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ARE THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS FROM KHIRBET QUMRAN?¹

The Dead Sea Scrolls continue to remain the subject of an intense academic debate concerning their interpretation, their authors, and whether there is a connection between the caves in which these documents were discovered and the archaeological site of Khirbet Qumran. The answers to these questions are important because of the unprecedented number of fragmentary documents in this collection and their diverse contents.² Because Roland de Vaux found the same types of pottery in

¹ It is an honor to be included in this special issue of the *Qumran Chronicle* dedicated to Professor Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, whose pioneering work on the Dead Sea Scrolls helped create an entirely new field of humanistic inquiry. As the last of the “giants” of the Scrollery Team, the work he and his group accomplished has stood the test of time and continues to inform us today. For a positive assessment of the achievements of the Scrollery Team, see further Kenneth Atkinson, “The Changing Views of the Hasmoneans in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Examining Seventy Years of Research,” in *Sacred Texts and Disparate Interpretations Qumran Manuscripts Seventy Years Later*, Henryk Drawnel, ed. (Leiden: Brill, 2020), 93-111.

² Because most of the Dead Sea Scrolls are fragments, and some of the reconstructed documents in the official *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* series undoubtedly include fragments that belong to other unknown works, it is impossible to offer an exact number of writings found in the caves. The best estimates are between 550 to 931 manuscripts. See further Sidnie White Crawford, *Scribes and Scrolls at Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2019), 132; Hanan Eshel, “The Fate of the Scrolls and Fragments: A Survey from 1946 to the Present,” in *Gleanings from the Caves*, Torleif Elgvin, ed. (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016), 35; Emmanuel Tov, “The *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* Series: History and System of Presentation,” in *The Texts from The Judaean Desert: Indices and An Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series*, Emmanuel Tov, et al. eds. (Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 27-114; ibid., *Revised Lists of the Texts from the Judaean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), esp. 1-4. For recent additions to the collection, see Eibert Tigchelaar, “A Provisional List of Unprovenanced, Twenty-First
the Scroll caves that he uncovered inside Khirbet Qumran, most scholars view the Scrolls as archaeological objects that are associated with this settlement.3 Khirbet Qumran’s architectural design, moreover, provides additional evidence that the Scrolls and this site are connected. Scroll Caves 7, 8, and 9 are inside the enclosure wall that surrounds Khirbet Qumran and are accessible only after passing through one of the site’s entrances.4 Nevertheless, the location of these three caves does not necessarily tell us much about the relationship between the Scroll Caves, the Scrolls, and Khirbet Qumran, but merely shows that some caves containing Scrolls were found within the site’s walls. This study explores the question of whether the Dead Sea Scrolls are from Khirbet Qumran by focusing on the content and classification of these texts, what these writings tell us about the period before the construction of the site, and what the historical contents in these documents reveals about the origin of many of these works.

---

3 The pottery found in the scroll caves and at Khirbet Qumran are made of the same clays (or pastes), meaning that they share the same morphology and chemical composition. For this evidence, see further Jodi Magness, “The Connection between the Site of Qumran and the Scroll Caves in Light of the Ceramic Evidence,” in The Caves of Qumran: Proceedings of the International Conference, Lugano 2014, Marcello Fidanzio, ed. (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 184-94.

4 One entrance is by a small stepped pool in the northwest (L138); the other just north (by L134) of the tower (L9 L11); and the third entrance by L84, near the potters’ workshop in the eastern wall that separates Khirbet Qumran from the cemetery. This enclosure wall remained in use until the end of Period II (ca. 68 C.E.), See Jodi Magness, The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 49. For sigla, descriptions of rooms, and site plans, see Roland de Vaux, Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls (London: Oxford University Press, 1973); Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Alain Chambon, Fouilles de Khirbet Qumran et de ‘Ain Feshkha I (Fribourg: Academic Press, 1994). The enclosure wall joins a terrace wall at the edge of pool 71 and continues southward from the site for nearly 140 meters to the top of the cliff. This boundary wall separates the site from the space outside, including the cemetery, and further isolates those caves inside Khirbet Qumran from its surroundings. See further Joan Branham, “Hedging the Holy at Qumran: Walls as Symbolic Devices,” in Qumran, the Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates: Proceedings of a Conference Held at Brown University, November 17–19, 2002, Katharina Galor, Jean-Baptiste Humbert, and Jürgen Zangenberg, eds. (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 117–31; Jean-Baptiste Humbert, “Some Remarks on the Archaeology of Qumran,” in Qumran, the Site, 20–30. Although not within this boundary wall, Caves 4, 5, and 10 should be considered as connected with Khirbet Qumran because of their proximity to the site.
I. The Nature of the Collection

The earliest Dead Sea Scrolls have been dated, largely through paleography, to the mid-third century B.C.E.\(^5\) A large percentage of the collection dates to the last half of the first century B.C.E. Paleography shows that the number of Scrolls continues to decline in the first century B.C.E. and abruptly ends in the last quarter of the first century C.E.\(^6\) Radiocarbon dates for some texts supports the paleographical datings, showing that we can be confident of the overall dates for the entire collection.\(^7\) This information does not exclude the possibility that some manuscripts have been misdated. It also tells us nothing about the origins of the Scrolls found in the caves within and near Khirbet Qumran. However, there is evidence that some Scrolls such as 1QHodayot\(^8\) were possibly manufactured at Khirbet Qumran.\(^8\) Yet, the dates and chemical tests of other Scrolls, including the Temple Scroll, indicate they were brought to the site from elsewhere since they predate its construction.\(^9\) Because nearly 25% percent of the manuscripts were produced before the 100 B.C.E. construction of Khirbet Qumran, this raises the question of whether they were associated with the Khirbet Qumran community. Because the site remained occupied for nearly a century after most of the manuscripts were produced, it is also important to consider whether many of the Dead Sea Scrolls were connected with those who placed them in the caves at the time of the First Jewish Revolt. In other words, did Khirbet Qumran’s inhabitants use many of the Dead Sea Scrolls?

Because an unknown number of scribes produced the Dead Sea Scrolls between the third century B.C.E. to the first century C.E., it is not surprising that they are written in different scripts. Nevertheless, individual scribes copied more than one manuscript; some of these

\(^5\) For some of the difficulties in dating the Dead Sea Scrolls, none of which contain any dates, see Eibert Tigchelaar, “Seventy Years of Palaeographic Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Sacred Texts*, 258-278.

\(^6\) For the paleographical and radiocarbon dates of the collection, see Brian Webster, “Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judaean Desert,” in *The Texts from The Judaean Desert: Indices*, 351-446.

\(^7\) See the evidence collected in Webster, “Chronological Index,” 351-75.


were found in different caves. This provides us with some valuable insight about the nature of the collection and its possible purpose. The most prominent scribe produced some of the most significant of all the Scrolls including many that are commonly considered sectarian documents: 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSB, 4QSamuelc (4Q53), 4QTestimonia (4Q175), 4QNarrative G (4Q181b), part of 1QpHab, and corrections to 1QIsaiaha. Several pesharim that contain historical content, such as the Psalms Pesher (4Q171) and the Hosea Peshera (4Q166), are written in the same script and were likely produced by the same scribe.10 Although a single scribe copied many of the most important sectarian documents, there are some peculiar features of these texts that raise questions about their connection with Khirbet Qumran. Certain orthographical and phonological idiosyncrasies unique to 1QS lacking in the other works copied by its scribe are found in the portion of 1QIsaiaha that was copied by another scribe. This suggests that the unique linguistic features in these two scrolls originated from earlier copyists, scribes, or the communities that preceded the Khirbet Qumran settlement.11 Nevertheless, there is a connection between all these texts. However, this relationship may have originated possibly centuries after their compositions.

The presence of texts copied by the same scribe in Caves 1 and 4, and the large number of multiple copies of documents in Cave 4, suggests that the Dead Sea Scrolls are the remains of one or more libraries that display a sectarian interest. These documents were likely deposited at the same time as evident by the deposition of the manuscripts in Cave 4. There is no discernible principle of organization in the placement of the texts in this cave. Rather, documents of different dates were mixed in a pile atop the cave’s floor. Moreover, some texts dated to the latest phase of Khirbet Qumran’s occupation were found in the lower strata of the cave deposit. Because fragments found in its lower levels were

---

11 For a detailed description of these linguistic features, see Eric D. Reymond, “The Scribe of 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSB, 4Q503 (4QSamc), 4Q175 and Three Features of Orthography and Phonology,” Dead Sea Discoveries 25 (2018): 238-54.
not necessarily the oldest, which would have been the case if the texts had been placed on its floor and deposited over time, the documents in this cave were deposited together.\textsuperscript{12} Although the paleographical and archaeological evidence, particularly the ceramics, demonstrates that the Qumran corpus is a unified collection that is related to the site of Khirbet Qumran, the earliest Scrolls, which date to the third century B.C.E. (including the Enoch literature and Jubilees), were clearly brought there possibly as late as the time of their deposition in the caves.\textsuperscript{13} This means that many of the Scrolls originally had nothing to do with Khirbet Qumran, although they were clearly important to those who preserved them and hid them in the caves sometimes centuries after their production.

Despite the diversity of their contents, the Dead Sea Scrolls exhibit a considerable unity, suggesting they are not a random assortment of

\textsuperscript{12} For descriptions of the locations of the manuscripts in Cave 4, see de Vaux, \textit{Archaeology}, 100; Crawford, \textit{Scribes}, 137-41; Frank M. Cross, “Reminiscences of the Early Days in the Discovery and Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in \textit{The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997}, Lawrence H. Schiffman, et al. eds., (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 932-42; Hannah Cotton and Eirk Larson, “4Q460/4Q350 and Tampering with Qumran Texts in Antiquity?,” in \textit{Emanuel}, 113-26. Although Cave 4 is two caves adjacent to one another (Caves 4a and 4b), they are traditionally designated as Cave 4 since their findings were merged together after their discovery. Unfortunately, few of the Scrolls identified as having originated from Cave 4 can be proven to have come from this cave. For this evidence, see further Weston Fields, \textit{The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Full History, Vol. 1: 1947-1960} (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 546, notes 107-08; Stephen A. Reed, “Find-Sites of the Dead Sea Scrolls” \textit{Dead Sea Discoveries} 14 (2007): 199-21.

\textsuperscript{13} The excavations of Khirbet Qumran have demonstrated that Dead Sea Scrolls were deposited in the caves surrounding the site in the Roman Period, and that most of the extant remains date to this time. Because the lowest level of Cave 4 contained a fair cross section of the texts in this cave, it appears that the manuscripts were already in great disorder when they were placed inside this cave. There is some evidence that many of the Cave 4 manuscripts were already damaged, and torn apart, before their deposition in the cave. See further the extensive discussions and publications discussed in the following: John M. Allegro, \textit{The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reappraisal} (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1964), 56; Kenneth Atkinson and Jodi Magness, “Josephus’s Essenes and the Qumran Community,” \textit{Journal of Biblical Literature} 129 (2010): 317-42; Cotton and Larson, “4Q460/4Q350,” 1123-25; Crawford, \textit{Scribes}, 137-42, 217-65; Florentino García Martínez, “Reconsidering the Cave 1 Texts Sixty Years After their Discovery? An Overview,” in \textit{Qumran Cave 1 Revisited Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana}. Daniel K. Falk, et al., eds. (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 1-13,1-13; ibid., “The Contents of the Manuscripts from the Caves of Qumran,” in \textit{The Caves of Qumran}, 67-79; Magness, “The Connection,” 184-94; Ulrich, “Identification,” 201-10.
documents. It is doubtful that so many caves containing copies of identical texts, many of which espouse a similar theology, were deposited in the caves within Khirbet Qumran and its vicinity by chance. Because a single scribe likely produced several works regarded as sectarian compositions, it is appropriate to view the collection as a single group of documents that was carefully collected and placed in the caves. This is true even if some documents predate the community at Khirbet Qumran and belonged to other groups. Those texts classified as non-sectarian, such as 4QInstruction, contain theological features found in sectarian documents such as the Community Rule, the Damascus Document, and the Hodayot. 4QInstruction shares an entire phrase with one of the poems in the Hodayot (4Q418 55 10 = 1QH 18:29–30), suggesting that the author of this poetic composition used 4QInstruction as a source. The frequency of the phrase “the mysteries that are to be” in 4QInstruction is reminiscent of 1QMysteries (1Q27 1 I 3–4) and the Community Rule (1QS 11:3–4).14 Nevertheless, the differences between 4QInstruction and the so-called sectarian Scrolls are considerable. This document deals with farmers (4Q423 5 5–6), poverty (4Q415 6 2; 4Q416 2 ii 20; 4Q416 2 iii 2, 8, 12, 19; 4Q418 177 5; cf. 4Q418 148 ii 4; 4Q418 249 3), advice regarding trade (4Q418 126 ii 12–13), and contains guidance for marriage and a secular lifestyle (4Q415 and 4Q418). It likely came from the pre-Qumranic period, although its contents clearly shaped sectarian texts.15 Because of its differences and similarities with the so-called sectarian texts, 4QInstruction is difficult to classify since it contains such diverse contents and genres.16 This raises the question of whether scholars should continue to force such writings into a


15 Goff proposes that 4QInstruction was likely written in the second century B.C.E. He notes that it does not contain such key terms as the yahad, maskil, mebaqker, as well as the Teacher of Righteousness, found in sectarian writings, which makes it probable that is not from the same community as the one that produced the sectarian Scrolls See further Matthew J. Goff, 4QInstruction (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 27-29. For the fragments that likely formed part of this composition, see Goff, 4QInstruction, 2-7.

16 Because its diverse features make it difficult to classify, Rey considers 4QInstruction a sapiential work in which this knowledge is universal to all humanity. See Jean-Sébastien Rey, 4QInstruction: Sagesse et eschatology (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 338.
single literary genre and classify any of them as sectarian or non-sectarian compositions.

The traditional nomenclature and methods of reconstructing and interpreting the Dead Sea Scrolls has led to misunderstandings regarding these writings and those who used them. This is particularly true of the sectarian texts, which provide the basis for reconstructing the Khirbet Qumran community’s history. Most notable is the document known as the *Community Rule*, which exists in at least ten manuscripts in addition to the complete Cave 1 copy (4Q255-264 and possibly 5QS). 17 The Cave 1 copy of the *Community Rule* is used to reconstruct and interpret the Cave 4 fragments, all of which are combined into a master text. 18 Jutta Jokiranta and Hanna Vanonen have cautioned that this tradition-

---

17 5Q13 may represent another related work while fragment 4 of this text may contain some parallels with 1QS/4QS, particularly regarding the covenant renewal. See further, Sarianna Metso, *The Serekh Texts* (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 61. An additional fragment, 1IQ29, is also identified as part of the *Community Rule*. See further Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “A Newly Identified 11QSerek ha-Yaḥad Fragment (1IQ29)?,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress*, 439-52. Stephen Pfann made the controversial identification of 8-9 copies of the *Community Rule* from approximately 200 fragments of poorly preserved papyri written in cryptic script. See Stephen J. Pfann, “Cryptic Texts,” in *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part I*, Stephen J. Pfann, ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 515-702. See further the review of his reconstructions by Charlotte Hempel in *Journal of Semitic Studies* 49 (2004): 161-63. A recent publication announced the discovery that 4Q249a and 4Q249e 2a are two parts of the same fragment and parallel 1QSa 1:8-12. See Asaf Gayer, Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, and Jonathan Ben-Dov, “A New Join of Two Fragments of 4QcryptA Serekh haEdah and Its Implications,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 22 (2016): 139-54. Although the three texts on the scroll that bear the designations 1QS, 1QSa, and 1QSb are typically regarded as distinct and independent compositions, with 1QSa and 1QSb forming appendices to 1QS, the superscriptions tie its units into an integrated and unified composition suggesting they were intended to be read together. See further, Michael Brooks Johnson, “One Work of Three?: A Proposal for Reading 1QS-1QSa-1QSb as a Composite Work,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 25 (2018): 141-77. This manuscript bears witness to an enhanced role of the sons of Zadok while the newly identified cryptic fragments of *Serek ha-Edah* that differ from 1QS bear further witness to the development of these texts that likely took place before the foundation of the Khirbet Qumran settlement, early in its history, or possibly in other communities.

al approach is not valid because “...no remaining manuscript, given
the title “S,” is completely identical with another S manuscript. The
same is true of another major sectarian text found in a complete copy
in Cave 1, namely the War Scroll. Similar documents are also found
in fragments from Cave 4 (4Q491-496) that are believed to preserve
“recensions” or “traditions” of this composition and are titled as War
Scroll manuscripts. Yet, none of the presumed Cave 4 fragments of
this text is identical with 1QM. The same is true of the Hodayot, which
was found in two separate parts in Cave 1: a scroll of unstitched sheets
and a mass of crumpled fragments. These two parts have been combined
and reconstructed into a single composition of twenty-eight columns,
whose text, like the Community Rule and the War Scroll, is supplement-
ed with Cave 4 fragments. Yet, there is no evidence that the Cave 1
Hodayot is a single composition. Rather, the unstitched sheets (col-
umns 9-20) appear to have been prepared for re-copying in the early
Herodian period while the other part had been destroyed in antiquity.
Although our present edition of the Hodayot is a reconstructed text, it
is inappropriate to supplement the two Cave 1 manuscripts of this doc-
ument with Cave 4 fragments to produce a single composition and then
use this hypothetical text to reconstruct the theology and history of the
Khirbet Qumran community. It is probable that the Cave 4 fragments
identified as belonging to this poetic work came from similar writings
either with no connection to the reconstructed text of the Hodayot or to

19 Jutta Jokiranta and Hanna Vanonen, “Multiple Copies of Rule Texts or Multiple
Rule Texts?: Boundaries of the S and M Documents,” in Crossing Imaginary Bounda-
ries: The Dead Sea Scrolls in the Context of Second Temple Judaism, Mika S. Pajunen
20 See further Jean Duhaime, The War Texts: 1QM and Related Fragments (London:
T&T Clark, 2004), 20-30, 41; Brian Schultz, Conquering the World: The War Scroll
(1QM) Reconsidered (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 18-19, 391-92. Note also 4Q497 which,
Baillet gives the title “texte ayant quelque rapport avec la regle de la guerre.” See Ma-
rice Baillte, Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482-4Q520) (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 69,
21 Hartmut Stegemann, Eileen Schuller, and Carol Newsom, 1QHodayot with In-
39-43.
22 There is also no evidence that chapter 1 was part of the original Hodayot. For a
detailed presentation of this evidence, see Angela Kim Harkins, “Another Look at the
Cave 1 Hodayot: Was CH I Materially Part of the Scroll 1QHodayot?,” Dead Sea Dis-
coveries 25 (2018): 185-216. Carmignac, one of the early researchers on the Hodayot,
proposed that the Community Hymns (1QH 1?-8) were inadvertently connected with
the collection by modern scholars. See further J. Carmignac, “Remarques sur le texte
different versions of it. The contents of the Scroll caves, moreover, raise additional questions about the inappropriateness of combining texts of varying dates found in different caves to reconstruct documents. They also suggest that many of these texts, even some of those classified as sectarian, were never used at Khirbet Qumran.

II. The Qumran Caves and their Connection with Khirbet Qumran’s Occupational Phases

Cave 1 contained the sole nearly complete copies of the Community Rule, the War Scroll, and the Hodayot. These texts and this cave’s contents raise some problems for the traditional methods of interpreting these documents as “master manuscripts” and then supplementing them with Cave 4 materials. Although reconstructing the original entrance to this cave is problematic due to its later enlargement by illicit Bedouin digging, the early descriptions of its opening suggest that scroll jars could only have been placed inside this cave if inserted sideways. The cave’s entrance likely required people to crawl through it on all fours to place the jars in its interior. The best assessment is that Cave 1 contained at least 50 jars, which completely filled its interior making it impossible for any subsequent activity to have taken place inside it. The vast number of manuscripts found in this cave, some in duplicates, are difficult to explain if these were “master manuscripts” stored there to be used for copying since their retrieval was nearly impossible. The wooden poles found in Caves 1 and GQ17 suggest that they were used to transport scroll jars for deposition in the caves. This find and the lack of domestic artifacts suggest these caves were not used for habitation.

23 For the understanding of these texts as so-called “master copies,” see further Hartmut Stegemann, The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 80.
26 It is possible, as indicated by some small finds such as palm fibers, a wooden
However, perhaps the greatest problem for theory that Cave 1 was used to store “master copies” of significant sectarian works is that many of the most important Dead Sea Scrolls, especially the pesharim, 1QSa, and 1QSb, are only found in this cave. Paleography indicates a further problem.

In the case of the Cave 1 copies of the Community Rule, the War Scroll, and the Hodayot, (and also Festival Prayers), the Cave 4 fragments are paleographically older than the assumed “master manuscripts” which scholars use to reconstruct the Cave 1 copies of these texts.27 These Cave 1 scrolls, moreover, are clearly composite works. This means that the Cave 1 copies do not represent the original editions of these documents. Although the Cave 1 copy of the Community Rule is the oldest manuscript of this text, this does not mean that it preserves the oldest version of it.28 Sarianna Metso has convincingly demonstrated, through an exhaustive redactional examination of all the extant copies of the Community Rule, that the paleographical dates of its extant copies should be inverted. According to her analysis, some Cave 4 copies of this work (4QSb [4Q256]; 4QSD [4Q258]; 4QSe [4Q259]), all of which are significantly shorter than the Cave 1 copy, have later paleographical dates yet preserve earlier versions of the composition.29

Although the Damascus Document (CD) was not found in Cave 1, it is widely regarded as a sectarian text that is important for understanding

27 For this evidence, see further García Martínez, “Reconsidering,” 1-13.


the history and beliefs of the sectarian community of Khirbet Qumran reflected in the *Community Rule*. It is often used in conjunction with 1QS and the classical sources about the Essenes to reconstruct the beliefs of the Khirbet Qumran community. A comparison of the Cave 1 copy of the *Community Rule* and this text suggests that the *Damascus Documents* preserves a simpler oath of admission, making it problematic to compare these documents with one another. The common passages regarding the temporary expulsion of erring members (CD 20:1b-8a; 1QS 8:16b-9:2) is often cited as one of the major arguments for connecting the movement behind these texts. However, the material with the closest overlap between 1QS 8-9 and CD 20 is missing from 4Q259 (4Q5). This portion of 1QS (8:15-9:11) contains few corrections and is absent from 4Q259, suggesting that 1QS preserves a later edition of this document while 4Q259 preserves an earlier redactional stage. This means that the parallels between 1QS 8-9 and CD 20 are confined to a block of material that is secondary to 1QS. Schofield suggests that 1QS 8:25 and 4Q258 were independently corrupted, and that they represent traditions diverging from a common original. The Hebrew of 1QS, moreover, also suggests it represents a much later edition of the presumed *Vorlage* behind all the copies of the *Community Rule*. Yet, this edition is far from perfect.

1QS contains many corrections. The scribe responsible for this scroll was apparently less trained than the copyists of other texts and influ-

---

30 CD=Cairo Genizah copy and the Cave 4 versions of the *Damascus Document* while 1QS refers to the Cave 1 copy of the text also known as the *Serek HaYaḥad*, or simply *Serek*. Both have long been used together, often with the classical sources, to connect Khirbet Qumran with the Essenes and to reconstruct the history and theology of the community that resided there. Even if one wants to accept the traditional Essene identification of Khirbet Qumran’s inhabitants who placed the Scrolls in the caves, our sources for the Essenes do not reflect the period when a significant portion of the Scrolls, particularly the sectarian texts, were produced. Rather, they describe Essene lifestyle of the first century C.E. long after the production of most Scrolls; these accounts may not be accurate reflections of earlier Essene lifestyle, practices, and beliefs. For a succinct presentation of the scholarship on this issue, see Gwynned de Looijer, *The Qumran Paradigm: A Critical Evaluation of Some Foundational Hypotheses in the Construction of the Qumran Sect* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), esp. 37-87.


enced by the weakening of gutturals and Aramaisms. Yet, the orthography and morphology of 1QS is more consistent than 4Q175, both of which were copied by same scribe. Rather than using 1QS to reconstruct the Cave 4 fragments of this text, the differences between all our manuscripts of this work, as evident by the differing linguistic features of manuscripts produced by the same scribe, suggest that they do not emanate from or describe a single community. Rather, they bear witness to the existence of different theologically related settlements that were influenced by many of the same texts, but which developed slightly different lifestyles and versions of their foundational documents, likely in response to their unique historical circumstances. This explains why the Dead Sea Scrolls include newer forms of the Community Rule alongside older copies: they did not replace earlier editions since they were never used together. Rather, various communities at different locations and times revised the text known as the Community Rule independently of one another. Multiple versions of this document were only brought together when the Dead Sea Scrolls were deposited in the caves. Their placement in the caves, therefore, should not be connected with the nearby settlement of Khirbet Qumran unless we have compelling evidence to associate them with the site.

III. The Dead Sea Scrolls:
A Library of Various Sectarian Communities

The Dead Sea Scrolls comprise a library with a sectarian emphasis. Yet, these texts are of different origins and dates of composition; they were only brought to the caves for hiding just before the First Jewish Revolt. The corpus is a deliberate collection that is shaped by the interests of elite scribes who belonged to unknown, and likely related, sectarian communities. This thesis is supported by the Scrolls, which contain the same type of writings, showing that they were assembled

34 Tigchelaar, “In Search of the Scribe of 1QS,” in Emanuel, 439–52, esp. 451. 1QS contains linguistic features such as the Aramaic suffix he in the prefix of hiphil yiqtol verbs and an exchange of gutturals not found in other scrolls copied by this scribe. This indicates that these features originated from earlier scribes who produced or copied older versions of these texts: the scribe responsible for 1QS merely copied these earlier grammatical features from an older manuscript. See further Reymond, “The Scribe of 1QS,” 238-54.

35 See Crawford, Scribes, 217-65. See also the numerous essays on this topic in Sidnie White Crawford and Cecilia Wassen, eds. The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Concept of a Library (Leiden: Brill, 2016).
Yet, the contents of this library suggests that the sect at Khirbet Qumran that placed these documents in the caves was influenced by other as yet unknown sectarian groups long before the construction of their settlement, which took place around 100 B.C.E. This is because of the close theological connection between many of these pre-Qumranic writings and the sectarian Scrolls. Unfortunately, it is difficult to reconstruct the Khirbet Qumran sect’s history as well as the beliefs and practices of its precursor movement(s) due to the lack of external accounts and the absence of texts with a sequential historical narrative. The contents of the Scrolls complicates matters, for they often make it nearly impossible to discern some of the historical events they describe.

The longstanding classifications of the Dead Sea Scrolls by genre continues to impede our understanding of this collection. The Scrolls are typically classified as sectarian, non-sectarian, or by other labels such as “intermediate texts,” and then examined in relation to the reconstructed beliefs of the yahad. It is better to speak about networks or clusters of texts and eschew such traditional classifications. This shifts the focus to other issues, such as networks between Scrolls that can be identified based on the physical features of various manuscripts. Two

36 The classical literature of Judaism makes up approximately 25.7% of the collection, the sectarian works 25.5%, affiliated texts 17.6%, and nonsectarian Hellenistic-Roman literature 18.3%. For these figures and an extensive discussion of these divisions, see further Crawford, Scribes, 217-65. García Martínez (“Reconsidering,” 13) comments that the Cave 1 manuscripts are “a perfect sample” of the library and represent a cross section of the Qumran collection.

37 For the importance of this observation, see further Collins, Beyond the Qumran Community, 52-87; Torleif Elgvin, “The Yahad is More than Qumran,” in Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection, Gabriele Boccaccini, ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), 273-79.

38 The classical sources for the Essenes, the group most widely identified as the sect that resided at Khirbet Qumran, dates to the latest period of the site’s occupation and not the time when most of the Dead Sea Scrolls were produced. This makes these sources of limited value for understanding many of the Dead Sea Scrolls that predate the classical writers, particularly Josephus, when the sect’s theology appears to have undergone many changes. See further, 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,” Scripta Judaica Cracoviensia 10 (2012): 7-35.

bodies of literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls illustrate this issue, namely the prayer texts and the *pesharim*.

The prayer literature from Qumran offers an important example of how labels impede our understanding of the collection. There is no standard definition of what constitutes a prayer.\(^{40}\) The index to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (DJD) series lists 57 works under the heading “Poetic and Liturgical Texts.”\(^{41}\) The DJD index also lists twenty-four works under the general heading “Fragmentary Poetic or Liturgical Texts.”\(^{42}\) Many of these can be classified as prayers. Poetic and liturgical works, however, should not be categorized under a single label. Several of the most important of the so-called sectarian texts, most notably the *Community Rule* and the *War Scroll*, contain prayers. The *Community Rule* even regulates times of prayer (1QS 9:26b-11:22) while the *War Scroll* lists the instances when prayers should be recited before battle (1QM 10:8-12:18; 18:5-19:8). Other Scrolls bear witness to the practice of reciting prayers at certain times of the day.\(^{43}\) If we include these texts, then the total is approximately 91 Scrolls that contain prayers. Yet, this figure is misleading since a large number of the four additional pages in the DJD index of Scrolls under the heading “Unclassified Manuscripts” are prayers, hymns, or liturgical works.\(^{44}\) But there is another problem.

The list of prayers in the index to the DJD series exclude prayers in Aramaic texts such as the *Genesis Apocryphon*, the *Book of Giants*, the *Aramaic Levi Document*, and the *Prayer of Nabonidus*. Although

---


\(^{42}\) Four collections (4Q503-504; 4Q505?; 4Q506; 4Q400-407; 11Q17; 1Q34-34\(^{bis}\); 4Q507-509) explicitly attest to the performance of prayer at regular fixed times during the day for Sabbaths and festivals. See further, Jeremy Penner, “Mapping Fixed Prayers from the Dead Sea Scrolls onto Second Temple Period Judaism,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 21 (2014): 39.

\(^{44}\) Lange with Mittmann-Richert, “Annotated List,” 145-49.
these works predate Khirbet Qumran and are not regarded as sectarian compositions, they were preserved for centuries and deposited in the caves near Khirbet Qumran along with other much later Hebrew compositions. The Enochic corpus predates Khirbet Qumran by several centuries and therefore cannot be a sectarian text; however, it contains the basic sectarian thinking found in many Dead Sea Scrolls and influenced their authors. This shows the problem with traditional classifications of the Scrolls into literary categories since texts that were non-sectarian clearly shaped the sectarian texts: if not for their earlier dates of composition scholars likely would have classed many of them as sectarian writings.

A look at the dates of the Qumran prayers is quite illustrative for understanding the corpus of Scrolls. Works such as *Words of the Heavenly Luminaries*, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, *Daily Prayers*, and *Festival Prayers*, all have been dated to the pre-Maccabean period. This suggests that regular formulaic prayer developed alongside Temple worship and not in reaction to its destruction. It also shows that Judaism was theologically diverse in the pre-Maccabean period. This suggests that the period before Khirbet Qumran, particularly the pre-Maccabean era, was one of great theological vitality of which we know little. It laid the foundation for the theology of the communities responsible for the Dead Sea Scrolls, which raises some questions concerning how important the Khirbet Qumran settlement was in antiquity. The *pesharim* suggests that it was perhaps not as significant as scholars have long held.

The eighteen continuous *pesharim* in the Dead Sea Scrolls are unique. They are only found in Caves 1 and 4; all are extant in a single copy. Several features in these documents show that they are not autographs, but updated editions of earlier versions of these writings. This is indicated by such features as the oddities in their verbal tenses as well as the presence of interlinear (4QPesher Isaiah\(^c\) frg. 23, 2.14; 4QPesher Isaiah\(^c\) frg. 5.5; 4QPesher Psalms\(^a\) frgs. 10-11, col. 3.5) and scribal corrections

---

45 See further, Eileen M. Schuller, “Prayers and Psalms from the Pre-Maccabean Period,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 13 (2006): 306-18. Although paleography cannot determine whether a Qumran text is an autograph or a revision of an earlier document, the prayer texts all have early dates in contrast to historical Dead Sea Scrolls that date considerably later. For the importance of this issue, see further Kenneth Atkinson, “Representations of History in 4Q331 (4QpapHistorical Text C), 4Q332 (4QHistorical Text D), 4Q333 (4QHistorical Text E), and 4Q468e (4QHistorical Text F): An Annalistic Calendar Documenting Portentous Events?,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 14 (2007): 125-51.
In the case of the *pesherim* on Nahum and Hosea, a scribe added material to account for later historical events that conflicted with the original text’s interpretation. This is evident in the *Habakkuk Pesher* by the interpretation of the phrase “the rest of the peoples” in Habakkuk 2.8 as a prediction that several nations will plunder the Hasmoneans (*Habakkuk Pesher* 9.3-4). This passage was updated to refer to the Romans, rather than the Seleucid Empire’s rulers, following Pompey’s conquest. Explicit historical references abruptly end in the Qumran corpus in the immediate decades following Pompey’s 63 B.C.E. conquest of Jerusalem and his termination of the Hasmonean state. The paleographical dates of the *pesharim*, moreover coincide with their latest dated historical references in the latter part of the first century B.C.E. as they were all produced shortly after this event.

---


47 See further, Kenneth Atkinson, *The Hasmoneans and Their Neighbors: New Historical Reconstructions from the Dead Sea Scrolls and Classical Sources* (London: Bloomsbury T and T Clark, 2018), 110-11; Hanan Eshel, “Two Historical Layers of Pesher Habakkuk,” in *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003-2006*, Anders Klostergaard Petersen, et al., eds. (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 107-17. Hartog also proposes that the *Habakkuk Pesher* was updated to reflect the demise of the Hasmonean dynasty, but he suggests that columns 2.5-10 and 9.3-7 were the sections added to it. See Pieter B. Hartog, *Pesher and Hypomnema: A Comparison of Two Commentary Traditions from the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (Leiden: Brill, 2017),1-22. The lengthy *vacat* in the *Nahum Pesher* (4Q169 3-4 I 1-12), and the anomalous spacing within the text here, appears to mark the beginning of an updated section that interprets the unexpected change in power during the reign of Jannaeus’s successor, his wife Shelamzion Alexandra. See further Atkinson, *Neighbors*, 107-12. The Teacher of Righteousness presumably taught orally from the written text of Habakkuk’s oracles and the pesharist committed his expositions in writing. The text of the pesher is, therefore, a mixture of the Teacher’s scriptural expositions and the pesherist’s comments and dates considerably later than Teacher’s time. Evidence in the extant copy of the Habakkuk Pesher suggests that the text was revised with the possible addition of marginal glosses that updated these interpretations in light of recent historical events. Because of these additions and errors to the text, which indicate a scribe copied this document and possibly updated it, the work most likely originated from outside Khirbet Qumran. See further Timothy H. Lim, *The Earliest Commentary on the Prophecy of Habakkuk* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 51, 129.

48 The paleographical dates of the *pesharim* are as follows: 4QpIsab (4Q162) prior to 30 B.C.E.; 4QpIsac (4Q163) ca. 100 B.C.E.; 4QpIsad (4Q164) ca. 30 B.C.E.-20 C.E.;
The historical events and names of identifiable persons in all the Dead Sea Scrolls mainly date to the mid-late first century B.C.E., with the bulk dating from approximately 76 B.C.E. to approximately 51 B.C.E.\textsuperscript{49} Many of the Scrolls that contain the names of identifiable figures are found in documents widely considered nonsectarian that predate the construction of Khirbet Qumran.\textsuperscript{50} It is essential to examine all these writings together, despite their different dates and possible locations of their compositions, since they were all placed in the caves together with texts that predated Khirbet Qumran’s destruction. Because Scrolls of different dates were mixed together in the caves, and since some texts dated to the latest phase of Khirbet Qumran’s occupation were found in the lower stratum of Cave 4, it is unlikely that the recent documents in the collection were deposited in the caves on multiple occasions atop earlier deposits of texts. This means that many of these pre-Qumranic texts were likely brought to the site as late as the final phase of Khirbet Qumran’s occupation before its destruction at the time of the First Jewish Revolt. This is also true of many Scrolls that date to the period of the Khirbet Qumran settlement that, like the \textit{pesharim}, exist in single copies and whose errors and updatings show they were undoubtedly written elsewhere.

**IV. Are the Dead Sea Scrolls from Khirbet Qumran?**

Khirbet Qumran was occupied for a single period, from approximately 100 B.C.E. until 68 C.E. The abandonment of the site after the 31 B.C.E. earthquake was brief.\textsuperscript{51} While the archaeological remains there are rather impressive and seemingly large, it is unlikely that many resided at Khirbet Qumran. The best estimates, based on the small number of ovens and cooking pots uncovered during its excavations, suggest

\begin{itemize}
\item 4Qplsa\textsuperscript{e} (4Q165) ca. 30 B.C.E.-20 C.E.; 4QpHos\textsuperscript{b} (4Q167) ca. 20-70 C.E.; 1QpMic (1Q14) before the first century B.C.E.; 4QpNah (4Q169) ca. 60-30 B.C.E.; 1QpHab ca. 30-1 B.C.E.; 1QpZeph (1Q15) and 4QpZeph (4Q170) dates unknown; 1QpPs (1Q16) before the first century B.C.E.; 4QPs\textsuperscript{b} (4Q173) ca. 20-70 C.E. For these dates, see Timothy Lim, \textit{Pesharim} (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 22-23; Webster, “Chronological Index,” 351-446.
\item \textsuperscript{49} See further Atkinson, \textit{Neighbors}, 102-72.
\item \textsuperscript{50} See further Atkinson, “Representations,” 125-51.
\end{itemize}
that 20-75 persons lived at the site on a permanent basis.\textsuperscript{52} The large number of scribal hands in the collection, the pre-Qumranic dates of many Scrolls, and the presence of sectarian and non-sectarian writings in multiple caves, indicates that the collection was gathered over a considerable time. This means that many, if not most of the Dead Sea Scrolls, were brought to Khirbet Qumran and were not written, copied, or used there.\textsuperscript{53}

Based on the theological and historical contents of the Scrolls, particularly sectarian texts such as the \textit{Community Rule} and the \textit{Damascus Document}, the community that resided at Khirbet Qumran existed long before the establishment of the site. The contents of their library suggest that this sect was influenced by other as yet unknown sectarian groups long before the construction of Khirbet Qumran.\textsuperscript{54} Unfortunately, it is difficult to reconstruct the Khirbet Qumran sect’s history as well as the beliefs and practices of its precursor movement(s) due to the lack of external accounts and the absence of texts with a sequential historical narrative. What we know about the Scrolls when compared with other writings suggests that the communities behind the collection were not isolated from the surrounding Greco-Roman world.

Pieter Hartog observes many similarities between the systematic interpretations of the base texts in the \textit{pesharim} and the \textit{hypomnema-}


\textsuperscript{53} For the importance of the presence of multiple copies of Scrolls in different caves for understanding the history of the community responsible for placing these texts in the caves, see further Carol Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran, in \textit{The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters}, ed. William H. Propp, et al., eds. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167-87. Golb proposed that the Scrolls were not the library of a single sect, but libraries from Jerusalem that were transferred to Khirbet Qumran. See further Norman Golb, \textit{Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?: The Search for the Secret of Qumran} (New York: Scribners, 1995). Although some of my argument is similar to Golb’s thesis, I do not connect the Scrolls with a library exclusively from Jerusalem, although many of these texts likely originated there. A large percentage of the collection clearly came from various unknown Jewish communities, many of which were apparently unrelated to the sect at Khirbet Qumran but whose writings influenced its members.

\textsuperscript{54} For the importance of this observation, see further Collins, \textit{Beyond the Qumran Community}, 52-87; Elgvin, “The Yahad,” 273-79.
ta, which elucidate passages in Homer’s *Iliad*. These resemblances, Hartog proposes, originated in an era when connections between Egypt and Palestine led to the spread of this interpretative method to Judea. Nevertheless, while the Scrolls exhibit some esoteric interpretations in which Scripture is decoded to comment on the present, there is a difference between them and many Hellenistic explications of ancient texts such as Homer. The writers of the Scrolls wanted their readers to connect their Scriptural elucidations with specific historical events. For this reason, they sometimes added names to their works to make the connection between past and present evident. This suggests that recording factual history was important to the communities reflected in the Scrolls and an essential key to understanding their theology. This is also true of those Scrolls that predate the community of Khirbet Qumran.

Archaeology raises some questions concerning the importance of the Khirbet Qumran community. According to the *Habakkuk Pesher*, the Teacher of Righteousness was residing “in his house of exile” (1QpHab 11:6) when the Wicked Priest attacked him in an effort to eliminate him and his followers (1QpHab 11:3-8; 4QPs¹ 1-10 iv 7-9). This has long been held to indicate that the Teacher of Righteousness and his supporters adhered to a different calendar since the Wicked Priest attacked him on the Day of Atonement. If the “house of exile” refers to Khirbet Qumran, this text may shed some important light on the purpose of the settlement, suggesting that its occupants greatly differed from other affiliated communities that produced most of the Scrolls.

---


56 The Scrolls themselves bear witness to contact with other Hellenistic cultures and possibly those outside the Middle East. The presence of papyrus fragments among the Qumran scrolls shows evidence of direct or indirect trade connections with Egypt while the red ink on some Scrolls had to be imported from Spain or China. See Mladen Popović, “The Ancient ‘Library’ of Qumran between Urban and Rural Culture,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*, 160.

57 See, for example, 1QS 4:22; 11:15-16; 4Q511 frg. 18 col. 2:8; 1QH² 26:14-15. See further Stone, *Secret Groups*, 7-31; Thomas, ‘Mysteries’ of Qumran, 35-79.


vertheless, it is unlikely that the *pesharim* that document the Teacher of Righteousness are autographs, suggesting that their single copies originated elsewhere from some related sectarian settlement(s.) The animosity between the Wicked Priest and the Teacher of Righteousness—assuming their hostile encounter occurred at Khirbet Qumran—may have taken place because of the type of worship that took place there.⁶⁰

Jean-Baptiste Humbert proposed that the enclosure to the north of Khirbet Qumran (L 130-135) was a sacrificial courtyard. This area contained numerous animal bone deposits and ash and dates to the late first century B.C.E. The stone feature in locus 138 appears to be the remains of an altar.⁶¹ There is nothing in the theology of the Qumran sect that forbids sacrifice in the settlement; many of these texts can even be read to imply that it did occur.⁶² The bone deposits at Khirbet Qumran could be remnants of what Dennis Mizzi has described as the remains of the “sacrificialization” of ordinary meals that included meat.⁶³ Allison Schofield emphasizes that none of the Rule texts prohibit the presence of an altar at the site. Rather, she makes the proposal that the “house of prostration” in CD XI.18-23 could refer to the place

---

⁶⁰ Even if some of the Scrolls refer to events that took place at Khirbet Qumran, it does not necessarily mean that these texts were written at the site. Rather, many were undoubtedly produced by related communities elsewhere. For this possibility, see the related comments of John J. Collins, “The Origin of the Scrolls Community and its Historical Context,” *Henoch* 39 (2017): 8-22. It is possible that the encounter between the Wicked Priest and the Teacher of Righteousness took place at Khirbet Qumran but that the *pesher* texts describing it were written elsewhere. This is suggested by the finding of single copies of each of the *pesharim*, all of which contain updatings and errors suggesting that the sole manuscripts of these works were produced elsewhere. It is probable that they were never at Khirbet Qumran until they were hidden in the caves.


⁶² Magness, “Sacrifices,” esp. 28-34.

of sacrificial worship run by the sectarians themselves. The Khirbet Qumran altar shows that those who resided there were extremists who set up their own sacrificial system. Although related to other sectarian groups, they chose to live in relative isolation and practice their unique form of Judaism in the desert. The presence of most of the Dead Sea Scrolls in their settlement is the result of chance and tragedy. Although some Scrolls certainly were produced at Khirbet Qumran, most were likely never at the site until they were placed in the caves at the time of the First Jewish Revolt.

Determining the origin of the Dead Sea Scrolls is impossible, although some were certainly produced at Khirbet Qumran. Nevertheless, Cave 4 may provide some valuable clues to its origin that tells us much about related sectarian communities that resided elsewhere. It is a historical accident that the Cave 1 Scrolls were discovered first and, except for the Cave 11 Temple Scroll, are the best preserved. Many Dead Sea Scrolls are relatively poor in terms of their quality; some are reused scrolls. The Cave 4 Scrolls contain papyrus texts, which include nearly all compositions identified as bearing sectarian characteristics. This suggests archival activity in which at least one copy of significant documents was preserved on papyrus. Given that the Cave 4 Scrolls were found in a

64 Schofield, From Qumran, 132-33.
67 The majority of opisthographs at Qumran are on papyrus. Most are prayer texts and were written by the same scribe on both sides of the papyrus. For a complete inventory, see Tov, “Lists,” 211-13. For an analysis of these texts that also shows that the compositions written on the same papyrus such as the War Scroll reflect the same orthography often associated with the Khirbet Qumran sect, see George J. Brooke, “Between Scroll and Codex: Reconsidering the Qumran Opisthographs,” in On Stone and Scroll: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies, ed. J. K. Aitken, Katherine J. Dell, and Brian A. Mastin, eds. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 123-38. All figures for the number of Scrolls found in the caves can only be approximate since many texts do not survive. Parts of Cave 4Qa and 4Qb have spilled over into the ravine; portions of Cave 10Q and 7Q have collapsed into the Wadi Qumran, much of Caves 8Q and 9Q have disappeared; and Cave 3 collapsed. Roland de Vaux, “Exploration de la Falaise de Qumran,” in Les
mixed pile on its floor, with older texts atop earlier documents, it was apparently deposited at one time. The papyrus texts may indicate that it was a sectarian library taken from elsewhere and hidden at Khirbet Qumran. This does not exclude the likelihood that some Scrolls were already in Cave 4 before the deposition of most of the collection in this cave on the eve of the First Revolt. Nevertheless, the diverse contents of this cave and the dates of its Scrolls show that many of its documents are witnesses to Judaism of the third and second century B.C.E. and later, before the construction of Khirbet Qumran. The same is true of many other Scroll caves.

Cave 1 with its many jars, as well as Cave 3 and some of the other caves, may have had a similar profile as Cave 4, although insufficient documents survive to determine the nature and possible origin of its collection. The careful hiding of texts in Cave 1 suggests they were taken

---

68 The papyrus Dead Sea Scrolls are mainly found in Cave 4 and date from approximately 150 B.C.E. to the early Herodian era. They number approximately 80 and preserve a vast number of genres and sectarian works. They were written by many scribes and their dates suggest that the Cave 4 collection was assembled over a vast period and transported in its entirety to Cave 4. For the papyrus Dead Sea Scrolls, see the complete inventory in Emmanuel Tov, “Lists of Specific Groups of Texts from the Judaean Desert,” in in *The Texts from The Judaean Desert: Indices*, 204-207.

69 Even if Cave 4, as often assumed, contained shelves, this would not explain the disarray of the manuscripts on the cave floor if it were a storage facility or library for the adjacent Khirbet Qumran settlement. Although it is highly probable that this cave dug into the marl terrace served as a library and contained shelves, it could not have held all the manuscripts found inside it. Rather, the large number of manuscripts dumped on the floor and crammed into every part of Chamber 1 and its nook can only be explained by the need to protect these texts immediately by removing them from their original location(s) and placing them in this cave with the hope that they would be left alone. The finding of numerous mezuzot in Cave 4 (4Q149-155), but not in any other caves, provides evidence that some the Cave 4 Scrolls were inside the site before they were placed in the caves. These mezuzot and some of these texts undoubtedly came from Khirbet Qumran and were among the last objects removed from the site and placed in this cave alongside some preexisting documents and texts that had just been brought to the site for hiding elsewhere. See further Sidnie White Crawford, “Qumran Cave 4: Its Archaeology and Its Manuscript Collection,” in *Is There a Text in This Cave?: Studies in the Textuality of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of George J. Brooke*, Ariel Feldman, Maria Cioa, and Charlotte Hempel, eds. (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 111; Mizzi, “Miscellaneous” 147.
there over time and carefully hidden. Cave 1, moreover, was so packed with nearly 50 Scroll jars that would have been impossible to retrieve them if someone wanted to read a text. It also would have been impossible to locate a specific document since the jars undoubtedly contained multiple manuscripts. This shows that these texts were placed in Cave 1 for hiding, and not for storage since there was no space in its interior for any subsequent activity to have taken place inside it.70

Cave 3 has a different history than Cave 1. Unfortunately, the poor state of this cave’s preservation makes its original appearance impossible to reconstruct. It had collapsed in antiquity before jars containing Scrolls were deposited in it. Because these jars were merely hidden behind rocks, this suggests that they were placed there in great haste. Perhaps those who hid these jars had little time to do so and merely tried to obscure them for retrieval later.71 Their placement is reminiscent of the disorganized manner in which the Cave 4 texts were strewn about its floor. Given Cave 4’s proximity to Khirbert Qumran, and the absence of Scroll jars to preserve most of its texts, it was likely among the last caves in which texts were hidden in haste. Presumably, there was insufficient time to place these documents in jars for hiding and preservation at a better location. It is a mere accident that the Scrolls from this cave, and not those from the other more hidden caves in which texts were placed in sealed jars, survived. This has led to an overestimation of the importance of Cave 4 and its relationship to Khirbet Qumran.

If we are to connect Scrolls from any cave with Khirbet Qumran, the best candidate is Cave 11. The sectarian nature of the fragments from this cave and the high number of documents copied according to the Qumran scribal practice, along with the preponderance of handle sheets, suggests, according to Emmanual Tov, that the “...collection of texts found in Cave 11 must have come as a whole from the Qumran community itself, possibly brought from a specific location.”72 Given its great distance from Khirbet Qumran, it is likely that the bulk of texts

---

70 Taylor, Mizzi, and Fidanzio, “Revisiting Qumran Cave 1Q,” 295-325.
in this cave were from Khirbet Qumran and hidden by the inhabitants of the site along with the Cave 1 texts when they had sufficient time to place them in fairly remote and inaccessible caves. However, unlike the Cave 1 texts that clearly came from elsewhere, it is probable that the Cave 11 documents came from Khirbet Qumran, although the Temple Scroll originated elsewhere but was likely used by the sect there at the time of its concealment. This may suggest that Cave 11, and possibly Caves 1 and 3, were the first caves in which Scrolls were hidden. Scrolls were likely placed in Cave 1, 3, and 11 and most other caves before the arrival of the Romans when there was enough time to place them in jars for their safety and preservation. Cave 4 was likely the last cave in which texts were hidden: they were merely strewn on the floor there in desperation because it was close to the settlement and because there was no time to place them in jars and hide them elsewhere. It is unlikely that this cave, although it likely was once a small library, ever contained most of the Scrolls discovered in it.

V. Conclusion

The size of the Dead Sea Scrolls is unprecedented for an ancient library. Although there is a scribal focus to the collection, the presence of multiple copies of texts of different dates suggests that the Scrolls emanated from several communities. Khirbet Qumran appears to have been the location where a small number of residents practiced a form of Judaism that involved animal sacrifice in relative isolation. Those who lived there had some relationship with earlier like-minded groups and shared many of the same writings. Each group, as evident in multiple recension of texts such as the Community Rule, shared certain documents and ideologies but interpreted them differently. Each undoubtedly was influenced by different historical experiences or understood their impact differently. Because most Scrolls are not from Khirbet Qumran, the site was likely not the center for a group of related sectarian communities. It was not the site of original thinking; most theological developments can be traced to the pre-Maccabean era. Because relatively few scrolls were placed in Cave 4, it may have been a last-ditch effort to hide the Scrolls in a remote location.

---

73 The residents of Khirbet Qumran presumably had less time to hide the Cave 3 Scrolls, as evident by the manner of their placement in the open behind rocks. They did have time to place these texts in jars and carry them to the remains of this collapsed cave and deposit them behind rocks. We can only speculate why they did so. It is possible they had to return to Khirbet Qumran to hide the remaining Scrolls in Cave 4 and possibly elsewhere due to the arrival of Roman forces.
were produced from the period after the 63 B.C.E. Roman conquest to the destruction of the site in approximately 68 C.E., the communities of the Scrolls appear to have largely died out during this time. Khirbet Qumran appears to have merely been the place where those who lived elsewhere but shared a similar ideology with its residents in desperation hid the contents of their libraries in the hope of retrieving them after the expected defeat of the invading Roman army. If not for the tragic events of the First Jewish Revolt, relatively few scrolls would have been found at or near Khirbet Qumran.

Addendum:

In this article, which is a reaction to Harkin’s study (cited note 22 above) Tigchelaar includes some problematic history on the original treatment of the Cave 1 Hodayot suggesting that some fragments may have been restored to the wrong place. Eibert Tigchelaar, “A Further Look at the Cave 1 Hodayot Scroll: The Material Evidence,” *Revue de Qumran* 32 (2020): 195-211. In these two articles, the authors identify some new fragments and discusses problematic joins in previously published texts. Asaf Gayer, Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, and Jonathan Ben-Dov, “A New Join of Two Fragments of 4QcryptA Serek HaEdah and Its Implications,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 23 (2016): 139-54; Eibert Tigchelaar, “On the Unidentified Fragments of “DJD” XXXIII and PAM 43.680: A New Manuscript of “4QNarrative and Poetic Composition,” and Fragments of “4Q13,” “4Q269,” “4Q525,” and “4QSb”(?),” *Revue de Qumran* 21 (2004): 477-485. Additional comments on the relationship of the Qumran prayer texts to the corpus of Dead Sea Scrolls may be found in Kenneth Atkinson, “Understanding the History, Theology, and Community of the Psalms of Solomon in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” In *Psalms of Solomon: Texts, Contexts, and Intertexts*, Patrick Pouchelle, G. Anthony Keddie, and Kenneth Atkinson, eds. (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2021), 57-80. For new and updated insights concerning many of the topics discussed in this article, see further Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2021). See especially Magness’s discussions in this book on the Qumran community (pages 33-83), the ceramic corpus (pages 84-119), and the sacrificial altar (pages 142-67).