

Kenneth Atkinson

**JOSEPHUS THE ESSENE AT QUMRAN?: AN EXAMPLE OF THE INTERSECTION
OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE IN LIGHT
OF JOSEPHUS’S WRITINGS**

Keywords: Khirbet Qumran, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Essenes, Flavius Josephus, archaeology, Judea

Abstract: The thesis that the Khirbet Qumran community was a branch of the larger Essene movement has dominated scholarship since the discovery of the first Dead Sea Scrolls. The number of books and articles challenging the theory that the Scrolls found in the caves belonged to a sectarian community that lived at Khirbet Qumran – and that these sectarians should be identified as Essenes – indicates that we are far from a consensus concerning the history of the Qumran history. What has largely been neglected in this debate is Flavius Josephus, who alone among the extant Second Temple Period authors claims to have been an Essene.

This article examines the importance of Josephus as an eyewitness to Essene beliefs and practices in the first century C.E. It suggests that his descriptions of the Essene admission procedure matches the latest version of the *Serek ha-Yahad*, which documents changes in the practices and beliefs of this sect during the first century C.E. The study seeks to show that the *Serek* belonged to a sectarian library that is archaeologically connected with Khirbet Qumran and that this library was more widely dispersed among the caves than previously recognized. The article builds on this evidence to propose that we can connect the *Serek* and Josephus to Khirbet Qumran, and that this text was used as a sort of archaeological blueprint for this settlement. The evidence examined in this article reveals that Josephus is our only extant witness to life at Khirbet Qumran during its later occupational phase (Periods II–III, ca. 4 B.C.E.–73/4 C.E.).

The thesis that the Qumran community was a branch of the larger Essene movement has dominated scholarship since the discovery of the first Dead Sea Scrolls.¹ The number of books and articles challenging the theory that the Scrolls found in the caves belonged to a sectarian community that lived at Khirbet Qumran – and that these sectarians should be identified as Essenes – indicates that we are far from a consensus concerning the broad contours of Qumran history. What has largely been neglected in this debate is Flavius Josephus, who alone among the extant Second Temple Period authors claims to have been an Essene (*Life* 10–12).

This study examines the importance of Josephus as an eyewitness to Essene beliefs and practices in the first century C.E. It further seeks to connect Josephus with the Khirbet Qumran community. The first section suggests that Josephus’s description of the Essene admission procedure matches the latest version of the *Serek ha-Yahad*, which

¹ This theory, commonly known as the Qumran-Essene hypothesis, was made by Sukenik (1948, I:16). I. Sowmy apparently made this link independently of Sukenik. See Trever 1965: 25.

documents changes in the practices and beliefs of this sect during the first century C.E.² The second portion seeks to show that the *Serek* belongs to a sectarian library that is archaeologically connected with Khirbet Qumran, and that this library was more widely dispersed among the caves than previously recognized. The third part attempts to show that we can connect the *Serek* and Josephus with Khirbet Qumran, and that this text was used as a sort of archaeological blueprint for this settlement. This study proposes that this combined evidence shows that Josephus was an eyewitness to life at Khirbet Qumran during its later occupational phase (Period II ca. 4–1 B.C.E. to 68 C.E.).³

I. The Admission Process of the *Serek ha-Yahad* and Josephus's *BJ* 2.137–42

No Dead Sea Scroll is more important to the debate over Josephus's Essenes and the identity of the people who inhabited Khirbet Qumran than the Cave 1 document known as the *Serek ha-Yahad*.⁴ The only complete copy of the *Serek* was found in Cave 1 (1QS).⁵ Approximately ten copies of the *Serek* were discovered in the Qumran caves.⁶ Given the number of its extant copies, the *Serek* is unquestionably among the most important of the Dead Sea Scrolls. If it can be established that Josephus reflects knowledge of the *Serek* – either the version preserved in 1QS or its other editions/recensions – this would lend additional support to the thesis that Khirbet Qumran was an Essene settlement. It would also suggest that Josephus had personal knowledge of the Essenes there.

² I do not intend to show that Josephus actually used 1QS or one of the Cave 4 copies of the *Serek ha-Yahad*, but merely that he knew the basic contents of some edition of this document. I accept that the members of the Qumran community did not produce all the Dead Sea Scrolls, but that this sect is connected with the wider Essene movement that collected (but did not necessarily write) all these texts. For the identification of the Qumran community with the Essenes, see Atkinson/Magness 2010: 317–342; Puech 2011: 63–102.

³ I follow the revised chronology of Magness (2002: esp. 63–69; Magness 1995: 58–65) that convincingly demonstrates that de Vaux's Period 1a (ca. 130–100 B.C.E.) does not exist. For a recent defense for the existence of de Vaux's Period 1a, see Pfann 2011: 703–718. For Qumran's stratigraphy, descriptions of its rooms and site plans, see de Vaux 1973; Humbert/Chambon 1994.

⁴ a.k.a. *The Community Rule*, 1QS, and the *Manual of Discipline*. 1QS and 4QS^a (4Q255), and the verso of the handle-sheet of the scroll containing 1QS, 1QSa, and 1QSB preserve the title (סֵרֵק הַיְהוּדָה). Because the Cave 4 versions of the *Community Rule* and 1QS overlap extensively, it is reasonable to assume that this title was used for other copies of this work in which the heading is not preserved. See Barthélemy/Milik 1955: 107; Alexander/Vermes 1998: 31–32.

⁵ For all extant *Serek* texts, see Charlesworth 1994.

⁶ 4Q255 (4QpapS^a), 4Q256 (4QS^b), 4Q257 (4QpapS^c), 4Q258 (4QS^d), 4Q259 (4QS^e), 4Q260 (4QS^f), 4Q261 (4QS^g), 4Q262 (4QS^h), 4Q263 (4QSⁱ), 4Q264 (4QS^j). The three fragments that make up 4Q262 may represent two copies of the *Serek*. See Alexander/Vermes 1998: 190. Fragments of the *Serek* were also found in Cave 5 (5Q11) and likely Cave 11 (11Q29). 5Q11 is listed in the *editio princeps* of 4Q255–264 as a non-*Serek* Text with liturgical parallels to 1QS, especially the annual ceremony for the renewal of the covenant. See Alexander/Vermes 1998: 4. It is recognized as a fragment of the *Serek* by Metso (1997: 65) and Lange/Mittmann-Richert (2002: 297). Although 5Q13 is not a copy of the *Serek*, it cites 1QS 3:4–5 and provides additional evidence for the importance of this rule at Qumran. See Milik 1995: 181; Metso 1997: 65–66. 11Q29 has been identified as correlating with 1QS 7.18–19 by Tigchelaar (2000: 285–292). It is listed as a parallel to 1QS by Lange/Mittmann-Richert (2002: 319), but is not recognized as such in the parallels to this text listed in the *editio princeps* of 4Q255–4Q264 by Alexander/Vermes (1998: 3). For 11Q29, see further Garcia-Martinez Tigchelaar 1998: 1309.

The various editions of the *Serek* preserve an admission process and oath for candidates. Since each is slightly different, and 1QS contains two versions of the entrance procedure, it is important not to conflate them. Rather, it is essential to examine each separately since they may witness to changes in the admission process in the community over time. It is also necessary to compare the *Serek* with the admission process described in the *Damascus Document* since many proponents of the traditional Qumran-Essene hypothesis have argued that the former describes a celibate community while the latter regulates life among married Essenes. If this view is correct, it would support Josephus's contention that there were two orders of Essenes: one that practiced celibacy and another whose members were married and resided in towns.⁷

The admission process in the *Serek* bears many similarities to versions of the *Damascus Document* and Josephus's *BJ*. However, there are notable differences. This is especially true among the *Serek* texts, which reflect different versions of this rulebook. Our only extant copy, 1QS, preserves the following two different oaths of admission:

1QS 6:13–20: (13c) And anyone from Israel who freely volunteers (14) to enroll in the council of the Community, the man appointed at the head of the Many shall test him with regard to his insight and his deeds. If he shows potential for instruction he shall let him enter (15) into the covenant so that he can revert to the truth and shun all injustice, and he shall teach him all the precepts of the Community. And when he comes in to stand in front of the Many, they shall be questioned, (16) all of them, concerning his affairs. And depending on the outcome of the lot in the council of the Many he shall be included or excluded. If he is included in the Community council, he must not touch the pure food of (17) the Many until they test him about his spirit and about his deeds, until he has completed a full year; neither should he share in the possession of the Many. (18) When he has completed a year within the Community, the Many will be questioned about his affairs, concerning his insight and his deeds in connection with the law. And if the lot results in him (19) entering the inner council of the Community according to the priests and the majority of the men of their covenant, his possessions and his earnings will also be joined at the hand of the (20) Inspector of the earnings of the Many. And they shall credit it to his account, but the Many shall not use it. He cannot touch the drink of the Many until (21) he completes a second year among the men of the Community. And when the second year is completed, he will be examined by the command of the Many. And if (22) the lot results in him joining the Community, they shall enter him in the order of his rank among his brothers for the law, for the judgment, for the purity and for the placing of his possessions. And his advice will be (23) for the Community as will his judgment.

1QS 5:7b–9: (7b) These are the regulations of their behavior concerning all these decrees when they are enrolled in the Community. Whoever enters the council of the Community (8) enters the covenant of God in the presence of all who freely volunteer. He shall swear with a binding oath to revert to the Law of Moses, according to all that he commanded, with whole (9) heart and whole soul, in accordance with all that has been revealed of it to the sons of Zadok.⁸

⁷ *BJ* 2.160. With the exception of two short passages (1QS 11:16, 21), 1QS contains no mention of women. For celibate Essenes in Josephus, see *BJ* 2.120–21.

⁸ The remaining verses (1QS 5:10–20) describe restrictions concerning possessions, the pure food, and work for new members. Translations of Qumran texts are adapted from García Martínez/Tigheelaar 1997/98. Translation of Josephus are adapted from Thackeray 1927.

The oath of admission in IQS 6:13–23 bears witness to a different admission procedure than the one found in IQS 5:7b–20.⁹ The former describes the following three-stage entry process:

Stage One: IQS 6:13–17. Investigation of a candidate’s spiritual fitness by a man appointed at the head of the Many (האיש הפקיד ברוש הרבים). If the candidate passes the test, he is brought into the covenant and taught the precepts of the Community. The Many (הרבים) test the candidate’s spiritual fitness by lot. If he passes, he is included in the Community council, but is not allowed to touch the pure food of the Many. This stage lasts for **one year**, during which the candidate is further tested and observed. His property is not joined with the Community’s possessions.

Stage Two: IQS 6:18–21a. The Many (הרבים) discuss the candidate’s spiritual progress and understanding of the Law. If he passes the test, he enters the “inner council of the Community” (לקרוב לסוד היהוד). The candidate’s property is entrusted to the “Inspector” (מבקר), who records them but the Community does not use them. The candidate cannot touch the drink of the Many until he completes a **second year**.

Stage Three: IQS 6:21b–23. The candidate is examined by “command of the Many.” If the lot is favorable, he is assigned a rank, and his possessions are merged with other members of the Community.

Josephus’s account of the Essene admission process is closest to IQS 6:13–23. It describes as well several stages through which a candidate must progress that may be outlined as follows:

Stage One: 2.137. The candidate must follow a prescribed rule of life for **one year** outside the Community. He is presented with a hatchet, a loin-cloth, and a white garment.

Stage Two: 2.138a. The candidate is brought closer into the community and taught more of its rules for an unspecified period of time. He is allowed to share the purer kind of holy water, but is not received into the meetings of the community.

Stage Three: 2.138b–142. The candidate’s character is tested for an additional **two years**. If he is found worthy, he is enrolled in the society. He must swear various oaths before he may touch the common food. He must also pledge to carefully preserve the books of the sect and the names of the angels.

⁹ Fragments 5a–b of 4Q256 contains a few passages that correspond with IQS 6:16–18. However, 4Q256 contains a considerably shorter text and lacks much of the material in IQS. Although the final fragmentary line of this text mentions “a full year” (שנה תמימה), and may have continued with the candidate being questioned by the “Many”, it is uncertain whether this period refers to a multi-year process, or preserves another version of the admission procedure in which candidates were tested for only a year. See further, Metso 1997: 29; Alexander/Vermes 1998: 55–57. 4Q261 frg. 3 contains some letters that align with IQS 6:22–23. There are, however, considerable problems in using IQS to reconstruct the missing portion since filling in the gaps results in irregular and too long line lengths. None of the chronological indicators survive in this fragment, so it is uncertain how similar the admission oath of 4Q261 is with IQS 6. See further, Alexander/Vermes 1998: 177–179; Metso 1997: 60. Schofield (2009: 92–93) suggests that both 4Q256 and 4Q261 show evidence of possible secondary/corrupt readings when compared to IQS. Although she proposes a slightly different relationship between the Cave 4 *Serek* fragments and IQS than the present study, Schofield’s observations on the problems in attempting to harmonize what are clearly different (although likely related) versions of the *Serek* are important since IQS has long been held to be a composite document that was expanded over time. Cf. Gagnon 1992: 61–72.

The apparent differences between 1QS 6:13–23 and *BJ* 2.137–42 are less than appears. Although it seems that Josephus allows the candidate to drink the pure water earlier than 1QS, he likely refers to the purification baths and not to the drink of the community.¹⁰ Josephus includes a detailed list of oaths during stage three of the admission process. This appears to contradict 1QS 6 in which they seem to take place during the preliminary stage of admission (cf. 1QS 5.8–9). However, Josephus does not state when these oaths are made, but merely enumerates them in a fuller form than found in 1QS 6. He only states that they are made at some point before the candidate is allowed to touch the “common food” (*War* 1.139). His concluding statement “with such oaths as these (τοιούτους) they secure their proselytes” suggests that Josephus is reproducing only the basic content of the oaths, and not their precise wording.¹¹ James C. VanderKam notes that Josephus’s description of the Essene admission procedure in *BJ* 2 is most reminiscent of the procedure in 1QS 6:13b–16.¹² According to Josephus, the first stage outside the community lasts one year, which appears to be described in 1QS 6:13b–16. The *Serek*, however, does mention the hatchet, the loin cloth, or the white garment. Josephus’s stage of two years matches 1QS 6:16–23, during which the candidate spends two years in the community. Most scholars attribute these similarities to Josephus’s use of sources.¹³ John Collins comments on the possible nature or provenance of Josephus source on the Essenes: “He could conceivably have gotten his hands on an Essene rule book, and supplied the Hellenizing presentation himself.”¹⁴ This study suggests that this thesis is partly correct: Josephus likely knew a rulebook similar to 1QS and other Essene lore because he was an Essene!

The suggestion that Josephus knew a rule book similar to 1QS is possibly supported by the dates of the *Serek* texts. The debate over the relationship between the various

¹⁰ Beall 1988: 73–74; 74–75; VanderKam, 2009: 427–428. Lawrence (2006: 141–158) notes that no Qumran text explicitly mentions purification as part of the initiation as implied by Josephus (*BJ* 2.137–38). He comments that most of the references to ritual bathing in the *Serek* (see, esp. 1QS 3.4–9) describe a special form of ritual washing for initiation or re-initiation of repentant members.

¹¹ As noted by Beall 1998: 76.

¹² These similarities even extend to vocabulary. Cf. Beall 1998: 74–75; VanderKam 2009: 427–428; Collins 2010: 146. Other prominent parallels include: (A) 1QS 6:16 says the candidate will “draw near” while Josephus writes that the novice “draws closer” to the community’s way of life. (B) (*BJ* 2.137) volunteers “eager” to join (ζηλούς); (1QS 6:13) those who join are “volunteers” (מתנדב).

¹³ Scholarship has traditionally espoused the belief that Josephus, as well as Philo, drew on literary and ethnographic accounts of the Essenes, which were likely written by Gentiles for a non-Jewish audience. See further, Hölscher 1916: 193–200; Bauer 1924: 386–340. Josephus mentions the Essenes in the following passages: *Life*, 10–12; *BJ* 1.78–80, 2.113, 2.119–61, 2.567, 3.11, 5.145; *AJ* 13.171–72, 15.371–79, 18.18–22. The parallels between *BJ* 2 and Hippolytus’s *Refutation of all Heresies* 9.18–28 suggests the two accounts drew upon a common source: Black 1956: 172–182; Smith 1958: 273–313. Smith (1982: 199*–214*) later retracted this thesis. Others have suggested that Hippolytus was dependent on Josephus. See Burchard 1974: 77–96; Bergmeier 1993: 1–41; Rajak 2002: 219–240; Bergmeier 2003: 443–470. Scholars have appealed to sources to account for the relationship between Philo’s account of the Essenes and Josephus’s *AJ* 18 by arguing that the latter used the former. See Bauer 1924; Rajak 2002: 231–236. Others suggest that Josephus and Philo used a common source. See Black 1956: 172–175; Smith 1958: 278–279; Bergmeier 1993: 66–107; Argall 2000: 75–91. Goranson (1994: 295–298) proposes that Philo drew on Strabo for his information on the Essenes. Bergmeier (1993: 108–113) postulates four distinct sources behind Josephus’s work. The majority of experts believe that Josephus did use sources, but do not try to delineate them. For examples, see Collins 2010: 133–142; Collins 2009b: 51–72; Eshel 2008: 6–8; Frey 2003: 23–57; Murphy 2002: 408–409; Sievers 2001: 241–251; Bilde 1998: 64–65.

¹⁴ Collins 2009b: 67.

copies of the *Serek* is quite complex. Philip S. Alexander suggests that the paleographical dating of the *Serek* texts reflects their likely order of composition.¹⁵ This would seem to be a valid methodology in contrast to that of Sarianna Metso, whose complicated redactional examination of the extant copies of the *Serek* essentially inverts their paleographical dates. She proposes that some 4Q copies of the *Serek* (4QS^b [4Q256]; 4QS^d [4Q258]; 4QS^e [4Q259]), which are significantly shorter and have a later paleographical date than 1QS, actually preserve earlier editions of the *Serek* than 1QS. This would mean that the most developed edition of the *Serek*, namely 1QS, is actually found in the earliest dated manuscript.¹⁶ Although Metso's thesis seems overly complex, a close look at the *Serek* texts in light of CD lends some support to it.

The relationship between the *Damascus Document* and the *Serek* remains the subject of an intense academic debate. A close look at the differences between the two suggests that the former preserves an older and simpler form of community structure than the latter.¹⁷ The simpler admission procedure in CD supports this dating, as well as Metso's thesis. The passage in the *Serek* regarding the admission oath in 1QS 5:7b–20 is paralleled in a shorter version in 4Q256 (4QS^b) and 4Q258 (4QS^d).¹⁸ All these texts require those wishing to join the community to swear a binding oath to return to the Laws of Moses as understood by the Community's leaders.¹⁹ The process described in full in 1QS 5:7c–9a consists of a simple oath like CD 15. In contrast, 1QS 6:13b–23 describes a more complex multistage process of admission.²⁰ The admission process in 1QS 6:13b–23, moreover, may have a separate history than 1QS 5:7c–9a.

The passage relating to the temporary expulsion of erring members in CD 20:1b–8a is close to 1QS 8:16b–9:2. This parallel is considered among the strongest arguments for connecting the movement behind these texts.²¹ What is particularly interesting is that

¹⁵ Alexander 1996: 437–456. Cf. Gamet 1997: 67–78.

¹⁶ Metso argues that two different lines of tradition are represented in 4Q256, 4Q258, and 4Q259, which suggests that newer forms of the *Serek* did not replace earlier editions. See further, Metso 1997: 107–149; Metso 2004: 315–335. See also her overview of these texts, Metso 2007.

¹⁷ Cf. Collins 2010: 56–58; Hempel 1998: 101, 158; Knibb 1994: 153–160; Davies 1987: 173–201.

¹⁸ There are some minor differences. Whereas 1QS 5:9 mentions the “men of their covenant,” both 4Q256 and 4Q258 read “men of the Community.” The words “according to all that he commanded” in 1QS 5:8 are also missing in these two 4Q parallels. Cf. Metso 1997: 28, 41–42.

¹⁹ The “Inspector” (מבקר) of CD presumably represents the council of the Community mentioned in the three *Serek* oaths and he apparently interprets the Torah.

²⁰ Regev (2003: 236, 262) originally suggested that 1QS 6:3 refers to a council that was a smaller group, and not the entire community. He nevertheless acknowledged that he could not explain why so many copies of CD were preserved in what appears to be the center of the competing and more meticulous group at Qumran. His recent work (Regev 2007: 184) rejects this view, largely based on the arguments of Collins (2010: 67–68) that the preposition in the phrase in 1QS 6:3 that “every place where there shall be ten men *from* the council of the community ([מעצת היידי] הייחוד)” is partitive and indicates that the ten do not constitute the council, but that it is a larger group of which they are members. The council and the *Yahad* appear to be interchangeable in the admission procedures in 1QS 6:13–23. Cf. Kapfer 2007: 159–162. This reading would imply that members living in villages, towns, or the larger community of Qumran were all considered members of the *Yahad* as suggested by the passage in *BJ* 2.124.

²¹ Both texts reflect similar communal self-designations and organizational terminology, such as *rabbim* and *Yahad*, that dominate the central columns of 1QS, especially 1QS 5–7. See Murphy-O'Connor 1972: 544–555; Knibb 1987: 71–72; Davies 1991: 57–58; Hempel 2009: 376–387. Murphy-O'Connor (1972: 554–555) comments on this similarity: “Had CD XX,1c–8a been found as an isolated fragment it would have been assumed that it belonged to the *Rule*...

the material with the closest overlap between 1QS 8–9 and CD 20 is absent from 4Q259 (4QS^e). The scribe responsible for 1QS was quite careless and prone to numerous errors, which may account for some differences between it and the 4Q copies of the *Serek*.²² However, the point at which 1QS and 4Q259 come together is marked with a *paragraphos* sign in the former, which the scribe may have inserted to mark a place where the text has evolved.²³ Because 1QS 8:15–9:11 contains an unusually small number of corrections, and is absent from 4Q259, this lends additional support to the thesis that 1QS preserves a later edition of the *Serek* even though it is preserved in an older manuscript. The shorter text of 4Q259 most likely preserves an earlier redactional stage of the *Serek* that is much shorter than 1QS.

If Metso's thesis is correct, this raises that likelihood that the parallels between 1QS 8–9 and CD 20 are confined to a block of material that is secondary to 1QS.²⁴ The possibility that 1QS 8–9 and CD 20 share a common redactional history, and that this material was later inserted in the 1QS copy of the *Serek*, lends additional support to this thesis, and suggests that different settlements of the *Yahad* used different editions of the *Serek*. Hempel suggests that 1QS 5, the shorter form of the admission procedure, is an earlier piece of communal legislation that has been preserved in 1QS alongside the later expanded and more elaborate procedure found in 1QS 6. The earlier admission process in 1QS 5, moreover, likely derived from the same community described in CD 15.²⁵ The two documents apparently reflect related, but not necessarily rival, groups with a common heritage.

When all the variations between 1QS and the other versions of the *Serek* are taken into consideration, it is more likely that the longer version represented in 1QS, despite its earlier date of copying, represents a later edition with significant expansions. The shorter versions of the *Serek* reflect a more egalitarian form of community organization, which was apparently later disrupted by the ascendancy of the sons of Zadok. The longer form of the *Serek* in 1QS, moreover, places greater emphasis on priestly authority.²⁶ The passage on separating from the men of deceit in 1QS 5:11–13 is supported by a pastiche of biblical phrases that have no counterpart in 4Q256 (4QS^b) and 4Q258 (4QS^d).²⁷ Metso comments on this phenomenon: "A comparison between the manuscripts of 1QS and 4QS^{b,d} reveals a process of redaction in 1QS, the purpose of which was to provide

²² Cf. Tov 1999: 232–263.

²³ 4Q259 (4QS^e) lacks almost an entire column that appears in 1QS 8:15–9:11. For the possibility that the various scribal markings in 1QS witness to its growth, see further Hempel 2010: 167–171.

²⁴ Cf. Hempel 2009: 377–378. Schofield (2009: 102–103) makes a convincing textual argument that 1QS 8.25 and 4Q258 (4QS^d) 7.1 were independently corrupted, and that they represent traditions diverging from a common original.

²⁵ Hempel (1997: 72) suggests that the community is likely the group from which the *Yahad* emerged. Cf. Collins 2010: 56–57.

²⁶ See Collins 2010: 60–65; Hultgren 2007: 317; Regev 2003: 233–362; 242; Kugler 1996: 315–320; Hempel 1996: 263–267. Metso (1997: 78) also notes that 1QS 5:21–22 places greater emphasis on priestly authority by adding references to the "sons of Zadok" while the short form of the *Serek* assigns special authority to the "many" as the true keepers of the covenant. Cf. Metso 1997: 78; Collins 2010: 63.

²⁷ The rubric in 1QS 5:7 appears to be an addition introducing the following passage about joining the community since it is lacking in both 4Q256 and 4Q258. For evidence the scripture citations in 1QS 5:1–20a were added, and that the lack of this material in 4QS^{b,d} supports Metso's thesis for the chronological priority of the latter copies of the *Serek*, see Lucas 2010: 30–52.

a Scriptural legitimation for the regulations of the community, as well as to reinforce its self-understanding.”²⁸

The Cave 4 fragments show that different recensions of the *Serek* were copied during the first century B.C.E. The similarities between the versions of the *Serek* and CD, and the contradictory passages in both texts, have led Collins to propose that we should not regard either of these documents as reflecting the life of a single community. Rather, they witness to the existence of various theologically-related settlements that differed in their lifestyles.²⁹ Both texts bear witness to a community that has undergone considerable theological change over time.

1QS 6 contains several passages that may bear witness to important changes in the community behind this text. The mention of a group of ten in 1QS 6:1c–8a is unique, and has been considered an interpolation. Hempel believes that this passage reflects the earliest and simplest beginnings of communal life, “where small numbers of individuals congregated together to eat, pray, and take counsel together.”³⁰ Collins, however, believes that 1Q6 attests to small groups with the *Yahad*.³¹ Metso suggests that the reference to communities with a quorum of ten in 1QS 6:1c–8a, along with several unique features in this passage, show that it is a relic of older legislation that has been added to the text.³² She also rejects Collins’s reading of the preposition before the term “council of the community” in 1QS 6:3 as partitive in the phrase “every place where there shall be ten men from the council of the community ([מִן הַחֵיד הַיְחִיד]).” Instead, she reads “from” in the locative sense and understands it as describing a rule of conduct for “traveling Essenes” members of the *Yahad*, namely members from the council of the community (מַעֲצַת הַיְחִיד). The legislation deals with them while they were visiting areas outside large settlements such as the one at Qumran, and while they were in contact with Essenes living in towns and villages among other Jews.³³

Both Metso and Collins, despite their different interpretations, recognize that the preposition in this passage shows that the organization as a whole, of which these ten men form a part, is much larger. For Collins, the partitive use of the preposition merely shows that those residing in villages and towns were just as much members of the *Yahad* as those living larger settlements, and that it is not necessary to assume that 1QS 6:1c–8a is an interpolation.³⁴ However, as Leaney and Knibb noted before the publication of the Cave 4 copies of the *Serek*, there are some notable differences between 1QS 6:1c–7a and 6:8b–13a that suggest they describe two different periods. The injunction to act together (1QS 6:2–3) appears superfluous at Qumran.³⁵ It appears to describe a more primitive community that originated in a different setting since it lacks the detailed and elaborate procedures elsewhere in 1QS, and contains no mention of sharing food.³⁶ Following the

²⁸ See Metso 1997: 105. Cf. Tigchelaar 2003: 451–452; Newsom 2004: 152; Hempel 2009: 385–387.

²⁹ On this, see further Collins 2009a: 351–369; Elgvin 2005: 273–279.

³⁰ Hempel 2003: 67.

³¹ Collins 2003: 104; Collins 2010: 65–69. Cf. Berg 2007: 161–177.

³² Metso 2008: 68–71. Metso emphasizes that nowhere else in the *Serek* is a group of ten mentioned, and that this passage alone contains the term מְגוּרִים, “their places of sojourning.”

³³ Metso 1997: 135. See also Metso 2008: 74–75.

³⁴ Collins 2010: 67–68.

³⁵ Leaney 1966: 180; Knibb 1987: 115.

³⁶ For these observations, see further Hempel 1998: 107–113.

interpretations of Leaney and Knibb, Metso proposes that 1QS 6:1c–7a describes meetings in smaller Essene settlements such as towns and villages. 1QS 6:8b–13a, moreover, describes the rule for the session of the *rabbim* taking place in the council of the community in a large Essene settlement such as that at Qumran.³⁷ The common material in CD 12:22–13:7 and 1QS 6:1–8 may suggest that the latter originated from the same circle as the former. The remainder of the *Serek* in contrast appears to describe a settlement that is larger, and more isolated, than the *maḥanot* described in D.³⁸

What is the significance of these observations regarding the admission procedure described in the different versions of the *Serek* for understanding Josephus's account of the Essene initiation process? His description of the Essene admission procedure most closely matches the latest edition preserved in 1QS 6:13–23, and not the corresponding passages in 1QS 5, CD 15:5b1–10a, or an earlier version of the *Serek*. Critics of the traditional Qumran-Essene thesis focus on passages pertaining to the admission procedure in 1QS and the *Damascus Document* that either do not match one another, or that appear to contradict Josephus, without taking into consideration the redactional history of both Qumran texts. Beall, writing long before the publication of the Cave 4 fragments of the *Serek*, comments on the differences between these two scrolls and Josephus:

...it is quite possible that these documents represent different stages in the community's development, and this may well account for some of the discrepancies not only between the Qumran documents but also between these documents and Josephus. On the whole it appears that Josephus' description of the Essenes more closely parallels the *Manual of Discipline* than the *Damascus Document*.³⁹

The various redactions to 1QS and the *Damascus Document* – as evident in the Cave 4 recensions of the *Serek* – support Beall's statement, and reveal that the various communities of Essenes periodically revised some of their foundational texts to reflect changes in their beliefs and practices. This is further suggested by inclusivist and exclusivist tendencies in the Scrolls. Holtz comments on this phenomenon:

A pan-Israelite perspective could be seen in 4QpNah, 4QFlor (1A), 4QSM (1C) and especially in 4QMMT (1A; 3C), 1QSa (1a; 3c), 1QSa (1a; 2b) and CD/4QD (2a; 3a.c). This perspective is missing almost entirely in 1QS. This evidence corresponds to what has already been observed by many scholars: that S as contrary to CD/4QD and 1QSa, but also to 4QMMT presupposes a community without women and children. The latter texts, especially CD/4QD, imply a community made up of families and related to the wider society in many ways whereas the S-tradition draws the picture of a male community whose view of the outside world is confined to its immediate (ideological?) enemies.⁴⁰

³⁷ Metso 2008: 71.

³⁸ The material in 1QS 6:1–8 was likely added to 1QS from a source different than the surrounding materials in 1QS 5–7. Cf. Hempel 1998: 111; Metso 2008: 72, 77–78; Hempel 2011: 31–40. In 1QS 6:1–8, moreover, the members of the ten (1QS 6:3) belong to the *Yahad* (the council of the community), with no mention of members of the *maḥanot* present. The group described in this text, however, is similar to the description of the *maḥanot* in CD 12:22–13:7. This provides additional evidence that 1QS 6:1–8 is an earlier piece of community legislation that originated in circles similar to the *maḥanot* of CD.

³⁹ Beall 1998: 127, esp. 122–129.

⁴⁰ Holtz 2009: 53.

Given the time gap between 1QS and Josephus, it appears that the Essenes had grown more exclusivist in Josephus's day when, perhaps with a few exceptions, no new sectarian compositions were written.

It is important to note that Josephus's time with the Essenes took place later than the dates of the majority of the extant Scrolls, which was also the period when the members of the sect had, for the most part, stopped producing new writings.⁴¹ Hanan Eshel suggests that the Qumran sect stopped composing new *peshtarim* following a theological crisis in the community that was brought by their awareness that their messianic expectations had not been fulfilled with the arrival of the Romans. He comments on this phenomenon:

There is no doubt that in the eyes of a group with such high messianic expectations like the one residing at Qumran, these events would have been considered as sure signs that the Day of Redemption was drawing near. The fact that we do not find any references to these events in the *peshtarim* found at Qumran, testifies that at some point, before 31 B.C.E., the leaders of the Qumran sect stopped composing new *peshtarim*. [...] Since it is far more difficult to amend or explain away a written text, the leaders of the Qumran sect probably decided to restrict their activity to oral interpretations.⁴²

The content of 1QS provides some indirect confirmation for this suggestion of a decided precedence for oral, rather than written, testimony at Qumran. We can perhaps learn more about this aspect of the Qumran community by looking at some unique features in 1QS, which represents the latest edition of the *Serek*, as well as the dates of the Dead Sea Scrolls. If the reconstruction of the opening line of 1QS as "For [the Instructor]" ([לְמַשְׁכִּיל...]) is correct, then this copy of the *Serek* likely belonged to a *maskil* (cf. 1QS 3:13). Among the principal tasks of the *maskil* in the *Serek* is to instruct members concerning "The Treatise of the Two Spirits" (1QS 3,9–21; 4Q257 [4QpapS^c] 5,7–13) and serve as a teacher and spiritual leader (1QS 9.12–21a; 21b–26), which included instructing new members about the secrets of the interpretation of the Law (1QS 9.14, 17–18). A *maskil* likely used 1QS as a basis for making decisions and teaching, as well as to record the history of his community.

Although we focus on the actual scrolls, 1QS 6.8–13 grants decision making power to the *rabbim* and not to written texts. The *Serek* was merely a guide, which in its 1QS version included much earlier theological interpretations and practices reflecting the history of the Essene movement, and likely functioned as a source for Essene norms and practices.⁴³ With nearly a century of oral decision making separating Josephus and 1QS, it is not surprising that there are some differences between the two works. Nevertheless, the extensive parallels suggest that both reflect a common tradition.

⁴¹ For the dates of the Scrolls, see Webster 2003: 351–446.

⁴² Eshel 2008: 178–179. Wise (2003: 85) suggests that the Roman conquest had a detrimental effect on the Qumran sectarians and comments: "By the beginning of the common era, it seems, the Teacher's movement had lost vitality, perhaps even ceased to exist. No more than a rivulet survived to flow into the first century C.E."

⁴³ Schofield (2009: 336–338, 342–345) suggests that its traditions were diverse and reinvented over time and place, but never isolated from the codifying center. Metso (2004: 393) comments on the likely oral nature of the Qumran community: "In light of the lack of mention of any written texts in the descriptions of judicial meetings included in the Scrolls, it seems that the actual authority of decision-making rested not so much on written texts but on the *oral* authority of priests and community officials."

As an eyewitness to Essene practices and beliefs during a period when the Qumran community continued to copy and redact earlier versions of the *Serek*, Josephus likely preserves practices and beliefs of the first century C.E. Essenes that were not placed in writing, but transmitted orally. During his sojourn with the Essenes Josephus was likely taught the dictates of a version of the *Serek* similar to that preserved in 1QS, which accounts for the great similarities, which even extend to vocabulary, between his account in *BJ* 2 and this text. Josephus's description of his own experience with the Essenes suggest that his time with them was rather brief since he apparently never made it past the first year of the admission process, when members were issued a hatchet, a loin cloth, and a white garment before taking the full oath of membership into the community (*BJ* 2.137). These items, not mentioned the Qumran texts as part of the initiation process, are likely later additions to Essene lifestyle made by the late first century B.C.E. to sometime in the first century C.E. They apparently served to distinguish Essenes from outsiders and as a visible sign of their pledge to follow a lifestyle of rigorous discipline.⁴⁴

Josephus appears to have an amazing knowledge of the inner practices of the Essenes as revealed by both archaeology and 1QS. This may be surprising since he claims that Essenes were not to disclose their secrets to outsiders; a concern also reflected in 1QS but not in Philo.⁴⁵ In conjunction with their oath of secrecy, Josephus makes the surprising claim that the Essenes are also to preserve "the books of their sect" and the names of the angels.⁴⁶ No Qumran text mentions the preservation of books. Josephus's observation that the Essenes place great care on this matter suggests personal knowledge of the community at Qumran, which placed great care on the preservation of its scrolls.⁴⁷ The Scroll jars and bitumen-impregnated linen from Qumran provides additional evidence to support Josephus's claim that the Essenes carefully preserved their texts.⁴⁸ The similarities between Josephus's accounts of the Essenes also extend to the design of site of Khirbet Qumran, which was likely built in accordance with the dictates of a text similar to 1QS. But is the *Serek* clearly connected with Khirbet Qumran of Josephus's day?

II. Josephus, the *Serek*, and the Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran

The *Serek* is important for understanding Josephus's Essenes, the deposition of the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the identification of the community at Khirbet Qumran. This text is so connected with the other Qumran texts that it is difficult to assume that the entire

⁴⁴ For the importance of these sectarian markers, see Baumgarten 1997: 53–61. Philo (*Omnis Probus* 86; *Hyp.* 11.12) also mentions distinctive Essene clothing.

⁴⁵ *BJ* 2.141–42; 1QS 4:6; 5:15f.; 9:16f.; 21f. Beall 1998: 84.

⁴⁶ *BJ* 2.142. Khirbet Qumran not only contains a library of books, but texts with many references to angels, including 1QS (3:20–21, 24, 4:12, 11:7–9). Angels are also mentioned in 1QSB 4:25–26, which was attached to 1QS. Cf. Collins 2000: 9–28.

⁴⁷ Cf. Beall 1998: 86–87.

⁴⁸ Although it is uncertain whether this linen was used to seal Scroll jars, wrapped around the Scrolls, or both, a bitumen-impregnated linen used as a casing around a scroll from Egypt in the University of Pennsylvania Museum (item 38-28-45) suggests that the Qumran linen was used to preserve scrolls. Because whole-mouthed jars are found in the natural caves (1Q–3Q, 6Q, and 11Q) and the site, and since the artificial marl caves (4Q–5Q, 7Q–10Q) lie within the settlement, this suggests that deposition of the scrolls was organized by those who lived at Khirbet Qumran. For this evidence, see Taylor 2012: 280–284.

collection did not emanate from a single group.⁴⁹ The dates and find spots of the Qumran texts suggest that they are connected with the *Serek* and the community that resided at the site during Josephus's day. Approximately 719 manuscripts are assigned dates on the basis of paleography in Webster's index in *DJD* 39. Both "biblical" and non-"biblical" scrolls show a decided peak in the second half of the first century B.C.E. (50–1 B.C.E.). In the first half of the first century B.C.E. the number of non-"biblical" manuscripts triples (32 to 100 manuscripts); during the same time the biblical manuscripts increase by only 40 percent. What is especially interesting is that no text that appears to reflect the distinctive sectarian identity of the community of the Scrolls (*pesharim*, rule texts, 4QMMT, etc.) dates from before approximately 100 B.C.E.⁵⁰

The number of manuscripts produced from the last half century B.C.E. is also quite high: 272 manuscripts. This data shows that the greatest period of scribal activity took place in the late Hasmonean and early Herodian periods. If we take into consideration the names of identifiable persons in the Dead Sea Scrolls we also find that they converge with this data. Of the eighteen identifiable persons actually named in these texts, the majority lived from the time of Alexander Jannaeus until Pompey's 63 B.C.E. conquest of Jerusalem. Those individuals who lived in the second century B.C.E., moreover, appear in texts that reflect back on this time, but which have been dated to the first century B.C.E.⁵¹

The dates and historical contents of the Dead Sea Scrolls show that the first century B.C.E. was the formative period for the community described in these documents. The number of scribal hands, moreover, suggests that many of the Scrolls from the various caves are physically connected with one another. Ada Yardeni observes that a single scribe copied 57 texts from caves 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 11, and possibly 36 additional texts from caves 4, 8, and 11.⁵² This observation, if correct, challenges recent attempts to show that the contents of Caves 1 and 4 are older than that of other Scroll caves, as well as theories presupposing various dates of deposition of the Scrolls, since a single scribe produced texts found in multiple caves.⁵³ Such theories, moreover, are questionable since they fail

⁴⁹ Ownership, however, should not be equated with authorship. I accept that the Qumran community did not produce all the Scrolls, but that these texts are connected with the wider Essene movement that collected (but did not necessarily write) all these documents.

⁵⁰ The figures in this section are from Lapin (2010: 108–127). Lapin estimates that these texts were produced at an average rate of approximately 5.5 manuscripts a year, of which 4.3 percent were non-"biblical." He notes that Scroll production should likely be adjusted to include two additional Scrolls per year if we include the manuscripts without paleographical dates. Lapin (2010: 115–116 and notes 13–14) comments that if the paleographical dates for 4Q248 and 11Q29 are correct, they may date to the late second century B.C.E. Earlier sectarian texts, however, likely bear witness to earlier related or precursor groups to the Qumran community. This latter community nevertheless gathered, collected, copied, and redacted, such earlier documents.

⁵¹ For this evidence, see further Atkinson 2007: 125–151.

⁵² Yardeni 2007: 287–298.

⁵³ Stökl Ben Ezra (2007: 313–333) identifies Caves 1 and 4 as "old" caves that have a different age structure than those from the "young" Caves (2, 3, 5, 6, and 11) to argue that these texts were hidden at Qumran on more than one occasion. Pfann (2007a: 147–170) distinguishes between caves with *Yahad* documents (1Q, 4Qa, 4Qb, 5Q, and 6Q) and "rebel caves" (2Q, 3Q, 11Q, Masada) that do not contain scrolls with *Yahad* doctrine. García-Martínez (2010: 8–10) notes that the radiocarbon dates of four Cave 1 texts, and the paleographical dates of several others from this cave, reveal that they postdate the supposed dates of their deposition proposed by Stökl Ben Ezra.

to recognize that there is a considerable degree of uncertainty as to the find-sites of many fragments. This is particularly true of those from Cave 4!

Of the 600 fragmentary manuscripts identified as having come from Cave 4, Stephen A. Reed notes that less than one-fourth were found in an excavation and therefore can be definitively associated with Cave 4.⁵⁴ Weston Fields's exhaustive history of the Cave 4 team notes that fragments purchased during January–March 1953 are listed in the “Scrolls Ledger” as from “unknown caves,” except one. Commenting on how the Cave 4 team changed the find-spot of these fragments from unknown caves to Cave 4, Fields comments:

Many fragments from these unknown caves were almost immediately identified as Cave 4 materials, because they could be joined with fragments whose provenance was certain, or which could be identified as from the same documents even if there were no joins. Naturally, no one made any notation of such identifications in the Scrolls Ledger, whose only purpose was to record purchases, and as far as I can tell, there was no cross-referencing system to keep things straight. In the process of moving *some* of the fragments from the provenance classification “unknown caves” in the Ledger to “Cave 4” in the scroller, it seems that *all* the unknown-caves fragments were thrown in with the Cave 4 fragments, even if they could not be connected with fragments excavated by archaeologists. Thus, as we have previously cautioned, *few, if any, conclusions about the Cave 4 materials should be drawn on the basis of where a fragment was found, unless all or part of a particular scroll or fragment can be shown to have been unearthed there by archaeologists.*⁵⁵

Stephen Pfann comments on this issue: “Of the approximately 600 fragmentary manuscripts which have been identified as having come from Cave 4, fragments of about one-fourth of these were identified among those found in the excavation.”⁵⁶ If we compare the list of fragments excavated from Cave 4 with Yardeni's list of scrolls/fragments that were copied by the same scribe, only two of the 45 fragments she lists as produced by this scribe were actually excavated.⁵⁷ Of the 28 texts from Cave 4 she lists as “perhaps also copied by this scribe,” only one was excavated.⁵⁸ This means that of these 73 Cave 4 texts, only three can be definitively connected with this cave: all the others are presumed, but not proven, to have emanated from Cave 4. If we consider the ten Cave 4 fragments

⁵⁴ Reed 2007: 199–221. Reed (2007: 206 n. 33) building upon an earlier inventory of Pfann, lists the following Cave 4 documents in PAM 40.962–40.985 that were excavated, mainly in the recesses in the floor of cave 4a, that can definitively be linked to Cave 4a+b: 4Q1, 14, 22, 24, 26a, 30, 34, 37, 39, 51, 62, 63, 68, 72, 74, 80, 84, 94, 103, 109, 112, 115, 121, 127, 151, 163, 165, 179, 204, 217, 227, 248, 249, 249b, 249e, 249g, 249i, 249z, 255, 258, 261, 270, 276, 282e, 282g, 289, 321, 324d, 324e, 324g, 334, 364, 365, 367, 378, 381, 384, 385, 387, 387a, 387b, 391, 395, 412, 418, 422, 432, 433a, 440, 485, 487, 489, 491, 496, 497, 499, 502, 503, 506, 508, 509, 512, 519, 525, 529, 532, 545, 558, Mur 6. Reed also raises doubts as to whether many texts supposedly from other Qumran caves have been appropriately proven as emanating from them.

⁵⁵ Fields 2009: 231 (author's italics). Fields also comments that the official team was likely unaware that there was any doubt as to the provenance of many fragments. Kando and the Bedouin likely identified fragments as emanating from Cave 4 since they were paid more for them. For this matter, see also the comments of F.M. Cross and J. Strugnell recorded by Fields (2009: 546, notes 107–108) and the “Scrolls Ledger” reproduced in his book (pp. 561–565).

⁵⁶ Pfann 2007a: 112.

⁵⁷ 4Q276 (Tohorot B*), 4Q432 pap Hodayot^f.

⁵⁸ 4Q525 (Beatitudes).

of the *Serek*, only three were actually excavated.⁵⁹ These figures raise the possibility that a large number of the fragments believed to have come from Cave 4 either emanated from other Scroll caves, or perhaps come from as yet unidentified caves.⁶⁰

The possible addition of new caves containing texts to the list of known Dead Sea Scroll caves compounds efforts to date the deposition of these writings to different periods, or to argue that the same community did not deposit them. It is unlikely that so many caves containing copies of identical texts such as the *Serek*, as well as documents espousing similar theology, were deposited at Qumran by chance. The possible addition of new caves containing Scrolls, possibly including different editions of the *Serek*, further supports the thesis that the Scrolls emanated from many communities and were brought to Khirbet Qumran for study, deposition, and/or hiding because of the site's connection with these other like-minded groups. The connection between the ceramics from the caves and the Scrolls, and the presence of three Scroll caves (7, 8, and 9) within the confines of Khirbet Qumran, further supports a connection between the texts and the site.⁶¹ The dates of these ceramics and the majority of scrolls suggest that they were for the most part deposited in the caves and the site during Period II – the era of Josephus.

Qumran's ceramics not only show a connection between the Scroll caves and Khirbet Qumran, but they also tell us much about this community during Josephus's day.⁶² Qumran's pottery, moreover, consists mainly of cups, bowls, cooking pots, storage jars, jugs, juglets, and flasks.⁶³ Qumran's ceramic corpus is different from contemporary sites in Judea not only in the types that are represented, but in those that are not. Fine wares common throughout Judea during the first century B.C.E. to the first century C.E. are either rare or unattested at Qumran. These include western terra sigillata, Eastern Sigillata A, Roman mold-made lamps, and other fine wares that are almost totally absent. Tests have revealed that some of the Qumran pottery was likely manufactured in Jerusalem or Jericho.⁶⁴ The absence of ovoid or cylindrical jars from Jerusalem makes it more likely that

⁵⁹ Excavated: 4Q255 (4QpapS^a), 4Q258 (4QS^d), 4Q261 (4QS^e). Not Excavated: 4Q256 (4QS^b), 4Q257 (4QpapS^c), 4Q259 (4QS^e), 4Q260 (4QSⁱ), 4Q262 (4QS^h), 4Q263 (4QSⁱ), 4Q264 (4QSⁱ).

⁶⁰ Tov suggests that several Cave 4 texts in all probability emanated from other sites. He notes that the Cave 4 text 4QGen^b, as suggested by its editor, J.R. Davila, is very close to the medieval MT and most likely came from Murabba'at. Tov agrees with those scholars who do not believe that the documentary texts 4Q342–348, 351–361 are from Qumran since deeds, letters, and accounts are rarely found among the Scrolls. He also notes that 4Q347 and XHev/Se 32 (papDeed F) are part of the same document, which suggests that scrolls from multiple sites were likely merged with the Qumran materials. For these examples, see further Tov (2011: 9–10).

⁶¹ Cf. Atkinson/Magness 2010: 323–325.

⁶² Cylindrical jars ("scroll jars") were found in both the caves and at Khirbet Qumran in contexts associated with de Vaux's Periods Ib and II. See de Vaux 1955: 3–36. One example of this jar was found covered with a limestone slab sunk into the floor of one of the rooms (locus 2) with a coin of a Roman procurator dated ca. 10 C.E. Magness's (2002: 68) revised chronology of period Ib dates these cylindrical jars to the post-31 B.C.E. phase (between 31 and ca. 9/8 B.C.E.). Bar-Nathan (2006: 275) accepting Magness's dating, comments on these jars: "There are no published examples from contexts that clearly antedate 31 B.C.E."

⁶³ de Vaux 1953: 83–106; de Vaux 1954: 206–236; de Vaux 1956: 533–577; de Vaux 1955, I: 8–13.

⁶⁴ Analysis suggests that some of Qumran's pottery either imitates forms common at Jericho or Jerusalem, or that some may have been brought from these locals to the site. One set of tests found two different chemical clay groups, one of Jerusalem (possibly near Jericho) clay and the other of non-Jerusalem clay. Those made from the former include the ceramic inkwell from L30, the jar inscribed with a Hebrew name from L34, and cylindrical jars and lids from the caves while those from the latter (presumably Qumran) include a cup and a bowl from the pottery annex (L86) adjacent to the dining room (L77). See Yellin/Broschi/

the clay was brought from there to Qumran since overland transport of pottery would have been difficult, and likely cracked many vessels.

The rarity of imported ware at Khirbet Qumran suggests that even though its inhabitants were connected with the outside world, especially Jerusalem and likely Jericho, they lived in a degree of isolation from these cities because of their purity concerns.⁶⁵ This is especially true of the “Scroll Jars” found both inside the caves surrounding Khirbet Qumran and within the site. Rachel Bar-Nathan comments on these vessels:

We have no clear evidence of the function of the jars, except for the evidence from Qumran Cave 1 where scrolls were reportedly found inside cylindrical jars. In fact the shape is well suited for the storage of documents. The jar stands upright on its own; its lid is very easy to remove and, therefore, is not suitable for storing food [...] the cover (bowl-lid) is easy to remove and not intended to keep products sealed. Therefore, the term “archival” or “Geniza” jars seems more fitting. Since these jars were found in special spots (either close to entrances, sunk into the floor, or placed into a wall niche), it seems that their function was very specific. Their absence from other sites is, thus, not surprising, since they would have been found only in places associated with archives or libraries.⁶⁶

Given the connection with the dated pottery from Khirbet Qumran, the Scrolls appear to have been associated with the site.⁶⁷ This is further suggested by Cave 1, which is unique among the Scroll Caves. This cave contained a large amount of linen. The discovery in this cave of a petrified scroll wrapped in linen and attached to the neck of a jar shows that this fabric was used to wrap Scrolls, and that the Scrolls were also stored in jars.⁶⁸

The ceramics reveal that there was a direct connection between Cave 1, Khirbet Qumran, and the other caves adjacent to and near the site. The surveys of the surrounding 270 caves in 1952, and the discovery of between 20 and 40 artificial caves on the plateau surrounding site, reveal that many of these caves contain the same pottery as discovered

Eshel 2001: 65–78. Cf. Magness 2002: 73–104; Magness 2004: 1–15. Petrographic analysis of several vessels, including cylindrical jars and other ceramics from the caves and the settlement, indicate that most are made of Motza clay from the Jerusalem area. See Michniewicz/Krysko 2003, II: 59–99. Another test revealed five chemical groups among the Qumran pottery. Most were made of clay from two sources: Jerusalem and a non-Jerusalem source. A few matched pottery from Jericho. Gunneweg/Balla (2003: 3–53) sampled 41 vessels, including the “scroll jars” and one of the squatter jars from Cave 1 (QUM 198) that they term “bulging cylindrical type scroll jar,” in addition to two complete Scroll jars from the Shrine of the Book. The test shows that these came from Jericho. Gunneweg and Balla have determined that some pottery from Qumran was made there. They also found that the marl/clay deposit of Pool 71 (QUM371) was not used for making Qumran pottery, which refutes the conclusion of Magen and Peleg that the Qumran cisterns were designed to collect clay for manufacturing ceramics. They also conclude that because the local fingerprint of Qumran is not found in any pottery outside the Qumran settlement that there was no export of pottery elsewhere, and that the estimated 5000 ceramic vessels were meant for local use at the site. See Gunneweg/Balla 2010: 39–61.

⁶⁵ See further Magness 2002; Magness 2007b: 652–653; Magness 2011a: 62–64.

⁶⁶ Bar-Nathan 2006: 276–277.

⁶⁷ If the recent spectroscopic study of the Scrolls, particularly 1QHodayot^g is correct, this would provide evidence that many of these texts were written with ink that was produced in the vicinity of the Dead Sea. See further Rabin 2009: 97–106; Wolff 2012: 1493–1503.

⁶⁸ For the Scroll fragment, see Lankester Harding 1955: 7 and plate I, 8–10. The linen has been examined by Crowfoot 1955: 18–38; Béllis 2003: 207–276. Tov (2011: 11) notes that the Bedouin are the sole source of information that the Cave 1 Scrolls were found in jars, and that two of the jars in this cave contained three Scrolls, two of which were wrapped in cloth. The Temple Scroll was presumably inside a large cylindrical jar in Cave 11 which, like Cave 1, also contained linen Scroll wrappers. Cf. Crawford 2000: 12.

within Khirbet Qumran.⁶⁹ Not only are the same type of storage jars, namely “ovid” and “bag-shaped” also found both in the caves and the site of Khirbet Qumran, but the “wasters” of these ceramics at the site suggest that they were produced there.⁷⁰ Although ceramics from Khirbet Qumran appear at Jericho and elsewhere, the cylindrical jars do not occur with the same frequency as at Khirbet Qumran.⁷¹ Sidnie White Crawford argues that the presence of identical ceramics in Khirbet Qumran and the surrounding caves, and the presence of distinctively sectarian works in these caves such as the *Serek*, and the large number of texts produced by a single scribe found in several of these caves, tie the Scrolls from the eleven caves into a common collection or corpus. Because Cave 4 not only contains virtually every category of Scroll in the entire Qumran collection, but also covers the entire time range of the collection, it is difficult to argue that these texts – many of which espouse sectarian beliefs and favor the solar calendar – from the 11 caves are not connected.⁷² The findings from the caves, including ceramics and the Scrolls, cannot be divorced from the site of Khirbet Qumran, and should be viewed as part of its archaeological remains. The ceramics and the Scrolls suggest that some of this material emanated from other sites, which may support Josephus’s claim that Essenes communities existed throughout Judea.⁷³ But can we connect Josephus with Khirbet Qumran?

III. Josephus, the *Serek*, and Khirbet Qumran

Jodi Magness comments that Josephus’s testimony about the Essenes is important not only because he claimed to have had personal acquaintance with them, but because the evidence suggests that much of his description in his *BJ* focused on the community at Qumran.⁷⁴ A few parallels will bear this out and suggest that Josephus actually visited, or perhaps for a short time resided at, Qumran.

When it comes to the meeting rooms, archaeology and IQS closely match Josephus’s account of the Essenes, suggesting that he had personal knowledge of Khirbet Qumran. He writes that the Essenes during their meals wear linen cloths, bathe in cold water, assemble in special buildings that are only open to members, and eat out of individual dishes.⁷⁵ Khirbet Qumran contains a large dining room (L77) with an adjacent pantry (L86)

⁶⁹ For the 1952 survey, see De Vaux 1955: 6–13. In their examination of the artificial caves in the marl terrace, Broshi/Eshel (2004: 321–333) comment that many of these caves are within the 1000 cubit Sabbath limit, which further suggest they should be viewed as part of the archaeological site of Khirbet Qumran.

⁷⁰ Bar-Nathan 2006: 275.

⁷¹ Magness 2004: 158–160.

⁷² Crawford 2011: 38–39. Taylor (2012: 303–304 n. 113) comments that although the common scribal hand noted by Yardeni does not necessarily require that all the Scrolls were associated with a library or a single patron, their presence in multiple caves at Qumran indicates a remarkable link between the origin and the final resting place of these Scrolls.

⁷³ *BJ* 2.124.

⁷⁴ Magness 2002: 40. For additional evidence that Josephus was an Essene and was an eyewitness to the Essene community at Khirbet Qumran, with some observations on Josephus’s years spent with other Jewish sects and the possible identification of Bannus as a member of the Qumran community, see Lemaire 2002: 138–151.

⁷⁵ *BJ* 2.129–31.

that closely matches the rooms described by Josephus and 1QS.⁷⁶ As Magness notes, the northern cluster of animal bones (located in L130, L132, L135) points to the existence of another upstairs dining room located in the secondary building situated in the western sector (L111, L120, L121, L122, and L123) of the site. The great dining room (L77) was likely rebuilt and moved upstairs following the earthquake of 31 B.C.E.⁷⁷ This not only demonstrates that meeting rooms were important to Khirbet Qumran's inhabitants, but it suggests that the same community occupied the site before and after 31 B.C.E.

Josephus shows knowledge about dining in the Scrolls that was at variance with normative Jewish behavior in his day. He writes that the priests prepare the bread and food in special dining room, which he compares to a holy shrine (*BJ* 2.129–33). Only fully initiated, and therefore most holy, members are allowed to partake of these meals. Special care is taken to ensure that food, especially liquids, is protected from ritual uncleanliness. The meal includes bread and wine and is presided over by a priest. Members dine alike in this common meal while eating in silence. 1QS (5.13–14; 6.16–21) and 4QMMT (B64–65) restrict access to the pure food to full members of the sect. Josephus also mentions that the Essenes purify themselves before these meals. Because several of the largest *miqva'ot* at Qumran are by the entrances to the communal dining rooms, the parallels between Josephus, the Scrolls, and archaeology suggest that he had knowledge of the group and their dining and purity practices described in this scroll.⁷⁸

The discovery of hundreds of small plates, cups, and bowls in pantries attached to Qumran's communal dining rooms (L86 and L114) supports the accounts of communal Essene meals in Josephus and the Scrolls. The ceramics from the two pantries at Khirbet Qumran (Loci 89 and 114) reveal an absence of cooking pots, suggesting that food was prepared elsewhere and only served in these rooms. The vessels, moreover, consist almost entirely of dining dishes, such as plates, cups, and bowls. They are all uniformly stacked and 85% bear a white surface, suggesting that color was used to indicate their special use.⁷⁹ The uniformity of the dishes at Qumran indicates a heightened concern with purity, and shows that the inhabitants of this site did not eat out of common dishes like other Jews. This evidence suggests they believed that impurity could be transmitted through food and drink. Josephus describes the sectarian custom of eating out of

⁷⁶ L86 in de Vaux's Period Ib which he divided into L86, L87, and L89 in his Period II.

⁷⁷ The large pantry (L114) of this second dining room, which is similar to those found in the pantry (L86) adjacent to the great assembly hall (L77), as well as a staircase (L113) that turned 180 degrees, like the staircase in L13 of the main building, provided access above several loci (L111, 120, 121, 122, and 123) where the dining room was likely located. For this evidence, see further Magness 2002: 50–62, 105–133. For photographs of these loci, see Humbert/Chambon 1994: nos. 96–97, 210–210, 222–223. The objections of R.R. Cargill (2009: 122–123) to the existence of the upstairs dining room above L77 fails to recognize that the three pillars were added to the eastern end of the room in Period II, and not Period Ib. The leveling of the plaster floor in Period II so that it could no longer be washed, and the addition of a spiral staircase in Period II that rose above L48–49, also indicate that the ground floor was no longer used for meals during this period of the site's occupation. See Magness 2009: 43. For a dissenting view, which does not accept the existence of a staircase rising above L48–49 and that argues the pillars were actually room dividers, see further Wage-makers/Taylor (2011: 139–154).

⁷⁸ *Miqva'ot*: L56–58 by L77 and the pair in L117 & L118 by the dining room above L111, L120, L121, L122, and L123. Cf. Atkinson/Magness 2011: 329–333; Beall 1998: 57–64, 123–125.

⁷⁹ Pfann 2006: 162–164. See further the comments on the stacking of these bowls, and a refutation that they were intended for sale (as proposed by R. and P. Donceel-Voûtre, Y. Magen and Y. Peleg, and D. Stacey) in Magness (2007a: 251–253). See also Puech 2011: 84–85.

individual dishes, which accounts for the hundreds of bowls, cups, and plates in the pantries adjacent to the communal dining rooms at Qumran (L86 and L114). This practice of dining out of individual dishes was no longer practiced in Josephus's day, which is why he highlighted this rather unusual and archaic custom for his readers.⁸⁰ The only difference between the pantry in L 89 and L 114 is that the latter contains fewer vessels. The pantry in L 114 served a dining room that was apparently located in the secondary building above the adjacent loci (L111, 120–123), which was constructed following the 31 B.C.E. earthquake. The drop in the number of vessels may suggest that fewer people inhabited Khirbet Qumran during its latter occupational period: the time when Josephus wrote his accounts of the Essenes.⁸¹

The design of Khirbet Qumran, and the location of the buried animal bone deposits on the fringes of the settlement and outside the main buildings, suggests that its inhabitants viewed their settlement as a sacred space, likely a spiritual substitute for the temple.⁸² These bones were likely the remains of ritual meals since most of the pottery associated with them was broken, apparently in conformance with the biblical injunction regarding the *hattat* (individual sin offering).⁸³ Magness suggests that the absence of poultry bones from these animal bone deposits provides further evidence for the thesis that the Qumran sectarians regarded their settlement as a substitute temple. She suggests that the Qumran community, in light of the prohibitions of the Temple Scroll (11QT 46:1–4; 11Q21/11QT^c), banned poultry from the temple precincts. The Qumran sectarians, she suggests, conceived of their settlement along the lines of a sacred camp and viewed all meat as sacrificial, and perhaps as a substitute for the temple sacrifices. They excluded poultry from these meals possibly because these birds scavenged sacrificial remains. This prohibition was apparently not enforced in Jerusalem, where poultry bones from the Second Period have been discovered.⁸⁴

A recent discovery at Khirbet Qumran may not only support the thesis that the site's inhabitants regarded it as a spiritual temple, but also show that the community that resided there changed its beliefs and lifestyles by the first century C.E. Randall Price recently uncovered additional animal bone deposits on the marl terrace to the south of the settlement.⁸⁵ These discoveries differ from those found by de Vaux and in the excavations of

⁸⁰ See further Atkinson/Magness 2011: 332–333; Magness 2002: 116–117.

⁸¹ Cf. Pfann 2006: 164. The great dining hall (L77) was moved upstairs following the earthquake of 31 B.C.E. and, based on the small number of ceramics that were apparently associated with it (thrown into pool L58), I am assuming that this room too housed fewer people in Period II. The possibility that the area was cleaned in a later period cannot be excluded. For the evidence upon which this conclusion is based, and a discussion of this room, see further Magness 2002: 121–126.

⁸² Five hundred of the bones from 39 jars from de Vaux's excavation were studied. These bones belonged to adult sheep and goats, lambs or kids, calves, cows, and oxen. See Zeuner 1960: 28–30. For these bones and their locations, see Magness 2004: 92–104; Puech 2011: 83–84. The recent excavations of the site uncovered similar deposits belonging to the same species. See further Magen/Peleg 2006: 4–6; Magen/Peleg 2007: fig. 4, 42–44.

⁸³ Lev. 6:21. See further, Magness 2004: 98.

⁸⁴ Magness 2011a: 44–51; Magness 2011b: 349–362. Magness also notes a similar ban against raising poultry in Jerusalem in the Mishnah. (*m.B. Qam.* 7:7).

⁸⁵ Price (2005): http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report_detail_eng.asp?id=126&mag_id=110; Price (2004): <http://www.worldofthebible.com/Documents/SpecialOnlineReport.pdf>.

Magen and Peleg.⁸⁶ Price found deposits of animal bones buried inside pottery vessels, or with potsherds, and not laid on top of the ground or flush with it. They also contained high quantities of ash and charred bones, including a small percentage of gazelle and a few poultry bones (approximately 2000 bones were discovered).

The finding of gazelle bones is significant since the Hebrew Bible, although permitting the consumption of gazelle and deer, banned these animals from the sacrifices. This discovery is important for the light it possibly sheds on religious changes at Khirbet Qumran. The bones discovered by de Vaux surround the buildings at Qumran and mostly postdate the 31 B.C.E. earthquake. Magness notes that if Price's claim that the animal bone deposits that he found along, and under, the boundary wall marking the eastern boundary wall of the settlement date to the pre-31 B.C.E. phase of Period Ib is correct, this may suggest that the Qumran community did not consider their settlement analogous to Jerusalem or the sacred desert camp before the 31 B.C.E. earthquake.⁸⁷ Additional proof that the sectarians after 31 B.C.E. reorganized the settlement as a sacred camp possibly comes from their decision not to replace the toilet in L51 destroyed in the earthquake.⁸⁸ The location of this toilet in the eastern side of the main building with a doorway that opens into a room with a miqveh (L48–49) suggests that it was designed so that members could purify themselves after defecation. This further suggests that the settlement in Period II was reorganized along the lines of the Jerusalem temple, and members relieved themselves outside the settlement as noted by Josephus.⁸⁹

The location and design of Khirbet Qumran indicates that it was chosen with great care and was a sectarian settlement for its entire history, and that this site was connected with the Scrolls. It is situated atop a plateau surrounded by deep ravines on its western and southern sides, and is surrounded by a wall with only three entrances.⁹⁰ A second stone boundary wall, dubbed the "coastline wall," continues intermittently southwards for 500 meters from the Wadi Qumran to the springs of Ein Feshka, suggesting that it may have been connected with Khirbet Qumran.⁹¹ Qumran's walls enclose a large site

⁸⁶ De Vaux uncovered bone deposits that were charred, which he suggested were the remains of meals in which the meat had been boiled or roasted. See de Vaux 1973: 14.

⁸⁷ Magness 2011a: 48.

⁸⁸ Magness 2011a: 48–49, 130–144. For this toilet, see Humbert/Chambon 1994: 148–151. Magness notes that the caption to Photo 150 in this book erroneously labels the mud-lining of the pit as a "jarred receptacle." The terracotta pipe was likely constructed to flush waste into the cesspit.

⁸⁹ *BJ* 2.148. See further, Magness 2004: 65, 68, 111–112; 2011a: 135–136. A similar prohibition against defecation within the camp is found in the sectarian text 1QM 7.6–8. For the supposed discovery of toilet facilities outside the Qumran settlement, see Zias, Tabor, and Harter-Lailheugue 2006: 631–640. Magness (2005: 277–278) rejects this claim. Because the area has been used by Bedouin, and possibly by residents throughout the Byzantine period as well (for this likelihood, see Taylor 2012: 300–305), Magness's caution is justified.

⁹⁰ One entrance is by the small stepped pool in the north-east (L138) and the other just north (south of L141) of the two-story tower (L9–L11). The third entrance is by L84 near the potters' workshop through the eastern wall, which separates Khirbet Qumran from the cemetery. This wall joins a terrace wall at the edge of pool 71, which continues southwards from the site, nearly 140 meters, to the top of the cliff. This wall had been dated as early as the Iron Age to the time of the cemetery (commonly dated from 150 B.C.E. to 68 C.E.). It remained in use until the end of Period II (ca. 68 C.E.). See further Laperrousaz 1976: 26; Humbert 1994: 206–207, 211; Magness 1998: 58–65; Magness 2002: 49.

⁹¹ For photos and discussions of these walls, see de Vaux 1973: 59–60, 83–84; Branham 2006: 117–131; Humbert/Chambon 1994: 4–10, 15–18, 184, 232, 269. A recent survey noted modern disturbances in this area but failed to uncover any evidence of the wall that de Vaux observed running between Qumran

containing several rooms for communal meals, deposits of animal bones from meals in the open spaces, ritual baths, and a large number of vessels designed to hold special food and drink.⁹² Three scroll caves (7, 8 and 9), moreover, are actually within the confines of Khirbet Qumran.⁹³ If the wall extending to Ein Feshka and the cliff was considered part of Qumran's boundary and functioned as a sort of *eruv*, then this may suggest that the artificial marl caves 4, 5 and 10 should also be considered within the settlement.⁹⁴

In his accounts of the Essenes, Josephus provides additional evidence of Essene life that reflects the archaeological remains of Khirbet Qumran in the first century C.E. He describes several functions that likely took place in Qumran's dining rooms. He mentions that judicial decisions were rendered by a body of no less than a hundred members. This statement that parallels the court of the "many" described in 1QS.⁹⁵ In a passage that could have been taken directly from 1QS, Josephus writes that the Essenes: "make it their duty to obey their elders as well as the majority; for example, when ten men sit together no man speaks if the other nine oppose it."⁹⁶ Here, Josephus appears to reflect knowledge of the judicial procedures described in 1QS, in which the judicial body of priests and elders and a majority of the community, all of whom are seated together, make some decisions jointly.⁹⁷

Josephus's accounts of the Essenes closely match the archaeological evidence of Khirbet Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls. This is especially true regarding his knowledge of such insider functions as meals and judicial procedures. The archaeological evidence suggests that the same community occupied the site after 31 B.C.E. Dining rooms existed both before and after the 31 B.C.E. earthquake, although the dishes from the latter period may indicate that the site's population had decreased in its final occupational phase. Nevertheless, the people at Khirbet Qumran continued to read and copy the *Serek* before and after 31 B.C.E. Meals were held at Khirbet Qumran during its major periods of sectarian occupation (Period 1B–II), and Josephus describes such meals in his day, during the first century C.E. (Period II).

The rebuilding of the dining rooms furnishes strong evidence that Khirbet Qumran was inhabited by the same group during all of its main phases (de Vaux's Periods I

and Ein Feshka. See Gibson/Taylor 2008: 225–227. Archaeological evidence indicates that Jews inhabited both Ein Feshkha and Ein el-Ghuweir, but that there is no clear evidence that their populations were related to the Khirbet Qumran sectarians. The ceramic evidence suggests that Ein Feshkha was established after the 31 B.C.E. earthquake, which would mean that if it was associated with Khirbet Qumran it became a sectarian site only around 9/8 B.C.E., likely at the end of Khirbet Qumran's Period Ib (ca. 9/8 C.E.). See Magness 2004: 58–61; Magness 2002: 50–51, 148, 220–223; de Vaux 1973: 6.

⁹² For extensive discussions of this archaeological evidence, see further Branham 2006: 125–131; Magness 2002: 105–133.

⁹³ Atkinson/Magness 2011a: 325; Crawford 2011: 36–38; Taylor 2007: 180. Broshi and Eshel (1999: 334) note that de Vaux found, in addition to five manuscripts, some 100 leather strips in Cave 8, which likely served as fasteners for scrolls. They suggest that this cave was a leather workshop. Several of these authors note that we should not expect to find scrolls within the rooms at Qumran since it was destroyed at least twice (ca. 9/8 B.C.E. and 68 C.E.) by fire.

⁹⁴ Broshi and Eshel, (1993: 334) note that three artificial caves inside Khirbet Qumran (Caves 7–9) and the five on the ridge to its west (Caves 4a, 4b, 5, the oval cave west of 5, and Cave 10) lie within the Sabbath limit according to CD 10:20–21. Caves 1–3 and 11 are outside this limit.

⁹⁵ *BJ* 2.145; 1QS 6:1, 8–23; 8:19–9:2.

⁹⁶ 1QS 5:2–3, 9; *War*, 2.145. Translation from Vermes/Goodman 1989: 45.

⁹⁷ 1QS 6:8–9. See further Beall 1998: 95.

and II), and that many of the buildings retained their same functions. Eyal Regev's spatial layout of Khirbet Qumran demonstrates that the site is divided into a few major sections that are accessed through a single entrance, most of which are internally divided into several different groupings of minimally connected spaces. This design, in which no major quarter leads to a marginal section as in sites like Hilkiya's Palace (Khirbet e-Muraq), Horvat 'Eleq (Ramat Hanadiv), Rujum el-Hamiri, and Qasr e-Leja, provide evidence of a highly structured complex typical of a sect. These spaces show evidence of the hierarchy reflected the Scrolls and Josephus: the site is designed to restrict access to different spheres.⁹⁸ Each of Khirbet Qumran's major divisions contains only a small number of large rooms (Loci 1, 2, 4, 30, 77, 1111, and 121), which provides further evidence of a plan designed to restrict movement and control access to certain rooms and portions of the site. The presence of two large dining rooms raises the intriguing possibility that these meeting halls, located in the western (above the secondary building comprising L111, L120, L121, L122, and L123) and the eastern (L77) portions of the site, were each restricted to particular members of the community (perhaps novices in the western sector). These, and other distinctive features of the site that match the communal, yet hierarchical society, described in IQS and other Dead Sea Scrolls and provide strong evidence that Khirbet Qumran was an Essene settlement known to Josephus.

IV. Conclusion

Although Essene groups resided throughout Judea, IQS describes a form of communal living that is best practiced in isolation, and which required distinctive living quarters, meal halls, and an avoidance of daily contact with outsiders. It is a unique text discovered in a unique site that matches Josephus's descriptions of the Essenes, suggesting that his knowledge of this group was not derived from sources, but from first-hand contact with the people of Khirbet Qumran.⁹⁹

The complexity of the various editions of the *Serek* and the *Damascus Document* make it unlikely that there was ever a single "Qumran community" that was responsible for producing all the Scrolls. The dates of the *Serek* and other Scrolls make it problematic

⁹⁸ Regev (2009: 85–99) divides Khirbet Qumran into the following major quarters, all of which are accessed through L128/99: the eastern "main building" (beginning in L12), the section south and east of the main building in L3 (containing rituals baths and workshops), and the western section beginning with L125 (with adjacent spaces L101/102), and a smaller northern section beginning with L133. Regev also comments on the separation of spaces at Khirbet Qumran: "apart from the kilns and potter's wheels placed in Loci 64–66 at the borders of the site, there is no apparent reason for this separation. The spaces appearing at the bottom of the graph (Loci 12, 3, 125, and 133) 'control' access to other spaces. Access to most spaces is limited, and several boundaries must be crossed to reach most spaces from any starting point on the site."

⁹⁹ As proposed by Beall (1998: 86) long before the release of the complete Dead Sea Scrolls and much of the archaeological evidence. Although it is theoretically possible that Josephus learned this information orally from an Essene, or conceivably gotten his hands on an Essene rule book, the extensive parallels between Josephus's accounts, the Scrolls, and the archaeology of Khirbet Qumran argue in favor of the thesis that he relied on his personal knowledge of Khirbet Qumran when writing his books. Taylor (2010: 193) comments on this issue: "In summary, the hierarchy, rules, pure meal, purity regulations, communality, and sharing of possessions found in the *Serekh* documents are highly comparable to features described in the classical sources on the Essenes."

to relate all of them with the archaeological remains of Khirbet Qumran as many predate the sectarian settlement there. Although neither Josephus nor Philo mention Qumran, or any other sectarian community living in the desert along the Dead Sea Scrolls, the other classical witnesses suggest a reason for their reticence about this particular Essene community. Both these Jewish writers living in the Roman period likely wanted to avoid mentioning religious extremists (zealots) while pagan writers such as Pliny and Dio focused on the more sensational elements of certain Jewish sects.¹⁰⁰ Qumran appears to have been an extremist form of the Essene movement by Josephus's day that was highly exclusivist and likely regarded as somewhat intolerant of other Jews. This description matches the classical sources, which suggest that membership was voluntary and that the group lived apart. The Essene settlement at Qumran represents a later stage of the earlier Essene movement reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Boccaccini comments on the differences between the Jewish and the pagan sources:

...all the elements recorded by non-Jewish authors about the community of the Dead Sea have parallels in the narratives of Jewish authors with regard to the Essene communities in Palestine. The difference always lies in a higher degree of intensity with which the community of the Dead Sea lived those common elements: separation that turned into isolation, sharing of goods that turned into abolition of private property, rejection of marital life that turned into abandoning family ties.¹⁰¹

The descriptions of the classical authors closely match the archaeological remains of Khirbet Qumran, suggesting that it was an Essene community in the first century C.E. The multiple versions of the *Serek*, moreover, reveal that there is no simple direction of textual evolution that accounts for their differences. Rather than earlier versions being combined to form 1QS, it appears that different communities of Essenes produced slightly different versions of the *Serek* that, despite their differences, reveal overwhelming similarities in religious thought and practice.¹⁰² The presence of different versions of the *Serek* at Qumran further suggests that these disparate Essene communities, which Josephus attests were widely scattered throughout Judea, had some connection with the community of Qumran.

Unless there is some other as yet undiscovered site similar to Qumran, it appears to have been a settlement that was unique even among the Essenes. Josephus's extensive knowledge of the Essenes, and the parallels between his accounts and the archaeological evidence of Qumran, suggests that he was not only an Essene, but that he knew the Essenes of Khirbet Qumran. Although he was likely not a full-member of this particular Essene community, it is conceivable that he spent some time there for religious instruction, or possibly during his tutelage with Bannus, whose purification regime is reminiscent of both Khirbet Qumran's extensive network of baths and the purification rituals described in the scrolls.¹⁰³ When Josephus wrote his accounts of the Essenes following

¹⁰⁰ See Boccaccini 2005: 305–306. In light of the events of the First Jewish Revolt, it is likely that Josephus also omitted the strong messianic and apocalyptic tendencies of the Essenes that are widely reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

¹⁰¹ Boccaccini 1998: 48.

¹⁰² See further, Schofield 2009: 273–280.

¹⁰³ *Life*, 11. It is possible that membership rules were relaxed in a later phase of Khirbet Qumran's history, and that the group there did not follow a strict interpretation of 1QS. The elusive identity of Bannus

the Jewish Revolt, the Essene movement was no longer a viable sectarian option. With no reason to adhere to his oath, Josephus was presumably free to reveal many secrets of this sect that were completely unknown to us until the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Josephus's knowledge of the Essenes is unparalleled by any other classical writer. This should not be surprising, since he alone makes the claim that he was for a short time an Essene.¹⁰⁴ Given the parallels examined in this study, we should not only accept Josephus's claim that he was for a brief time in his life an Essene, but recognize that he spent some time at Qumran as well. When examining his time with this community, however, we must consider that the Essenes of Josephus's day, although related to the groups described in the Dead Seas Scrolls, had undergone a profound theological change and no longer produced written texts, but the leaders of the sect restricted their activity to oral interpretations. We must assume that some rules and procedures of the Essenes as reflected in the Scrolls had changed by Josephus's time, which accounts for some of the apparent discrepancies between his accounts and the Qumran texts.¹⁰⁵

If we look at the date of 1QS and the Qumran settlement we find a remarkable parallel. 1QS, dated to approximately 100–75 B.C.E., was likely produced shortly after the founding of Khirbet Qumran.¹⁰⁶ Given the similarities between the lifestyle described in this text and the physical structure of Khirbet Qumran, it is very likely that the settlement was constructed, and expanded over time, so as to practice the lifestyle described in this particular version of the *Serek* or a related version. Given that Khirbet Qumran is the only settlement of its kind, it was likely constructed as sort of retreat center for those Essenes seeking to devote themselves to a life of perfect holiness. Josephus, if he spent time much there, at most would have been a novice, and have been identified as such by his small shovel, loincloth, and white garment. His personal knowledge of the Qumran community explains his extensive descriptions of a rather unique community of Essenes, which are not solely dependent on sources. If Josephus claims to have been an Essene, then who are we some two thousand years later to refute his statement! Josephus the Essene was likely, at least for a short time in his life, not only an Essene, but a Khirbet Qumran Essene as well. With the exception of the Dead Sea Scrolls, he is our best source for understanding the Essenes of Khirbet Qumran. Because most of the Dead Sea Scrolls date to the first century B.C.E., Josephus is the major eyewitness to life at Khirbet Qumran during Period II (401 B.C.E. to 68 C.E.) until its destruction.

and his association, if any, with the Qumran community or the wider *Yahad*, is beyond the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, during his sojourn with Bannus, Josephus would have had ample opportunity to interact with Essenes and likely visit Khirbet Qumran. For Bannus, see further Lemaire 2002: 144–148.

¹⁰⁴ *Life*, 10. For an opposing view, see the detailed commentary by Mason with Chapman 2008: 84–131. Mason (p. 129–130) rejects the existence of married Essenes and argues that Josephus in *BJ* 2.160 invented their existence.

¹⁰⁵ On this, see further Atkinson/Magness 2010: 340; Beall 1998: 127.

¹⁰⁶ Magness offers a new chronology of Khirbet Qumran that divides de Vaux's Period Ib into two periods: a pre-31 B.C.E. phase (100–50 B.C.E. to 31 B.C.E.) and a post-31 B.C.E. phase (31 B.C.E. to approximately 9/8 B.C.E. or sometime thereafter [4 B.C.E.?). She attributes the majority, if not all, of the architectural remains from de Vaux's Period Ia to her pre-31 B.C.E. phase of Period Ib. De Vaux's Period Ib, therefore, includes both pre-31 B.C.E. and post-31 B.C.E. remains. According to her chronology, Qumran was abandoned for a short time around 9/8 B.C.E. or shortly thereafter and reoccupied early in the reign of Herod Archelaus in 4 B.C.E. This settlement lasted until 68 C.E. See further Magness 2002: 47–69; Magness 2009: 42–43.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, P.S. (1996): The Redaction-History of *Serek ha-Yahad*: A Proposal, *Revue de Qumran* 17: 437–56.
- Alexander, P.S., Vermes, G. (1998): *Qumran Cave 4.XIX: Serekh ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts*, Oxford.
- Argall, R.A. (2000): A Hellenistic Jewish Source on the Essenes in Philo, Every Good Man Is Free 75–91 and Josephus, Antiquities 18.18–22, in: R.A. Argall, et al. (eds.), *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism and Early Christianity*, Harrisburg, PA: 13–24.
- Atkinson, K. (2007): Representations of History in 4Q331 (4Qpap Historical Text C), 4Q332 (4Q Historical Text D), 4Q333 (4Q Historical Text E), and 4Q468e (4Q Historical Text F): An Annalistic Calendar Documenting Portentous Events?, *Dead Sea Discoveries* 14: 125–151.
- Atkinson, K., Magness, J. (2011): Josephus's Essenes and the Qumran Community, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 129: 317–342.
- Bar-Nathan, R. (2006): Qumran and the Hasmonaean and Herodian Winter Palaces of Jericho: The Implication of the Pottery Finds on the Interpretation of the Settlement at Qumran, in: K. Galor, et al. (eds.), *Qumran: The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates, Proceedings of a Conference Held at Brown University, November 17–19, 2002*, Leiden: 263–277.
- Barthélemy, D., Milik, J.T. (1955): *Qumran Cave I*, Oxford.
- Bauer, B. (1924): Essener, in: G. Wissowa and W. Kroll (eds.), *Paulys Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft: Supplementband IV*, Stuttgart: 386–340.
- Baumgarten, A.I. (1997): He Knew that He Knew that He Knew that He was an Essene, *Journal of Jewish Studies* 48: 53–61.
- Beall, T.S. (1998): *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Cambridge.
- Béllis, M. (2003): Des textiles, catalogues et commentaires, in: J.-B. Humbert and J. Gunneweg (eds.), *Khirbet Qumrán et 'Ain Feshka*, Vol. 2: *Études d'anthropologie, de physique et de chimie*, Göttingen: 207–276.
- Berg, S.A. (2007): An Elite Group Within the *Yahad*: Revisiting IQS 8-9, in: M.T. Davis, B.A. Strawn (eds.), *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Question*, Grand Rapids, MI: 161–177.
- Bergmeier, R. (1993): *Die Essener-Berichte des Flavius Josephus: Quellenstudien zu den Essenertexten im Werk des jüdischen Historiographen*, Kampen.
- Bergmeier, R. (2003): Die drei jüdischen Schulrichtungen nach Josephus und Hippolyt von Rom, *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 34: 443–470.
- Bilde, P. (1998): The Essenes in Philo and Josephus, in: F.H. Cryer, T.L. Thompson (eds.), *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments*, Sheffield: 64–65.
- Black, M. (1956): The Account of the Essenes in Hippolytus and Josephus, in: W.D. Davies, D. Daube (eds.), *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, Cambridge: 172–182.
- Boccaccini, G. (1998): *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Boccaccini, G. (2005): Qumran: The Headquarters of the Essenes or a Marginal Splinter Group?, in: G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, Grand Rapids, MI: 305–306.
- Branham, J. (2006): Hedging the Holy at Qumran: Walls as Symbolic Devices, in: K. Galor, et al. (eds.), *Qumran: The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates, Proceedings of a Conference Held at Brown University, November 17–19, 2002*, Leiden: 117–131.
- Broshi, M., Eshel, H. (1999): Residential Caves at Qumran, *Dead Sea Discoveries* 6: 328–348.
- Broshi, M., Eshel, H. (2004): Three Seasons of Excavations of Qumran, *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 17: 321–333.

- Burchard, C. (1974): Zur Nebenüberlieferung von Josephus Bericht über die Essener, *Bell.* 2, 119–161 bei Hippolyt, Porphyrius, Eusebius, Niketas Choniates und anderen, in: O. Betz, *et al.* (eds.), *Josephus Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Festschrift für Otto Michel*, Göttingen: 77–96.
- Burchard, C. (1977): Die Essener bei Hippolyt, REF. IX 18, 2–28, 2 und Josephus, *Bell.* 2, 119–161, *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 8: 1–41.
- Cargill, R.R. (2009): *Qumran Through Real Time: A Virtual Reconstruction of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Piscataway, NJ.
- Charlesworth, J.H. (ed.) (1994): *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, vol. 1: *Rule of the Community and Related Documents*, Louisville.
- Collins, J.J. (2000): Powers in Heaven: God, Gods, and Angels in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in: J.J. Collins, R.A. Kugler (eds.), *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Grand Rapids: 9–28.
- Collins, J.J. (2009a): Beyond the Qumran Community: Social Organization in the Dead Sea Scrolls, *Dead Sea Discoveries* 16: 351–369.
- Collins, J.J. (2009b): Josephus on the Essenes: The Sources of His Information, in: Z. Rodgers, *et al.* (eds.), *A Wandering Galilean: Essays in Honour of Seán Freyne*, Leiden: 51–72.
- Collins, J.J. (2010): *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Crawford, S.W. (2000): *The Temple Scroll and Related Texts*, Sheffield.
- Crawford, S.W. (2011): A View from the Caves: Who Put the Scrolls in There?, *Biblical Archaeology Review* 37: 30–39, 69.
- Crowfoot, G.M. (1955): The Linen Textiles, in: D. Barthélemy, J.T. Milik (eds.), *Qumran Cave I*, Oxford: 18–38.
- Davies, P.R. (1987): *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the Damascus Document*, Sheffield.
- Davies, P.R. (1991): Communities at Qumran and the Case of the Missing Teacher, *Revue de Qumran* 15: 57–58.
- de Vaux, R. (1953): Fouille au Khirbet Qumrân. Rapport préliminaire, *Revue Biblique* 60: 83–106.
- de Vaux, R. (1954): Fouilles au Khirbet Qumrân. Rapport préliminaire, sur la deuxième campagne, *Revue Biblique* 61: 206–236.
- de Vaux, R. (1955): La Poterie, in: D. Barthélemy, J.T. Milik (eds.), *Qumran Cave I*, Oxford: 3–36.
- de Vaux, R. (1956): Fouilles au Khirbet Qumrân. Rapport préliminaire, sur les 3e, 4e, et 5e campagnes, *Revue Biblique* 63: 533–577.
- de Vaux, R. (1973): *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, London.
- Elgvin, T. (2005): The *Yahad* is More Than Qumran, in: G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, Grand Rapids, MI: 273–279.
- Eshel, H. (2008): *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State*, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Fields, W. (2009): *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Full History*, Vol. 1: 1947–1960, Leiden.
- Frey, J. (2003): Zur historischen Auswertung der antiken Essenerberichte: Ein Beitrag zum Gespräch mit Roland Bergmeier, in: J. Frey, H. Stegemann (eds.), *Qumran Kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer*, Paderborn: 23–57.
- Gagnon, R.A.J. (1992): How Did the Rule of the Community Obtain its Final Shape?: A Review of Scholarly Research, *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 19: 61–72.
- García-Martínez, F. (2010): Reconsidering the Cave 1 Texts Sixty Years After Their Discovery: An Overview, in: D.K. Falk, *et al.* (ed.), *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery*, Leiden: 1–13.
- García-Martínez, F., Tigchelaar, E.J.C., van der Woude, A.S. (1997), *Qumran Cave 11.II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31*, Oxford: 33–34.
- García-Martínez, F., Tigchelaar, E.J.C. (eds.) (1997–1998), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2 vols., Leiden.
- Garnet, P. (1997): Cave 4 MS Parallels to 1QS 5.1–7: Towards a *Serek* Text History, *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 15: 67–78.

- Gibson, S., Taylor, J.E. (2008): Roads and Passes Around Qumran, *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 140: 225–227.
- Goranson, S. (1994): Posidonius, Strabo, and Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa as Sources on Essenes, *Journal of Jewish Studies* 45: 295–298.
- Gunneweg, J., Balla, M. (2003): Neutron Activation Analysis, Scroll Jars and Common Ware, in: J.-B. Humbert, J. Gunneweg (eds.), *Khirbet Qumrân et 'Ain Feshka*, vol. 2: *Études d'anthropologie, de physique et de chimie*, Göttingen: 3–53.
- Gunneweg, J., Balla, M. (2010): Was the Qumran Settlement a Mere Pottery Production Center? What Instrumental Neutron Activation Revealed, in: J. Gunneweg (ed.), *Holistic Qumran: Trans-Disciplinary Research of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Leiden: 9–61.
- Hempel, C. (1996): The Earthly Essene Nucleus of 1QSa, *Dead Sea Discoveries* 3: 253–369.
- Hempel, C. (1997): Community Structures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Admission, Organization, Disciplinary Procedures, in: M.J. Bernstein, et al. (eds.), *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995*, Leiden: 67–92.
- Hempel, C. (1998): *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Traditions, and Redaction*, Leiden.
- Hempel, C. (2003): Interpretative Authority in the Community Rule Tradition, *Dead Sea Discoveries* 10: 59–80.
- Hempel, C. (2009): CD Manuscript B and the Community Rule, *Dead Sea Discoveries* 16: 376–387.
- Hempel, C. (2010): Sources and Redaction in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Growth of Ancient Texts, in: M.L. Grossman (ed.), *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods*, Grand Rapids: 162–181.
- Hempel, C. (2011): Satellites or Precursors of the *Yahad*?, in: A.D. Roitman, et al. (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)*, Leiden: 31–40.
- Hölscher, G. (1916): Josephus, in: G.W. August Friedrich, et al. (eds.), *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. 9, München: 193–2000.
- Holtz, G. (2009): Inclusivism at Qumran, *Dead Sea Discoveries* 16: 22–54.
- Hultgren, S. (2007): *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Leiden.
- Humbert, J.-B. (1994): L'espace sacré à Qumrân: Propositions pour l'archéologie, *Revue Biblique* 101: 161–214.
- Humbert, J.-B., Chambon, A. (1994): *Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân et de 'Ain Feshkha I*, Fribourg.
- Kapfer, H.E. (2007): The Relationship between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule: Attitudes Toward the Temple as a Test Case, *Dead Sea Discoveries* 14: 159–162.
- Knibb, M. (1987): *The Qumran Community*, Cambridge.
- Knibb, M. (1994): The Place of the Damascus Document, in: M.O. Wise, et al. (eds.), *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site*, New York: 153–160.
- Kugler, A. (1996): A Note on 1QS 9:14: The Sons of Righteousness or the Sons of Zadok, *Dead Sea Discoveries* 3: 315–320.
- Lange, A., Mittmann-Richert, U. (2002): Annotated List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert Classified by Content and Genre, in: E. Tov (ed.), *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series*, Oxford: 115–164.
- Lankester Harding, G. (1955): Introductory, the Discovery, the Excavation, Minor Finds, in: D. Barthélemy, J.T. Milik (eds.), *Qumran Cave I*, Oxford: 3–7.
- Laperrousaz, E.-M. (1976): *Qoumrân: L'établissement essénien des bords de la Mer Morte: histoire et archéologie du site*, Paris.
- Lapin, H. (2010): Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historiography of Ancient Judaism, in: M.L. Grossman (ed.), *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods*, Grand Rapids, MI: 108–127.

- Lawrence, J.D. (2006): *Washing in Water: Trajectories of Ritual Bathing in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*, Atlanta.
- Leaney, A.R.C. (1996): *The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning: Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Philadelphia.
- Lemaire, A. (2002): L'expérience essénienne de Flavius Josèphe, in: F. Siegert, J.U. Kalms (eds.), *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Paris 2001: Études sur les Antiquités*, Münster: 138–151.
- Lucas, A.J. (2010): Scripture Citations as an Internal Redactional Control: 1QS 5:1–20a and its 4Q Parallels, *Dead Sea Discoveries* 17: 30–52.
- Magen, Y., Peleg, Y. (2006): *The Qumran Excavations 1993–2004: Preliminary Report*, Jerusalem.
- Magen, Y., Peleg, Y. (2007): Back to Qumran: Ten Years of Excavation and Research, 1993–2004, in: K. Galor, et al. (eds.), *Qumran: The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates, Proceedings of a Conference Held at Brown University, November 17–19, 2002*, Leiden: 55–113.
- Magness, J. (1995): The Chronology of the Settlement at Qumran in the Herodian Period, *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2: 58–65.
- Magness, J. (1998): The Chronology of Qumran, Ein Feshkha, and Ein El-Ghuweir, in: Z.J. Kapera (ed.), *Mogilany 1995: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Aleksy Klawek*, Kraków: 55–76.
- Magness, J. (2002): *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Magness, J. (2004): *Debating Qumran: Collected Essays on Its Archaeology*, Leuven.
- Magness, J. (2005): Toilet Practices at Qumran: A Response, *Revue de Qumran* 86: 277–278.
- Magness, J. (2007a): A Response to D. Stacey: Some Archaeological Observations on the Aqueducts of Qumran, *Dead Sea Discoveries* 14: 244–253.
- Magness, J. (2007b): Qumran: The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Review Article, *Revue de Qumran* 88: 652–653.
- Magness, J. (2009): The Qumran Digital Model: A Response, *Near Eastern Archaeology* 72: 42–45.
- Magness, J. (2011a): *Stone and Dung, Oil and Spit: Jewish Daily Life in the Time of Jesus*, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Magness, J. (2011b): Dogs and Chickens at Qumran, in: A.D. Roitman, et al. (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)*, Leiden: 349–362.
- Mason, S. with H. Chapman (2008): *Flavius Josephus Translation and Commentary*, vol. 1B: *Judean War 2*, Leiden: 84–131.
- Metso, S. (1997): *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*, Leiden.
- Metso, S. (2004): Methodological Problems in Reconstructing History from Rule Texts Found at Qumran, *Dead Sea Discoveries* 11: 315–335.
- Metso, S. (2007): *The Serekh Texts*, London.
- Metso, S. (2008): Whom Does the Term *Yahad* Identify?, in: F. García Martínez, M. Popović (eds.), *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS Groningen*, Leiden: 63–84.
- Michniewicz, J., Krysko, M. (2003): The Provenance of Scroll Jars in the Light of Archaeometric Investigations, in: J.-B. Humbert, J. Gunneweg (eds.), *Khirbet Qumrân et 'Ain Feshkha*, vol. 2: *Études d'anthropologie, de physique et de chimie*, Göttingen: 59–99.
- Milik, J.T. (1962): Une règle de la secte, in: M. Baillet, et al. (eds.), *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân*, Oxford: 181.
- Murphy, C.M. (2002): *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community*, Leiden.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. (1972): A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document XIX, 33–XX, 34, *Revue Biblique* 79: 544–555.
- Newsom, C.A. (2004): *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*, Leiden.
- Pfann, S.J. (2006): A Table in the Wilderness: Pantries and Tables, Pure Food and Sacred Space at Qumran, in: K. Galor, et al. (eds.), *Qumran: The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological*

- Interpretations and Debates, Proceedings of a Conference Held at Brown University, November 17–19, 2002*, Leiden: 159–178.
- Pfann, S.J. (2007a): Reassessing the Judean Desert Caves: Libraries, Archives, *Genizas* and Hiding Places, *Bulletin of the Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society* 25: 147–170.
- Pfann, S.J. (2007b): Sites in the Judean Desert Where Texts Have Been Found, in: E. Tov (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: Companion Volume*, Leiden: 109–119.
- Pfann, S.J. (2011): Appendix: Period IA and the *Terminus A Quo* of De Vaux's Period IB, Essene Occupation, in: D. Roitman, et al. (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)*, Leiden: 703–718.
- Price, R. (2004): New Discoveries at Qumran, *World of the Bible News & Views* 6: <http://www.world-ofthebible.com/Documents/SpecialOnlineReport.pdf>.
- Price, R. (2005): Qumran Plateau, in: *Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 117: http://www.hadashot-esi.org.il/report_detail_eng.asp?id=126&mag_id=110.
- Puech, É. (2011): Khirbet Qumrân et les Esséniens, *Revue de Qumran* 25: 63–102.
- Rabin, I., Hahn, O., Wolff, T., Masic, A., Weinberg, G. (2009): On the Origin of the Ink of the Thanksgiving Scroll (1QHodayot^a), *Dead Sea Discoveries* 16: 97–106.
- Rajak, T. (2002): *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome. Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction*, Leiden.
- Reed, S.A. (2007): Find-Sites of the Dead Sea Scrolls, *Dead Sea Discoveries* 14: 199–221.
- Regev, E. (2003): The 'Yaḥad' and the 'Damascus Covenant': Structure, Organization, and Relationship, *Revue de Qumran* 21: 233–262.
- Regev, E. (2007): *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*, Berlin.
- Regev, E. (2009): Access Analysis of Khirbet Qumran: Reading Spatial Organization and Social Boundaries, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 355: 85–99.
- Schofield, A. (2009): *From Qumran to the Yaḥad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for the Community Rule*, Leiden.
- Sievers, J. (2001): Josephus, First Maccabees, Sparta, The Three *Haireseis* – and Cicero, *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 32: 241–251.
- Smith, M. (1958): The Description of the Essenes in Josephus and the Philosophumena, *Hebrew Union College Annual* 29: 273–313.
- Smith, M. (1982): Helios in Palestine, *Eretz Israel* 16: 199*–214*.
- Stökl Ben Ezra, D. (2007): Old Caves and Young Caves: A Statistical Reevaluation of a Qumran Consensus, *Dead Sea Discoveries* 14: 313–333.
- Sukenik, E.L. (1948): *Megillot Genuzot*, Jerusalem (Hebrew).
- Taylor, J.E. (2007): Review Article Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence, *Bulletin of the Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society* 25: 180.
- Taylor, J.E. (2010): The Classical Sources on the Essenes and the Scrolls Communities, in: T.H. Lim, J.J. Collins (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Oxford: 173–99.
- Taylor, J.E. (2012): Buried Manuscripts and Empty Tombs: The Qumran *Genizah* Theory Revisited, in: A.M. Maier, et al. (eds.), "Go Out and Study the Land" (*Judges 18:2*): *Archaeological, Historical and Textual Studies in Honor of Hanan Eshel*, Leiden: 269–315.
- Thackeray, H.St.J. (trans.) (1927): *Josephus II: The Jewish War Books I-III*, Cambridge, MA.
- Tigchelaar, E.J.C. (2000): A Newly Identified 11Q Serekh ha-Yaḥad Fragment (11Q29)?, in: L.H. Schiffman, et al. (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*, Jerusalem: 285–292.
- Tigchelaar, E.J.C. (2003): In Search of the Scribe of 1QS, in: S.M. Paul, et al. (eds.), *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, Leiden: 439–452.
- Tov, E. (1999): Correction Procedures in the Texts from the Judaean Desert, in: D.W. Parry, E. Ulrich (eds.), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, Leiden: 232–263.

- Tov, E. (2011): Some Thoughts at the Close of the *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* Publications, in: A.D. Roitman, et al. (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)*, Leiden: 3–13.
- Trever, J.C. (1965): *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Personal Account*, Westwood, NJ.
- VanderKam, J.C. (2009): The Oath and the Community, *Dead Sea Discoveries* 16: 416–432.
- Vermes, G., Goodman, M. (eds.) (1989): *The Essenes According to the Classical Sources*, Sheffield.
- Wagemakers, B., Taylor, J.E. (2011): New Photographs of the Qumran Excavations from 1954, and Interpretations of L.77 and L.86, *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 143: 134–156.
- Webster, B. (2002): Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judaean Desert, in: E. Tov et al. (eds.), *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series*, Oxford: 351–446.
- Wise, M.O. (2003): Dating the Teacher of Righteousness and the *Flourit* of His Movement, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122: 53–87.
- Wolff, T., Rabin, I., Mantouvalou, I., Kanngiesser, B., Malzer, W., Kindzorra, E., Hahn, O. (2012): Provenance Studies on Dead Sea Scrolls Parchment by Means of Quantitative Micro-XRF, *Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry* 402: 1493–1503.
- Yardeni, A. (2007): A Note on A Qumran Scribe, in: M. Lubetski (ed.), *New Seals and Inscriptions, Hebrew, Idumean, and Cuneiform*, Sheffield: 287–298.
- Yellin, J., Broshi, M., Eshel, H. (2001): Pottery of Qumran and Ein Ghuweir: The First Chemical Exploration of Provenience, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 321: 65–78.
- Zeuner, F.E. (1960): Notes on Qumrân, *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 92: 28–30.
- Zias, J.E., Tabor, J.D., Harter-Lailheugue, S. (2006): Toilets at Qumran, The Essenes, and the Scrolls: New Anthropological Data and Old Theories, *Revue de Qumran* 88: 631–640.