noted—with evident astonishment—that the army of their enemy worshipped. The monastery, this structure of stone that endures,

* It should be mentioned that Dr. J. L. Teicher of Cambridge believes that the sect were Ebionites, "Poor Ones"—that is, Jews, who had been converted to Christ, but who continued Judaistic practices. The Teacher of Righteousness would then be Jesus, and the Man of Truth, Paul, who has extended the cult to the Gentiles. One difficulty with this theory is that the dating of the departure from the monastery is too early to make this possible; and another that the literature of the sect contains no obvious mention of Jesus or any direct reference to his teaching. Dr. Teicher has tried to discover some, but the few resemblances he points to seem farfetched or very faint. The words of Jesus should have left plainer marks on even still Judaizing adherents.

between the bitter waters and precipitous cliffs, with its oven and its inkwells, its mill and its cesspool, its constellation of sacred fonts and the unadorned graves of its dead, is perhaps, more than Bethlehem or Nazareth, the cradle of Christianity.

One would like to see these problems discussed; and, in the meantime, one cannot but ask oneself whether the scholars who have been working on the scrolls—so many of whom have taken Christian orders or been trained in the rabbinical tradition—may not have been somewhat inhibited in dealing with such questions as these by their various religious commitments. It is surprising to the layman, and inspires respect, to find that the ablest of these scholars have been bringing to what a couple of centuries ago must have been for such men of the church almost a domain of pure myth, a keenness and a coolness that seem quite objective. On almost any aspect of the scrolls that demands special learning and special research you may find, by one of these churchmen, an acute and exhaustive study; and yet one feels a certain nervousness, a reluctance to take hold of the subject and to place it in historical perspective. On the Jewish side, as Habermann says, it is a fear of impairing the authority of the Masoretic text, and also, one gathers, a resistance to admitting that the religion of Jesus could have grown in an organic way, the product of a traceable sequence of pressures and inspirations, out of one branch of Judaism; on the Christian side, it is, of course, as Dr. Brownlee says, the fear "that the uniqueness of Christ is at stake," as well as a reciprocal resistance to admitting that the morality and mysticism of the Gospels may perfectly well be explained as the creation of several generations of Jews working by and for themselves, in their own religious tradition, and that one need not assume the miracle of a special magnanimous act of

God to allow the salvation of the human race. Do these prejudices and preconceptions play some role in certain stubborn attempts—apparently, against all the evidence—of such scholars as Solomon Zeitlin of Dropsie College in Philadelphia and G. R. Driver of Oxford to date the scrolls very late? Dr. Zeitlin, who believes that the Karaites did not derive their doctrine from the Zadokites but wrote the Zadokite documents themselves, wants to put them in the eighth century; Dr. Driver inclines toward the sixth. In either case, their teachings could have played no role in the early development of Christianity. Do such considerations have anything to do with the persistence—not untinged, one fears, with acrimony—with which Dr. Joseph Reider, also of Dropsie College, has attempted to explain away the text of the Dead Sea Isaiah, in which Brownlee has found evidence of the Messianism, either of Second Isaiah himself or of the scribe who made the Dead Sea copy

New Testament scholars, it seems, have almost without exception boycotted the whole subject of the scrolls. The situation in this field is peculiar. It is precisely the more "liberal" scholars in Britain and the United States who have been most reluctant to deal with the scrolls, for the reason that these liberals tend to assume that the doctrines known as Christian were not really formulated till several generations after Jesus' death, and especially, as I have said, that the Gospel of John came late and was influenced by Gnostic thought. Professor Albright believes that the doctrine of John was "already either explicit or implicit before the Crucifixion," that the material relating to Jesus—though it was not written down till later—must go back to before 70 A.D. (by which date, according to the evidence of the coins, the Romans would have driven out the sect), and that it represents authentic memories and correctly reflects Jesus' teaching.

These new documents have thus loomed as a menace to a variety of rooted assumptions, from matters of tradition and dogma to hypotheses that are exploits of scholarship. How gingerly, in many quarters, the approach to the scrolls long remained has been shown in a striking way by the disturbing but air-clearing effects of the writings of Dupont-Sommer.

Professor A. Dupont-Sommer occupies a unique position in the controversy of the scrolls. I had noticed, in reading his books, that (so far as my experience went) he was the only one of all these scholars who invoked the authority of Renan. The author of the *Histoire du Peuple d'Israël* and the *Origines du Christianisme* calls attention to the first emergence in the "intertestamental" apocrypha of certain characteristic Christian themes, and M. Dupont-Sommer refers to this. I was, therefore, not surprised, when I met him, to find that he is conscious of carrying on what may be called the Renanian tradition. Renan now is "vieux," he told me, in the sense that he now dates, but his ideal for writing history is valid. M. Dupont-Sommer himself occupies the chair of Hebrew at the Sorbonne, whereas Renan was professor at the Collège de France, but their roles are somewhat similar, and Dupont-Sommer is the present director of the project over which Renan presided and of which he sometimes said that he regarded it as the most important work of his life, the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*. M. Dupont-Sommer, when one meets him, presents a remarkable example of a phenomenon encountered so often that it cannot be due wholly to coincidence. Just as biographers sometimes look like their subjects and ornithologists are often birdlike, so M. Dupont-Sommer in person astonishingly resembles Renan. He is round-faced, short and rotund, bland and urbane and smiling. This smoothness has perhaps a slight tinge of the priestly—for, as Renan

first studied for the priesthood, so Dupont-Sommer was once an abbé. He is now, he says, "*un pur savant*," without any religious affiliations; and to an inquirer in the same situation, it is pleasant and reassuring to find that the great secular seekers for truth as well as the Teachers of Righteousness may establish their lasting disciplines. Such an inquirer comes finally to ask himself whether anyone but a secular scholar is really quite free to grapple with the problems of the Dead Sea discoveries. There may have been, perhaps, just a shade of the sensational in the manner in which Dupont-Sommer originally propounded his thesis in connection with the Habakkuk Commentary. Other scholars were certainly shocked, and a reference to the broken text will show, as I have said, that he has filled in the gap with a somewhat highhanded conjecture. Yet the fact, after all, remains that this independent French scholar has made so far the only attempt on any considerable scale to recover the lost chapter of history and to put it before the public. You can buy his two admirably written books—in the series *L'Orient Ancien Illustré*—at any first-rate bookstore in Paris. They have till now been the only source—aside from a few mostly perfunctory articles in newspapers and magazines—from which it was possible for the world at large to form any idea of the interest and scope of the writings contained in the scrolls. The whole subject, though the first announcements made news in 1948-49, has largely since been hidden from general knowledge in monographs and periodicals. In order to acquaint yourself, for example, with Dr. Brownlee's undoubtedly important ideas about the Suffering Servant of Isaiah, you must combine a technical paper of his on the language of the text in the *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* with another paper by him which, chopped up into very short lengths, appeared in no less than five issues of the *United*

Presbyterian, a church weekly published in Pittsburgh. And it is impossible to explore this literature without becoming aware that the impact of Dupont-Sommer has not merely been to rouse resistance. It is evident that two of the ablest men who have concerned themselves with the scrolls—H. H. Rowley and Père de Vaux—in spite of their strong criticisms and their reservations, have in some respects been led to revise their views more nearly in conformity with his.

It must, however, be left to the scholars to criticize scholarly theories. The layman can but try to calculate whether a scholar committed to the Christian faith has anything really at stake in dealing with the possible debt of the morality and practice of Christianity to those of the Dead Sea sect. For anyone who believes that the Son of God was born into the family of a carpenter of Nazareth in northern Palestine, that he preached by the Lake of Tiberias and that he was questioned in Jerusalem by Pilate, should it really be any more difficult to admit that he had been trained in the discipline and imbued with the thought of a certain Jewish sect, and that he had learned from it the role that he afterwards lived of teacher, Messiah and martyr? Or will the explanation of Jesus—as well as of Paul—in terms of preëxistent factors, the placing him and visualizing him in a definite historical setting, inevitably have the effect of weakening the claims of divinity that have been made for him by the Church? Anyone who goes to the Gospels from the literature of the intertestamental apocrypha and the literature of the Dead Sea sect must feel at once the special genius of Jesus and be struck by the impossibility of falling in with one of the worst tendencies of insensitive modern scholarship and accounting for everything in the Gospels in terms of analogies and precedents. The writings of these pre-

Christian prophets and saints are often, though not always, insipid. Properly to judge them, however, one would have to know them in the Hebrew, which, in the case of the apocryphal writings, has usually not survived; and one must pay attention to General Yadin when he says of the *Thanksgiving Hymns* that he "doubts that any language other than the original Hebrew can convey the depth of emotion and the spiritual beauty of these verses." Yet even in their non-classical Greek, the Gospels still convey an electrical power; they can move and excite and convert. I have spoken before of the moral audacity, the sense of spiritual freedom, that one gets from certain scenes in the Gospels; and such a passage of high drama as that of John 18-19: Jesus arraigned before Pilate, must surely have been inspired—like Plato's account of the trial and death of Socrates—(whether literally true or not) by a noble and commanding personality. Neither Hillel, nor the author of the *Testaments* nor, apparently, the Teacher of Righteousness ever stirred and drew people as Jesus did. And yet, as Albright has said, it is now for the first time possible to "elucidate the New Testament historically in the light of the immediate background of John the Baptist and Jesus." Will or will not this process of elucidation inevitably have the effect of making Jesus seem less superhuman till he has come to appear miraculous only in the sense, say, that Shakespeare is miraculous: in relation to his predecessors? Professor Albright himself evidently does not think so, for he elsewhere declares that "the historian cannot control the details of Jesus' birth and resurrection and thus has no right to pass judgment on their historicity. . . . The decision must be left to the Church and to the individual believer, who are historically warranted in accepting the whole of the Messianic framework of the Gospels or in regarding it as partly true literally and as partly true spiritually—which is far more

important in the region of spirit with which the Christian faith must primarily deal."

Yes: only the believer can answer this. But, for one who is not concerned with the theological problem, the implications of the scrolls are reassuring. The point of fundamental importance was put to the present writer in a precise and conservative way by Professor Millar Burrows of Yale. "We now realize," he said, "that there was much more variety and flexibility in Judaism than had ever been supposed." To anyone who has given thought to the peculiar and strained relations that for centuries prevailed between Jews and Christians, and that in some quarters still continue, it must be plain that behind these antagonisms lies an ancient deep-seated fear on the part of each of these groups of the other. Almost everyone must have noted some instance of an involuntary irrational suspicion, in cases where it is quite unjustified, cropping up, if only for a moment, to trouble normal relations. I was told, when in Israel, an anecdote that is typical of this kind of situation. At the time of the last war, an Englishwoman in England had felt very strongly that enough was not being done for the Jewish refugees from Hitler. One of her neighbors in the country was Jewish, and one day when she was passing his house at the time he was watering his garden, she somehow got sprayed with his hose. "Do you think he did it on purpose?" she appealed to a Jewish friend. This reaction—the result of instinctive fear combined with a feeling of guilt—may be matched, from the other direction, by instances in which Jewish critics have sometimes found anti-Semitic implications in books where there was certainly no question of anything of the kind. This nervousness has recently been mainly due to the atmosphere created by the Nazi persecutions; and these persecutions, of course, were not carried on in the name of the ancient religious issues. Hitler

preached the innate inferiority of the Poles as well as of the Jews, and he had repudiated Christianity as a Jewish religion for mollycoddles; the Nazi leaders, indubitably, in making a scapegoat of the Jews, were playing on something in the German mind so primitive as to seem pre-Christian. Yet such persecutions could hardly have been possible if there had not been the opportunity to revive the traditional restrictions against Jews in medieval Germany—restrictions which had been the product of bigotry and superstition. The Christians, brought up on the Gospels, have never been able to forget that the Jews rejected Jesus and demanded his death. For centuries—as I learn from a Jewish historian, Dr. Cecil Roth—they could not imagine that the Jews believed in good faith that their Judaic theology, their ritual and their law, were the true ones, given them by God through Moses; the Christians were convinced that the Jews knew better, and that their failure to accept the Christian faith was due to a stubborn perversity that must have the Devil behind it. It was for centuries a Christian objective to convert the Jews to Christ, and since they almost invariably failed in this, the Christians became very bitter against them. Even—as in Spain and Portugal—when they extorted the forms of conversion, the Jews would go on practising Judaism, and to the Christians it seemed that their counter-religionists were still in the same state of mind that had led them to crucify Jesus, that they would willingly crucify him again. This gave rise to the legend of the ritual murder of Christian children at Passover, a symbolic perpetuation of the Crucifixion. The reciprocal Jewish legends connected with ritual murder—such as those about Rabbi Loew of Prague—show that as late as the sixteenth century the dwellers in the European ghettos lived in continual terror of being framed for this crime by the Christians: the great rabbi is always rescuing them; and trials for ritual

murder were still occurring in Central Europe through the turn of the nineteenth century. In the meantime, the assumption of Jewish depravity had been giving the followers of Christ carte blanche—not merely with a quiet conscience but with fervor and exaltation—to penalize, tax, torture and slaughter the Jews, under the sign of the crucified Jesus. On the Jewish side, the moral sense was outraged, and the resentment to some extent still lingers, that the communicants of a religion whose Deity is a God of Love and whose Savior brings salvation through mercy, should, for example, inaugurate a crusade to the Holy Land for the purpose of rescuing the tomb of this Savior by massacres of their Jewish compatriots. If the Christian has never ceased to be horrified by the callousness of the Jews toward Jesus, the Jew has never ceased to be shocked by what seems to him the hypocrisy of the Christians. A Jew, on occasion, in a position of power, may become as fanatical and ruthless as any other kind of man; but, though he may do it in the name of Justice, like certain of the Jewish Communists, he does not do it in the name of a religion which talks about forgiving everybody and turning the other cheek. Yet the bitterness of the Jew toward the Christian may have had other sources, too. I have sometimes imagined that the Jew has resented the success of Jesus, that he has been troubled by an uneasy sense that, in its day, the religion of Jesus was a beneficent, a "progressive" movement, and that the Christians have stolen his Messiah and attempted to appropriate his Bible. Of the two post-Christian Messiahs that have most raised the hopes of the Jews, one, Sabbatai Zevi, let them down, under pressure, by confessing Muhammedanism, and the other, Jacob Frank, by succumbing to Christianity. The Orthodox Jew was left with a discipline of difficult observances, an anxious devotion to the letter of Scripture, which

in time did perhaps as much as the malignity of Christian prejudice to keep him locked in his special compartment.

The rigors and repressions of this old Jewish world may be gauged by the attitude of the strongest spirits who have liberated themselves from it. I remember a conversation with the late Professor Morris Cohen—a man who gave the impression, as Mr. Alvin Johnson once said of him, of an alabaster lamp inside of which burned a bright flame. He told me—to my astonishment and rather to my horror—that, though he had loved the *Divine Comedy* in youth and known a good deal of it by heart, he had never been able to bear it from the time that he broke with Judaism: it reminded him too claustrophobically of the tight medieval system in which he had himself grown up. As he talked, I became aware that this had actually distorted his conception of Dante, for whom Thomism was not really a prison, since he had his premonitions of the Renaissance and even some affinity with the Restoration. How close Morris Cohen remained, none the less, to this closed-in Orthodox world was shown me by a curious incident. In my then capacity as editor, sometime in the middle twenties, I persuaded him to write a short piece on a current documentary film that attempted an explanation of the Einstein theory. One day, some fifteen years later, I happened to meet him on a train. "You know," he said, "it was you who induced me to go to a movie—you paid me fifty dollars. It was the only movie I have ever seen." It was thus Morris Cohen who gave me the first memorable glimpse I had had of the conditions under which the Jewish intellect had survived through the Middle Ages, and I have had it in mind in the present connection. It is as cramping to creative thought to accept the Judaic restrictions as it is misleading and warping to imagine that respect for suffering, consideration for other people and the light of

the Holy Spirit were invented by Christianity. All these antiquated prejudices and limitations sound crude enough when thus stated baldly, but the present is hardly the moment to take lightly the baleful power of fanaticisms and superstitions; and it would seem an immense advantage for cultural and social intercourse—that is, for civilization—that the rise of Christianity should, at last, be generally understood as simply an episode of human history rather than propagated as dogma and divine revelation. The study of the Dead Sea scrolls—with the direction it is now taking—cannot fail, one would think, to conduce to this.

In the meantime, it is going forward at what is evidently a vigorous pace. In the handsome modern museum in Old Jerusalem, built with Rockefeller money, which has so admirably been designed to fit into the architectural landscape of blunt yellow towers and blank old walls, yet which makes you feel, once inside, that you are luxuriously back in New York, in a new wing of the Metropolitan, the fragments of the Dead Sea documents have been gathered and are being examined. Père de Vaux presides over this; and there are only three scholars authorized to decipher and report on the manuscripts: J. T. Milik, a Polish Roman Catholic priest; Dr. John Allegro of Manchester; and one American expert: last year Professor Cross of Chicago, at the present time Monsignor Patrick W. Skehan of the Catholic University of America. The tens of thousands of fragments—there has been no attempt to count them—have been put away in boxes. The utmost pains, of course, have been taken to keep separate the contents of the different caves and the pieces found in groups together. These range in size from morsels as large as your hand, which may include a whole column, to crumbs with a single letter. Some believe that it will take

fifty years to sort them all out and decipher them, but the energetic de Vaux is more hopeful and thinks they may get through it in ten. The fragments selected for study are set out on long tables in a large white-walled room. They are mostly of leather but a few are papyrus. In color, they range from the darkest brown to an almost paper-like paleness, so that they give the impression of autumn leaves that have lain in the forest all winter. The ones that are being studied have been flattened under plates of glass; but before they can thus be smoothed out, they have to be rendered less brittle by being put into a "humidifier," a bell-glass containing moist sponges. When they are taken out of this, they are cleaned with a camel's hair brush, dipped in alcohol or castor-oil. Sometimes the ink comes off along with the marly clay of the caves. Sometimes they flake at the touch of the brush and have to be backed with tape. Sometimes they have turned quite black, in which case they are photographed with infra-red rays and examined through a magnifying glass. The first problem is to bring together—through a study of the various hands of the scribes and the substances on which they have written—the pieces that belong together. The scholars work on this in a small inner room, equipped with concordances, dictionaries and all the relevant texts. The concordance may place a fragment as coming from a Biblical book or a known non-canonical work, and others will be found to fit it.

The whole harvest of the fragments is not yet in; there are still hundreds in the hands of the Arabs, who have been making things more difficult by cutting the large pieces into strips and selling them one after the other at successive interviews—raising the price for the second piece, asking still more for the third, etc. To put a stop to this, it has been necessary to offer special baksheesh in proportion to the size of the pieces. It is estimated by Père