This volume is based on the proceedings from a conference organized by the Qumran Institute in April 2008 and honours the scholarly achievements of Florentino García Martínez who retired in 2007. There are 16 contributions with topics ranging from broad observations about the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls to methodological critiques and close textual studies. The thread that unites these contributions is their focus on exploring questions of ancient authority and strategies of authorization. Instead of employing the anachronistic terms of “bible” and “canon” to this early period, this volume explores the use of the word “authoritative” in relation to the developing scriptural traditions. In his introduction, Mladen Popović weaves a narrative connecting the essays, providing the reader with a necessary and valuable roadmap for understanding the volume.

García Martínez’ essay opens with broad strokes covering the history of 60 years of Dead Sea Scroll research. He states that ancient Judaism was characterized by its pluriformity deeply connected to authority. This essay touches upon the larger themes in this volume: authorization through individuals, anachronistic divides, and the intersection of revelation and prophecy as scripture.

Authority is often conferred through the individual, whether real or constructed. George Brooke writes about the authority of the Teacher of Righteousness and his connections with rewritten scriptures. He determines that the Teacher is central to the identity of the community members, who base their lives on his teachings (51). The interplay between figure and text is further developed by Hindy Najman, who analyzes Philo of Alexandria’s conception of Paideia. She argues that Philo saw three paths to perfection: automathesis, sage as model, and text as guide. The scribe is likewise an important figure, in the authorization of texts as discussed by Arie van der Kooij in his chapter on scribes and scribalism. He argues that scribes had a vital role in the validation of the authority of a text (70). Popović’s paper asks how Pseudo-Ezekiel texts related to the book of Ezekiel and proposes a dialectic process of developing Ezekiel traditions, whereby many co-existed simultaneously within one community (247).

Other papers focus on the impacts of modern methodological divides. Emanuel Tov looks at 4QReworked Pentateuch and asks whether it should be re-named 4QPentateuch. Drawing the history of this text’s characterization demonstrates that the line between biblical and non-biblical is a construct. Another approach is taken by Julio Trebolle, who considers 1 Kings 3–10 in order to demonstrate the
importance of the ordering of books or sections of books in terms of authority. Albert Hogeterp deals with the similarities between 4QFour Kingdoms\textsuperscript{a,b} and the book of Daniel, which he interprets as a para-biblical text that elaborates upon Danielic themes (191). A linguistic divide is addressed by Eibert Tigchelaar who asks whether Aramaic texts were held to the same level of authority as Hebrew texts at Qumran. In his view, the authority was not diminished in Aramaic texts, but different authorizing strategies were employed (171). Charlotte Hempel calls for the same questions asked of “biblical” texts to be asked of “non-biblical” texts. She analyzes variants between 1QS and 4QS to demonstrate the acceptance of textual plurality at Qumran (208). Émile Puech looks at the tripartite divide of the canon. He considers the works commonly placed into the categories of “Writings” and “Prophets” and the “Deutero-canonical.”

Prophecy, revelation, and inspiration are also significant when studying textual authority. Michael Knibb investigates the status of Early Enochic writings and whether they can be viewed as authoritative for diverse Jewish communities. John Collins examines the role of history in prophetic texts in the Pesharim. It is history that authorizes and gives the essential logic to prophecy (226). Similarly, Tobias Nicklas argues that the book of Revelation “shows an immense claim to authority” (309). It is Christ who is constructed as the ultimate authority in the past, present and future (325). In George H. van Koosten’s chapter, the author argues that Jewish writings were sacred because they were ancestral and oracular. He demonstrates that Paul saw the Jewish scriptures as authoritative because they contained divine revelations. Jan N. Bremmer’s analysis is a fitting closing chapter as it begins in antiquity and traces the development of “holy books” and its impact on Christianity, Judaism, and Islam.

The various perspectives and approaches in this volume demonstrate the viability of this term “authoritative” for the study of ancient Judaism. Although not characteristic of conference proceedings, the volume would have benefited from concluding remarks to connect some of the broader themes. However, the volume shows a field in the process of defining and re-defining its parameters and terminology. While caution must be made when using the terms “bible” or “canon” in this early period, this volume’s suggestion of the word “authority” has opened up new issues of exploration and offered directions of future study.
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