

Dear Sam,

2/14/93

I was more than merely surprised to read in this symposium, "The Dead Sea Scrolls after Forty Years" of which I attach the pages I refer to that in the words of one eminent scholar, "We get students now in the seminaries who are ignorant of the bible" when they get there and if I understand the rest of the quote correctly, are when they leave the seminaries.

No reflection on you of your Hebrew ^Union, rabbi - in 1992 he said "now" and your religious education began in the mid-1930s.

This quotation is from the discussion following the four speeches.

And the question is raised in my mind is not limited to either religion or scholarship in religious matters or on the scrolls themselves and the interpretations thus far made and published.

So you will understand that these four did not reflect unfavorably on your alma mater, in the event you have not seen this slim volume, it is referred to as one of four that are the best and outstanding in their scholarship.

But if this is true - and none of the others contradicted him - of scholarship in the bible in a country like ours and in the world that believes in either part of the bible, can it in general be a legitimate criticism of scholarship in general? It got me to thinking and from my own experience and knowledge it is true of history. True as reflected by scholars and by the most respected publications. I have had occasion in the wake of the controversy over ^Uliver Stone's movie JFK to address some of these so-called scholars and their publication. By which ^I mean the respected journals that published them, both history publications and others, like Tikkun, plus a number of popular publications.

I can evaluate our current historians who edit the publications and those who wrote for them about the JFK assassination. In summary, they do not know their anal orifices from their appetites. And the responses I've gotten from the editors- the few who responded - should blame the average college freshman.

Of those who have soiled study and understanding of the JFK assassination the one with the best scholarly credentials is Edward J. Epstein. His first work was Inquest. It appeared after the general edition of my first, Whitewash: the Report on the Warren Report, and before Mark Lane's Rush to Judgement. Without reading it I agreed to help Viking publicize it. Tom Gervasi was the flack. And when in return for my help he introduced me to Guinzberg who then owned Viking, that great man ~~was~~ was barely civil. (Viking rejected Whitewash in early or mid-1965. The decision, I was then told, was by a man who since has become famous as an editor, Aaron Asher. By which I do intend to suggest that political opinions and attitudes do influence what is published or publishable.)

From the outset Epstein's work was not in any sense scholarly. It was closer to politicized journalism. He imposes his views that began right-wing and grew into far right-wing. Just yesterday ^I learned from what was sent me from the archive at the ^University

of Kentucky left by former Senator and Warren Commissioner John Sherman Cooper that the doors were opened for Epstein by Cornell's Professor Andrew Hacker. He wrote those on the Commission who agreed to be interviewed. I do not know that this extended to the staff and it may not have but a staffer of the right, Wesley Liebeler, was Epstein's most important source. *Epstein says he on his own got them to see & speak to him.*

It is precisely because Epstein's first book was his master's theses and he was a student who said what the right liked that the media went for it big. But the most important point he makes in it was conjecture and grossly false- that the autopsy report was rewritten. You can evaluate his scholarship by the fact that what he referred to as the rewritten Autopsy report is clearly labelled a supplement to it and that by content it is only that and no more. It ^{was} ~~was~~ ^{available} long before Epstein started writing published and available, both the original and the supplement. This is scholarship?

^{It} typifies the field. And, save two, the professional ^{or} historians who have written on the subject and those who edit history publications.

The current republication of his three books on the JFK assassination has no political inspiration or meaning. I was just given a copy. I'll read the preface this morning. I read the books when they appeared.

I tell you a story to illustrate what may or may not be true of religion and of Sanders' criticism of scholarship. With great difficulty and effort I got the Washington Post interested in Whitewash. Our then Congressman, later Senator and then my friend, Charles "Mac" Mathias read the ms. immediately after release from the hospital after major surgery. His wife Ann, than also a friend, took it away from him the first night so he'd rest. He was that taken by it. He finished it the next day. He was then on the judiciary committee. Manny Celler, then its chairman, refused to consider the subject or to read the ms. Mac then gave it to the liberal Al Friendly, a Post managing editor. He gave it to the liberal and widely respected ^{liberal} reporter whose first name now escapes me, ^{Laurence} Stern. When after months I asked for its return, Stern's marker was on page 47 of the triple-spaced ms. He had gone no farther. Later I took ^{the book to} Friendly, who took it and me into Ben ^BBradlee, who was just above Friendly in rank and a former friend of ~~JFK~~ JFK (I think he introduced him to Jackie) along with a couple of really devastating xeroxes from what was supposed to have been the FBI's ^{C D I.} definitive report on the JFK assassination. Bradlee was impressed. He gave the book I had just printed to Dan Kurzman, an excellent reporter. A few days later Kurzman took me to lunch at the Post to tell me how high an ~~opinion~~ ^{opinion} he had of the book. Bradlee decided that Dan and Larry Stern should ask questions of a former Commission staff member who was recently in the news as one of Caspar Weinberger's lawyers, Howard ^CWillens. They asked me to give them the questions. I went into the newsroom, sat down at a typewriter and gave them a single page of questions. I returned after lunch. While Stern was with Bradlee Kurzman told me, "Kid, you are in!" He couldn't answer any one of the questions as satisfactorily."

3

The story the Post was to do on the book was assigned to Kurzman. But within a few days he was fired. I do not know and do not suggest it was over this. I then had a reason I do not now remember ^{to believe} that this firing related to something he had written about the Dominican Republic. So the story was assigned to a new member of the staff who is now an editor and whose name will come back. Dick Harwood, just picked up then from the Chicago Tribune. At no point was Harwood friendly. And he and the Post jumped the release date on Inquest for the major story of the Memorial Day issue. It had a banner headline across the top of the first page. But most of the story was in Inquest, a later and much more limited book, *a month before publication date*

What are the significant differences? Political!

Epstein went after the liberal Earl Warren and he praised the FBI.

One can argue about his focus on Warren, who was the head, but about the FBI there can be no argument: it was always grossly wrong, entirely political, and its work in that five-volume major and supposedly definitive report would disgrace, again, a college freshman of normal intelligence. It is so atrocious I can't begin to tell you in a few words.

But, these factors, not scholarship, political, against Warren and for the FBI, are what made Epstein's seriously flawed book so acceptable as a book and to the Post for its major story, *and to professional scholars and reviewers. not one checked it out.*

As I remember it, most of Inquest comes from the staffers like Liebeler who always had a fine instinct for covering his own ass, even on the Commission. It is not in any sense either a good or a scholarly book.

His Counterplot, his anti-Garrison book, which appeared first as a lengthy article in The New Yorker, was a legitimate criticism of Garrison. While it is not material, there was something at the time that made me wonder if Epstein is gay.

Then, after other writing that was so loved by the right that one of his works was publicized ^{pro-publication} on coast-to-coast TV by John Mitchell he ^{wrote a book} ~~did what was~~ revised into Legend, a very bad and very dishonest book. What Mitchell loved was clearly helped if not inspired by the FBI. It was Epstein's anti-black ~~sex~~-activist book.

I am not checking the file I have to tell you (and others) how ^{Legend,} that book began but James Jesus Angleton of the CIA took Epstein over, fed him his propaganda line that was actually irrational, and the entire ~~first~~ book was changed into what appeared as Legend. Again, propaganda of the right. (The book was advertised long before it was written and I have the ads from Publisher's Weekly about it. It clearly began as an entirely different book ^{but} still of the right and contracted to The Readers' Digest.)

Long before Epstein ~~had~~ decided to start the book that became Legend he knew that Oswald was not and could not have been pro-Soviet. He portrays Oswald as a KGB spy.

4

He was familiar with my work and he knew that in Whitewash I published the Commission's and the FBI's report that Oswald was anti-USSR and anti US Communist Party. Epstein quotes from my Oswald in New Orleans. But he ignores from it, as he did from what the Commission published, that Oswald was an Orwellian and that his favorite book he discussed with his fellow Marines was The Animal Farm. As my book quotes Liebel as telling one of those Marines who asked if The Animal Farm was a Communist book, Liebel told him it is an anti-Communist classic.

And this is the so-called critic of the official assassination "solution" that has the most authentic scholarly credentials, of those who published books.

None of his work is in any sense really scholarly yet it is generally regarded as really scholarly. You should have read some of the reviews by reviewers who lacked any concept of critical reading or comment. They gave him his academic and scholarly credentials in the field. He has the degrees but he lacks the scholarship.

Angleton and the others of the CIA he opened up for Epstein used him in Legend to justify themselves. I won't here go into what Angleton et al did to the Warren Commission but I do tell you that one of Epstein's formerly CIA sources is the man who left notes on how they should kill Yuri Nosenko, the defected KGB defector. Nosenko told the FBI what has separate confirmation and in secret the government, including the CIA then had, that Oswald was anti-USSR within the USSR and was suspected by the KGB of being a US agent-in-place or "sleeper" agent. That man, Miler, wondered on paper yet whether it would be better to drive Nosenko crazy, which his treatment for three years normally should have accomplished, or dropping him into the ocean from an airplane, etc.

These are the sources for that eminent scholar, Edward J. Epstein!

I was reminded of this and more in reading the lines I attach from the Scrolls book.

With my age and the present state of my health in mind it also made me wonder what the future scholarship on the JFK assassination will or can be. What long has troubled me is that I have knowledge of it not duplicated anywhere. This is the reason I wrote what is still being retyped on his computer by dear friend Dave Wrone, one of the authentic scholars in the field. I did not seek publication before I began to write because it was more important for me to get on paper for the future if not for present publication what I have done.

While it may not be justified and I am not in a position to make scholarly judgements I think that Sanders' criticism of biblical scholars who do not really know the bible has wider application. It is certainly true of so-called scholarship on the political assassinations. Not a single one of the many works for close to two decades is an honest or legitimate or scholarly work. They are all by would-be Perry/Masons not a single one of whom has any knowledge of the readily-available fact of the assassination. Not a single one has made any real use of the 60 file cabinets of this information I make available to all, knowing in advance that I'll disagree with what they write. Most are self-promoters, exploiters and commercializers. Not one has any quality of scholarship. In haste, Harold

Disconcerted and with interruptions some of which were additionally disconcerting I finished reading Epstein's preface. As I read it I annotated it. My bad handwriting will be more difficult to read because it is a thick paperback. That makes writing on the pages of both sides awkward and difficult when I have to read holding the book in my left hand. I do not here undertake the detailed criticism I'd like to make as a matter of record. But the comment from Sanders that got me to thinking is really typified by this fraud of a scholar, this prostitute of a writer, this baselessly egocentric man who is anything but an assassination expert. His ignorance, not detectable to most, is beyond belief, and the arrogance of mind he reflects I suppose is typical of him. His mistakes are glaring and he even contradicts himself in one place between the bottom of one page and the top of the other. In fact, it is apparent that he imagines much of what he writes, having decided that he understood what happened and did not have to check. Or he was so contemptuous of normal scholarship that he did not have to. One of these glaring examples is that the Commission's records that were disclosed by the National Archives were disclosed under FOIA lawsuits. I got only two records that way. Almost all was disclosed on review and under the existing guidelines. He refers to the secrets still there and 98% of the records have been disclosed. It is not hard to imagine that the two percent are withheld for legitimate reasons, varying from personal privacy for defamations on one extreme to legitimate national security and informant-disclosure content. *see p. 7.*

He actually says that no new information had been disclosed by the time the House assassins report was released. What in the hell fills my basement? If not most, close to half as the minimum was disclosed in December, ^{1977 and Jan 1977} 1978. I had about 100,000 pages there then and more soon followed.

He actually says the physical ~~and~~ evidence, including the ballistics and medical, entirely support the official story. The precise opposite is true.

On Nosenko, he makes no reference to what was disclosed long before he did Legend but he does recount a little of his relationship with Angleton. In this he tells me that Angleton got my ^{European} correspondence that was intercepted, including a manuscript and several letters offering to publish Whitewash. Also that that caused me to lose British publication by the two-month delay in my letters reaching my London agent. Together with preparing the CIA to feed another intended published bad information that he accepted while he was, literally, drafting the contract to publish Whitewash. *Sir Leslie Frewin, in "Book" file.*

Where he got some of the crap I can't imagine, like JFK assassination books being written by those fresh from the booby-hatch.

There are a number of points ^{at} which he reveals his gross ignorance. It is clear on reading this preface alone that he has never done any work in the disclosed records. Even the five-volume FBI report, which he misrepresents entirely, he did not get on his own, at the Archives. Liebler gave that to him. His comments on it means that because ^s it painted

Oswald red it was a great job. That it does not account for the assassination or all the President's wounds he did not understand or just ignored. Red is beautiful to him, and it blinded him to all else.

It is really shocking, Sanders-shocking, that a scholar, he has a PhD, would even think of writing anything new without any basis for it at all. He never spent any time at all in the Archives, for example, or in the FBI or CIA reading rooms where the records others and I forced out are readily available. He not only does not refer to them, he says that as the time of HSCA's report they were not available. *They were. See p 7, 21*

He even imagines that because the KGB had the Oswald connection he imagines that it had other than surveillance files on him. It surveilled him because it suspected him and although he did tell the embassy he would give the USSR the secrets he had, except for the radar codes, which it may or may not have had already, ~~he had no secrets from his~~ *he believed* Marines work. ^y This the KGB is suspect and he implies this because Oswald worked for them.

He imagines an intellectual circle in Dallas that Oswald associated with when in fact the only ones were White Russians who were anti-Soviet. DeMohrenschildt's association was largely when they met at White Russian gatherings or when his wife took clothing and ~~scdn~~ ^{to Marina}. There is no record of any other contact between the two.

These are just a few of the things that come to mind without the book at hand.

Another disclosure that has credibility and spelled out in print is new to me is that The Readers Digest had such a "working relationship" with the CIA that without checking it assured ~~Oswald~~ ^{Epstein} he could interview Nosenko and could have the tapes of the Mexico City intercepts at the USSR and Cuban embassies!

Much is plain fiction, like his referring to the CIA's own picture of how the KGB ~~ha~~ "handled" Oswald. There is no reason to believe that they "handled" him at all. They suspected him, the apparent reason he had no trouble leaving when he wanted to, and with ^{Marina}.

He knows so little about the Dallas police tapes that on one page he dismisses them by saying they could have been made at a different time, which is impossible, and on the very next page saying that the Ramsey panel established "unambiguously" when it was taped.

Enough for this wretchedness, aka "scholarship." Before going on to his epilogues I note, having indicated that early on I thought he is gay, that his dedication is to his mother. Had he no wife to whom to dedicate the drek?

And I add that as of 1992 he is still ignorant of the disclosed records, the Commission's and those of the agencies, especially of the FBI's.

His first epilogue, titled "The House Select Committee on Assassinations (1992)", and it was not of 1992—that is when he wrote the three pages of garbage beginning on 161, is intended to cover his very serious error coming from his own exalted opinion of his scholarly imagination, that there were two autopsy reports, that the original one had been rewritten. He does not admit his error and he pretends that CD1 contains an autopsy report when it does not. What he refers to is from an FBI report in CD7. It was what the autopsy surgeons said

until after the autopsy examination was over and the agents left. He did not get it from the Archives. Liebeler leaked it to him. So he was ignorant of the source and thought it was only in CD1. It and the report were both available at the Archives before Inquest was published. He misrepresents what HSCA did and said. In three pages yet!

I should have ^{noted} ~~noticed~~ that this modest man titled his junk "The Assassination Chronicles." It does not in any sense chronicle ^{assassination} them and it is hardly "the" one that does. The modest comment on the back cover about these crappy books is that he "has been credited with writing the three most important books about the Kennedy assassination." By whom other than Epstein I cannot guess!

I also note so I will not forget that he has two epilogues numbered III, the first of these two (533) not in the table of contents.

1/ from page 5: His table of contents for Appendix C reads "19 Questions for the Archives (if opened)." Never closed!

2/ From page 6: He even refused to go to the Archives for his publisher when I told Gervasi about some of the documents available there. Gervasi told me this and asked for my help on it, too. I told him to ask Marion Johnson there for the documents I identified for him. Those are the FBI reports, including ~~the~~ ^{the} Sibert-O'Neill ~~report~~ ^{report} reporting what those agents saw and heard in the autopsy room. Viking gave xeroxes away wholesale to promote the book. Yet even in his Epilogue I he refers to CD1 as having a second "autopsy report." It is this report that was used in CD1, nothing else.

Epilogue II, hardly more than two pages, 289-91, is "The Trial of Clay Shaw (1992)". While it has minor errors revealing the true character of Epstein's "scholarship" its criticism of Garrison is justified.

The first of ~~the~~ ^{two} Epilogue III's begins on 533, continues through 549, and is followed by the second Epilogue III, pages 551 ~~to~~ 554. Both are on Legend and both have #LEGEND" at the top of the pages, as does the reprint of that sick stuff.

He is so grossly ignorant of the officially published fact relating to Nosenko that on the very first page, first paragraph he refers to the special building the CIA constructed at Camp Peary, with the awful, windowless room in it for Nosenko, as in a house close to downtown Washington!

On ~~534~~ 534 he has Robert Kennedy making "frequent phone calls" to learn if Nosenko had confessed being a KGB dispatched agent. There is no basis for this. He just made it up. No source cited. His account of Nosenko's captivity excluded ^{used} all the many dangerous abuses of him the CIA admitted on coast-to-coast TV and HSCA published. He justifies all the baseless suspicions about Nosenko and even seeks to detach Angleton from his abominable treatment and the suspicions that led to it. He gets so carried away with what

he and his CIA paranoid sources only imagined that he attributes "accomplices" to Nosenko (536) the FBI should have investigated.

On 537, without any characterization of the nutty KGB defector Golitsyn, whose code name he says was "Stone," he continues to try to justify Angleton's involvement and to play it down. By mere mention of his name he involves Newton Miler in an alleged re-evaluation of a report on the Nosenko interrogations. In this he misrepresents the value of the information Nosenko gave the CIA. He omits informing it about and locating 50 hidden microphones in the embassy building in Moscow that Adlai Stevenson used one so effectively for at the UN and to which The CIA testified ^{to this} to HSCA on TV. And as he continues with his fanciful attempt to justify the CIA's barbarity and stupidity he even attributes Nixon's plumbings and the Huston plan to what he says was Hoover's over-reaction to mistrust at the CIA ^{of} Nosenko. Really (538) ~~barbaric~~ a fairy tale! (538) without a single footnote!

As he rambles on with imaginary and distorted justifications of the rabidly paranoid Angletonians, without ~~once~~ ^{yet} mentioning the barbaric conditions of Nosenko's illegal three years of captivity or that ^{BAGLEY} Miler left notes on how to get rid of him he does say (549) that Miler's ^{Nosenko's} notes were destroyed and he winds up with his insistence that the nuts were not nuts and that Nosenko was and is a phony. I've just skimmed this sickening stuff.

What a scholar this reflects!

He second Epilogue III is "The Nosenko Incubus (1992)" He begins that with the FBI's acknowledgement that its source "Fedora" was not a genuine spy for the FBI. I see here that if he is right, and I presume he is (552) it was not Miler but Bagley who toyed with how to dispose of Nosenko. He quotes HSCA as saying that Nosenko lied about Oswald (553).

He ends this self- and CIA-~~nutty~~ justification by saying "I now believe that Nosenko was under KGB control only on his first approach to the CIA in Geneva in 1962..." Then what purpose was served by all that precedes this? *Or the suspicions about him?*

Epilogue IV follows immediately (555-69), "The Man Who Really Knew Too Much (1992)". DeMoreschildt. I'm not even skimming this because it is not worth the time, between Epstein's total undependability and the fact that deMoreschildt was just out of Parkland's psycho ward and had earlier manifested much indication of insanity in what he said.

Epilogue V is "JFK: The Second Vomming of Jim Garrison (1992)", pages 571-81, on the Oliver Stone movie. In discussing the movie and his own concept of New Orleans re-faity he finally has an epilogue footnote, to Garrison's and Marrs' books that Stone used, on 575. He has a long one on 578 disputing Prouty as used by Stone and ^{by} his 1978 book. In the text he has a long list of Prouty's right-wing connections and activities.

This is followed by "Afterword The State of the Evidence of the State (1992), 583-94.

He poses seven of his own questions and gives his own answers that essentially say that the official versions are correct. I have not yet decided whether to take the time for his appendixes. But his afterword confirms his total ignorance of all that has come to light, all the more than a third of a pages of FBI records alone that are available.

The Dead Sea Scrolls After Forty Years

Symposium at the Smithsonian Institution

October 27, 1990

Sponsored by the Resident Associate Program

HERSHEL SHANKS

JAMES C. VANDERKAM

P. KYLE MCCARTER, JR.

JAMES A. SANDERS

On the cover: View from a Qumran cave. In the second century B.C.E., a group of devout Jews, possibly Essenes, withdrew to this barren area adjacent to the Dead Sea, where they formed a community to await the end of an evil age.

The remains of their settlement can be seen on the plateau. A library of more than 800 volumes, including all the books of the Hebrew Bible (except Esther) and documents delineating the sect's particular practices and beliefs, was stored, or hidden, in nearby caves.

Biblical Archaeology Society/photo by Werner Braun

BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY SOCIETY
Washington, DC

Are they any closer to recovering the lost books of the Bible?

Sanders: I think that Sid Leiman says there are 29 references in the Hebrew Old Testament to prior works we no longer have. We are no closer to recovering those lost books than we ever were. We don't have copies or fragments of any of them.

Shanks: There is one qualification, one speculation, that I might mention that involves the Temple Scroll. There are references in the Hebrew Bible to two lost books, books we don't have. There is nothing in the Hebrew Bible that tells you the plans for the Temple and there is a passage that indicates that the plan was given to David or Solomon. There is also a reference to another book about the laws limiting the king's prerogatives. Both of these subjects, supposedly contained in books referred to in the Bible, are treated in the Temple Scroll. Yigael Yadin has raised the possibility, not that the Temple Scroll incorporates these lost books, but that whoever wrote the Temple Scroll was somehow influenced by this and thought he was supplying this kind of loss because there are very detailed instructions and limitations on both these subjects.

Sanders: The difficulty with that is that you turn that coin over and we now, for instance, have the Prayer of Manasseh and have had for a long, long time. But the question really is, since Chronicles said that he uttered a prayer, didn't someone say that, oh well, we better fill that gap. You don't know if that's the case with the author of the Temple Scroll.

I speak as an outsider about the effect of scholarship on the practice of religion. I note from my own library that scholarship like yours has been going on for a few hundred years at least. People in the religions have been changing but not in response to your scholarship. They go their own way; and your scholarship keeps on going. But what is the point if the religionists are not going to pay attention to you?

Sanders: I think that there has been an influence, some of it good and some of it not so good. That is to say, the historic mainline churches are pretty much staffed by ministers from graduates of Harvard and Yale and Union and Claremont and so on. The graduates of these seminaries get their degrees for knowing theories about the historical formation of the Bible, but they don't know what the Bible says. This is a great lament I have. We get students now in the mainline seminaries who are igno-

rant of the Bible in the first place because they are not learning it at home or in church anymore. Then they come to seminary and learn all about J, E, D and P—the documentary hypothesis—but they have not read the Pentateuch yet. The documentary hypothesis is just one theory about possible formation of the Pentateuch.

George Steiner, in the *New Yorker* of February 1988, engages in a real lament and I agree with him when he says that very few people outside of theological circles, or English departments of literature know Bible content anymore. In an address that I gave at Georgetown University last year, I said, "Mr. Steiner, it is worse than you think. They don't know the Bible all that well in theological circles either." I would not want to say how much of the Bible is really known in mainline seminaries. What you get is sometimes the opposite of what you are talking about. The ministers go out into the churches and you have a gap between pulpit and pew. The guy or gal in the pulpit knows the theories about the formation of the Bible but probably hasn't read too terribly much out of 2 Chronicles recently, if ever. The people in the pew don't know it anymore either for the most part, and the minister is afraid, because the budget has to be met each fall, to tell them what he really learned about the J, E, D and P theory.

When the scrolls were first found and divvied up, no Jews were allowed to edit or publish. Why was that?

Shanks: Because the team was assembled under Jordanian auspices and that was a condition of the Jordanian government. That is not true today. I tried to stress that, when I said that this bias did not extend to the scholars themselves. This was a restriction that was imposed on them. John Strugnell, for example, who is now chief editor, has enlisted several prominent Israeli scholars—Devorah Dimant, Elisha Qimron, Emanuel Tov.

Were the caves sealed in any way? If so, I can imagine how through the years the sealing might have disintegrated, giving an opportunity for vandalism. If you had vandalism it could account for why things were mixed up in there.

McCarter: I think that a visit to the caves gives you a kind of answer. It is important to remember how inaccessible these places were, and still are. You can take a bus to Qumran now but it is still difficult to get into

The Lecturers



Hershel Shanks is founder, editor and publisher of *Biblical Archaeology Review* and *Bible Review*. He is the author of *The City of David* (Bazak, 1973), a guide to biblical Jerusalem; and *Judaism in Stone* (Harper & Row, 1979), tracing the development of ancient synagogues. He edited *Recent Archaeology in the Land of Israel* (Israel Exploration Society, 1984) with Professor Benjamin Mazar; *Ancient Israel: A Short History From Abraham to the Roman Destruction of the Temple* (Prentice Hall, 1988) and the two-volume *Archaeology and The Bible: The Best of Biblical Archaeology Review* (BAS, 1990). A graduate of Harvard Law School, he has also published widely on legal topics.



P. Kyle McCarter, Jr., is the William Foxwell Albright Professor of Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Maryland. Prior to going to Johns Hopkins in 1985, he taught for 11 years at the University of Virginia. His books and other publications include commentaries on 1 Samuel and 2 Samuel in the Anchor Bible series published by Doubleday. He is currently preparing a new edition and translation of the Copper Scroll from Qumran (3Q15) to be published by Princeton University Press.



James C. VanderKam, a professor of Old Testament at the University of Notre Dame, has written extensively on biblical languages and literature for a number of publications, including *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, *Biblical Archaeologist*, *Journal of Biblical Literature* and *Bible Review*. He received a National Endowment for the Humanities Fellowship for 1989-1990 and is currently at work on a translation of a commentary on 1 Enoch 72-82 to appear in G. W. E. Nickelsburg's *Hermeneia Commentary on 1 Enoch*. He is also editing for publication the Qumran fragment from the Book of Jubilees.



James A. Sanders is professor of intertestamental and biblical studies at the School of Theology at Claremont, California, and professor of religion in the Claremont Graduate School. He is founder and president of the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center for Preservation and Research, where he has developed an archive of thousands of biblical manuscripts on negatives, including all the Dead Sea Scrolls. He serves as associate editor of the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project of the United Bible Societies. His numerous publications include *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll* (Cornell, 1967), *Torah and Canon* (Fortress Press, 1972), *Canon and Community: A Guide to Canonical Criticism* (Fortress Press, 1984) and *From Sacred Story to Sacred Text* (Fortress Press, 1987). He is also the editor of *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert IV: The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11* (Clarendon Press, 1965).

The Dead Sea Scrolls After Forty Years

Symposium at the Smithsonian Institution

October 27, 1990

Sponsored by the Resident Associate Program

HERSHEL SHANKS

JAMES C. VANDERKAM

P. KYLE MCCARTER, JR.

JAMES A. SANDERS

On the cover: View from a Qumran cave. In the second century B.C.E., a group of devout Jews, possibly Essenes, withdrew to this barren area adjacent to the Dead Sea, where they formed a community to await the end of an evil age. The remains of their settlement can be seen on the plateau.

A library of more than 800 volumes, including all the books of the Hebrew Bible (except Esther) and documents delineating the sect's particular practices and beliefs, was stored, or hidden, in nearby caves.

Biblical Archaeology Society/photo by Werner Braun

BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY SOCIETY
Washington, DC

Are they any closer to recovering the lost books of the Bible?

Sanders: I think that Sid Leiman says there are 29 references in the Hebrew Old Testament to prior works we no longer have. We are no closer to recovering those lost books than we ever were. We don't have copies or fragments of any of them.

Shanks: There is one qualification, one speculation, that I might mention that involves the Temple Scroll. There are references in the Hebrew Bible to two lost books, books we don't have. There is nothing in the Hebrew Bible that tells you the plans for the Temple and there is a passage that indicates that the plan was given to David or Solomon. There is also a reference to another book about the laws limiting the king's prerogatives. Both of these subjects, supposedly contained in books referred to in the Bible, are treated in the Temple Scroll. Yigael Yadin has raised the possibility, not that the Temple Scroll incorporates these lost books, but that whoever wrote the Temple Scroll was somehow influenced by this and thought he was supplying this kind of loss because there are very detailed instructions and limitations on both these subjects.

Sanders: The difficulty with that is that you turn that coin over and we now, for instance, have the Prayer of Manasseh and have had for a long, long time. But the question really is, since Chronicles said that he uttered a prayer, didn't someone say that, oh well, we better fill that gap. You don't know if that's the case with the author of the Temple Scroll.

I speak as an outsider about the effect of scholarship on the practice of religion. I note from my own library that scholarship like yours has been going on for a few hundred years at least. People in the religions have been changing but not in response to your scholarship. They go their own way; and your scholarship keeps on going. But what is the point if the religionists are not going to pay attention to you?

Sanders: I think that there has been an influence, some of it good and some of it not so good. That is to say, the historic mainline churches are pretty much staffed by ministers from graduates of Harvard and Yale and Union and Claremont and so on. The graduates of these seminaries get their degrees for knowing theories about the historical formation of the Bible, but they don't know what the Bible says. This is a great lament I have. We get students now in the mainline seminaries who are igno-

rant of the Bible in the first place because they are not learning it at home or in church anymore. Then they come to seminary and learn all about J, E, D and P—the documentary hypothesis—but they have not read the Pentateuch yet. The documentary hypothesis is just one theory about possible formation of the Pentateuch.

George Steiner, in the *New Yorker* of February 1988, engages in a real lament and I agree with him when he says that very few people outside of theological circles, or English departments of literature know Bible content anymore. In an address that I gave at Georgetown University last year, I said, "Mr. Steiner, it is worse than you think. They don't know the Bible all that well in theological circles either." I would not want to say how much of the Bible is really known in mainline seminaries. What you get is sometimes the opposite of what you are talking about. The ministers go out into the churches and you have a gap between pulpit and pew. The guy or gal in the pulpit knows the theories about the formation of the Bible but probably hasn't read too terribly much out of 2 Chronicles recently, if ever. The people in the pew don't know it anymore either for the most part, and the minister is afraid, because the budget has to be met each fall, to tell them what he really learned about the J, E, D and P theory.

When the scrolls were first found and divided up, no Jews were allowed to edit or publish. Why was that?

Shanks: Because the team was assembled under Jordanian auspices and that was a condition of the Jordanian government. That is not true today. I tried to stress that, when I said that this bias did not extend to the scholars themselves. This was a restriction that was imposed on them. John Strugnell, for example, who is now chief editor, has enlisted several prominent Israeli scholars—Devorah Dimant, Elisha Qimron, Emanuel Tov.

Were the caves sealed in any way? If so, I can imagine how through the years the sealing might have disintegrated, giving an opportunity for vandalism. If you had vandalism it could account for why things were mixed up in there.

McCarter: I think that a visit to the caves gives you a kind of answer. It is important to remember how inaccessible these places were, and still are. You can take a bus to Qumran now but it is still difficult to get into

The Lecturers



Hershel Shanks is founder, editor and publisher of *Biblical Archaeology Review* and *Bible Review*. He is the author of *The City of David* (Bazak, 1973), a guide to biblical Jerusalem; and *Judaism in Stone* (Harper & Row, 1979), tracing the development of ancient synagogues. He edited *Recent Archaeology in the Land of Israel* (Israel Exploration Society, 1984) with Professor Benjamin Mazar; *Ancient Israel: A Short History From Abraham to the Roman Destruction of the Temple* (Prentice Hall, 1988) and the two-volume *Archaeology and The Bible: The Best of Biblical Archaeology Review* (BAS, 1990). A graduate of Harvard Law School, he has also published widely on legal topics.



P. Kyle McCarter, Jr., is the William Foxwell Albright Professor of Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Maryland. Prior to going to Johns Hopkins in 1985, he taught for 11 years at the University of Virginia. His books and other publications include commentaries on 1 Samuel and 2 Samuel in the Anchor Bible series published by Doubleday. He is currently preparing a new edition and translation of the Copper Scroll from Qumran (3Q15) to be published by Princeton University Press.



James C. VanderKam, a professor of Old Testament at the University of Notre Dame, has written extensively on biblical languages and literature for a number of publications, including *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, *Biblical Archaeologist*, *Journal of Biblical Literature* and *Bible Review*. He received a National Endowment for the Humanities Fellowship for 1989-1990 and is currently at work on a translation of a commentary on 1 Enoch that will appear in G. W. E. Nickelsburg's *Hermeneia Commentary on 1 Enoch*. He is also editing for publication the Qumran fragment from the Book of Jubilees.



James A. Sanders is professor of intertestamental and biblical studies at the School of Theology at Claremont, California, and professor of religion in the Claremont Graduate School. He is founder and president of the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center for Preservation and Research, where he has developed an archive of thousands of biblical manuscripts on negatives, including all the Dead Sea Scrolls. He serves as associate editor of the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project of the United Bible Societies. His numerous publications include *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll* (Cornell, 1967), *Torah and Canon* (Fortress Press, 1972), *Canon and Community: A Guide to Canonical Criticism* (Fortress Press, 1984) and *From Sacred Story to Sacred Text* (Fortress Press, 1987). He is also the editor of *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert IV: The Palms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11* (Clarendon Press, 1965).