

- 14. Sukur
- 14.1. Sukur
- 15. Matakam
- 15.1. Matakam
- 15.2. Gisiga
- 15.3. Mofu-Gudur
- 16. Daba
- 16.1. Daba
- 16.2. Musgoy
- 17. Gidar
- 17.1. Gidar
- 18. Kotoko
- 19. Musgu
- 19.1. Kaykay
- 19.2. Muzuk
- 19.3. Mbara
- 20. Masa
- 20.1. Masa
- 20.2. Banana
- 20.3. Lame
- 20.4. Zime

East Chadic Languages

- 21. Kwang-Kera
- 21.1. Kera
- 21.2. Modgel
- 22. Lai
- 22.1. Nancere
- 22.2. Tobanga
- 22.3. Kabalai
- 23. Somrai
- 23.1. Somrai
- 23.2. Tumak
- 24. Sokoro
- 24.1. Sokoro
- 24.2. Barain
- 25. Dangla-Migama
- 25.1. Dangla
- 25.2. Migama
- 26. Mokilko
- 26.1. Mokulu
- 27. Mubi-Toram
- 27.1. Jegu
- 27.2. Mubi
- 27.3. Bidiya

Zdzisław Jan KAPERA

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF NORMAN GOLB'S HYPOTHESIS OF THE JERUSALEM ORIGIN OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

On April 20 of 1979 Norman Golb, professor of Hebrew and Judaeo-Arabic Studies at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, speaking before the American Philosophical Society, presented a new hypothesis concerning the origin and identification of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In his opinion the scrolls are remnants of the Jerusalem Temple library, and stem from the Palestinian Judaism of the 1st century A.D. They are not of Essene origin and the Qumran people should not be identified with that sect.

The main point of Golb's hypothesis must be shocking to anybody who has been following then thirty years of discussion on the Qumran scrolls. It became obvious after "the first battle of the Scrolls" of the early 1950s, that a working hypothesis of their Essene origins was the only one which could be defended and such a consensus has been in existence since the late 1950s. The Essene hypothesis has been repeated both in handbooks and in encyclopaedias all around the world. Norman Golb, who, as is worth remembering wrote his Ph.D. dissertation about the Qumran documents in early 1950s¹, is the first scholar to decide to reevaluate known data and to test the current working hypothesis. For several years his Jerusalem hypothesis was known only from his lectures in the USA (Chicago 1983), in Israel (Jerusalem 1984) and in France (1985). Nobody except J. D. Amusin (1983) and C. Aziza (1985) did noticed his article on the Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society even if it was abstracted in the Old Testament Abstracts and the New Testament Abstracts², or perhaps nobody wanted to be the first to criticize. The publication of the more popular presentation of Golb's hypothesis first in French in the *Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations* and later in the *Biblical Archaeologist* in 1985³, finally broke the silence concerning the matter. I myself discovered the Jerusalem hypothesis thanks to Dr. C. Ligota from the Warburg Institute in London, who showed me the first publication of Golb in 1980. Unfortunately, I did not realise its implications till I came back to the problem in autumn 1985, after reading Golb's article in the *Biblical Archaeolo-*

gist. I checked the bibliographical compilations for the years 1980-1985 and immediately discovered that nobody except J. D. Amusin had tried to evaluate Golb's hypothesis. I presented the fact to the R  v. Professor S. M  dala of the Academy of Catholic Theology in Warsaw and invited him to discuss the Jerusalem hypothesis at the scholarly forum of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Cracow. His lecture to the Oriental Committee took place on May 9, 1986 and caused a lively discussion. S. M  dala analysed both the positive and the negative results of N. Golb's hypothesis, stressing the unintentional results. The Jerusalem hypothesis properly underlines the role of the branch of the Essenes living in a special quarter of the Holy City. M  dala's general conclusion was to reject Golb's hypothesis as a whole while stating that many of his detailed remarks deserved full discussion.

M  dala's paper and the ensuing discussion have convinced me that the Jerusalem hypothesis needs to be presented to specialists in the field in a direct dispute among those interested. As I informed Prof. Golb about M  dala's lecture he himself at once proposed to come to Cracow and to defend his hypothesis in person. This idea inspired me to invite to Cracow not only Polish Biblical scholars and historians, but first of all foreign Qumran scholars I knew and could get in touch with. Thirty five people from the U.S.A., France, West Germany, and Belgium as well as from Poland, Hungary, East Germany and Czechoslovakia gathered in Mogilany near Cracow at the very end of May 1987. Several hours of discussion took place after a special paper by Professor Golb. It seems that nobody including the present writer was convinced by the Jerusalem hypothesis, because of the counterattack by defenders of the current Essene hypothesis consisted of serious arguments. Each party maintained their position at the end. As the editor of the proceedings of the Mogilany colloquium⁴ I wanted to publish the discussion, but since we have not yet received the text of Prof. Golb's lecture for publication, this has had to be postponed. In the meantime, I have only published my own preliminary remarks on the discussion when presenting the results of the colloquium to the Polish readers⁵.

In the last few years Prof. Golb has been spreading his ideas in France, where he answered public objections by Prof. E.-M. Laperrousaz, and again in the U.S.A.⁶ In France, it seems, his opinions seem to be accepted (or at last tolerated) by ancient historians. Certainly the publication of his article and long polemic with Prof. E.-M. Laperrousaz in the pages of the Annales ESC is a kind of nobilitation in the professional historical circles.

Biblical scholars and Qumran scholars are still silent. Even general articles on the 40th anniversary of Qumran discoveries did not mention Golb's theory in any way. This looks unfair to his efforts. I present the compilation below so

that interested scholars can find details of Golb's theory and any comment that have been made on it. It can be expected that the discussion will continue. As I have stressed elsewhere, I keep the possibilities of discussion open because it might show the limits of the present Essene hypothesis. It can also result in new explanations of its weak points.

Part I

PRESENTATIONS OF THE JERUSALEM HYPOTHESIS BY NORMAN GOLB

USA:

1. The Problem of Origin and Identification of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 124, 1980, n   1, pp. 1-24 (Read April 20, 1979).
2. Who Hid the Dead Sea Scrolls?, Biblical Archaeologist 48, 1985, n   2, pp. 68-82.
3. Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? A New Answer Suggests a Vital Link Between Judaism and Christianity, The Sciences (New York), May-June 1987, pp. 40-49.
4. Whose Scrolls? Norman Golb replies, The Sciences, January-February 1988 (cf. No 12 below).
5. The Dead Sea Scrolls. A New Perspective, The American Scholar 58, 1989, n   2 (Spring 1989), pp. 177-207.

France:

6. Les manuscrits de la mer Morte: une nouvelle approche du probl  me et leur origine, Annales.   conomies. Soci  t  s. Civilisations (Paris), September-October 1985, n   5, pp. 1133-1149.
7. R  ponse    la "Note" de E.-M. Laperrousaz, Annales ESC, November-December 1987, n   6, pp. 1313-1320. (Cf. No 19 below).

Poland:

8. The Hypothesis of Jerusalem Origin of the Qumran Scrolls, Sprawozdania z Posiedze   Komisji Naukowych. Polska Akademia Nauk. Oddzia   w Krakowie, t.31/1 1987, (Krak  w 1989), pp. 74-75.
9. Kto spisa   manuskrypty znad Morza Martwego? [Nowa odpowied   wskazuje na   w   n     czac   judaizm i chrze  cija  stwo], Przegl  d Powszechny (Warsaw), September 1989, pp. 294-310. (Polish translation of No. 3 above).

DISCUSSION CONCERNING THE JERUSALEM HYPOTHESIS

10. J. D. Amusin, Kumranskaja Obščina (The Qumran Community), Moskva 1983. [Cf. the extensive note 66 on page 266].
11. C. Aziza, Les manuscrits de la mer Morte: une hypothèse non-conformiste, L'Histoire (Paris), June 1985, n° 79, pp. 81-83.
12. M. Broshi, Whose Scrolls?, The Sciences, January-February 1988. (Cf. No. 4 above).
13. W. Chrostowski, Qumran - 40 lat później (II), (Qumran - 40 Years Later), Przegląd Powszechny, December 1987, n° 12, pp. 377-396. [Cf. § N. Golb's Hypothesis: Qumran manuscripts - a part of Jerusalem collections?, pp. 392-396 and Prof. Golb's reply in the letter of April 15, 1988 to the author, pp. 1-3].
14. P. Gibert, La Bible "entre" l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament, Études (Paris), July-August 1987, pp. 122-124. [Cf. remarks on p. 123 in connection with No. 6].
15. Z. J. Kapera, An International Colloquium on the Origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Mogilany near Cracow: May 31-June 2, 1987), Folia Orientalia (Cracow) 24, 1987, pp. 299-301. [Cf. p. 299 f].
16. Z. J. Kapera, I Międzynarodowe Kolokwium Qumranologiczne w Polsce. Krótka prezentacja wniosków. Przegląd Orientalistyczny (Warsaw) 1988, n° 2(146), pp. 169-176. [Cf. pp. 173-175].
17. Z. J. Kapera, Międzynarodowe Kolokwium Qumranologiczne w Mogilanach (1987) (An International Qumran Colloquium in Mogilany near Cracow (May 31-June 2, 1987)), Euhemer (Warsaw) 33, 1989.
18. Z. J. Kapera, Bibliografia hipotezy jerozolimskiej Normana Golba (Bibliography of Norman Golb's Jerusalem hypothesis), Przegląd Powszechny, September 1989, pp. 310-312 [An appendix to No. 9 above].
19. E.-M. Laperrousaz, Note sur l'origine des manuscrits de la mer Morte, Annales ESC, November-December 1987, pp. 1305-1312. [Cf. No. 7 above].
20. S. Mędala, Nowa hipoteza na temat pochodzenia pism znad Morza Martwego, Sprawozdania z Posiedzeń Komisji Naukowych. PAN-Kraków 30, 1986, (Kraków 1988), pp. 118-119. [Summary of the lecture held on May 9, 1986].
21. S. Mędala, Nowa hipoteza na temat pochodzenia pism znad Morza Martwego (Nouvelle hypothèse concernant l'origine des manuscrits de la région de la mer Morte), Studia Theologica Varsoviensia (Warsaw) 26, 1988, n° 1, pp. 117-136. French summary, p. 136.

22. S. Mędala, Le camp des esséniens de Jérusalem à la lumière des récentes recherches archéologiques, Folia Orientalia 25, 1988, pp. 67-74.
23. P. Muchowski, Zwój Miedziany (3Q15), Euhemer 34, 1990 (in preparation).
24. G. Rafiński, Z problematyki genezy pism z Qumran (W 40. rocznicę pierwszych odkryć), Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny 40, 1987, pp. 465-476. [Cf. pp. 465-466].

Notes

- ¹ Cf. Introducing the Authors, Biblical Archaeologist 48, 1985, n° 2, p. 66.
- ² Cf. abstracts by D. J. Harrington in the New Testament Abstracts 25, 1981, p. 62 (§ 312) and by B. Vawter in the Old Testament Abstracts 5, 1982, p. 95 (§ 337).
- ³ Cf. summaries of No. 2 by L. A. Mitchel in the Old Testament Abstracts 8, 1985, p. 295 (§ 910) and by D. J. Harrington in the New Testament Abstracts 30, 1986, p. 69 (§ 383).
- ⁴ First International Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls (Mogilany near Cracow, May 31-June 2, 1987) in the Folia Orientalia 25, 1988, pp. 1-155.
- ⁵ Cf. No 16 and No 17 of the present compilation.
- ⁶ I have noticed only a few American references to Golb's publications. Cf. M. Wise, The Dead Sea Scrolls, Biblical Archaeologist 49, 1986, pp. 148, 151 note 8, 231 and Phillip R. Callaway, The History of the Qumran Community. An Investigation, Sheffield 1988, pp. 217 f (note 1).

[Prepared in Spring 1989]