

CLAUDE COHEN-MATLOFSKY

Institut Universitaire d'Études Juives Élie Wiesel  
Séminaire Qumrân de Paris

**QUMRAN AND VICINITY:  
AN INTERPRETATION OF THE SCROLL CAVES,  
THEIR CONTENTS AND FUNCTIONS**

**Introduction**

The wealth of the literary material found in the caves of the Judean desert, mostly near Qumran, is unprecedented in the history of archaeology. In the vicinity of Qumran, as far as the texts are concerned, nothing was apocryphal let alone heretic, since nothing was yet canonical or dogmatic. Therefore everything was true, everything was prime material. We are not sure that there was even an intention for canonisation, let alone codification at that time. Nonetheless traces of exegesis and halakhic discussions are revealed by these written documents, but where did these documents originated from? The Qumran vicinity caves, including the newly discovered one (or rather re-discovered)<sup>1</sup>, are indeed

---

<sup>1</sup> The recent discovery of a twelfth cave (controversially numbered this way although no inscribed manuscripts were found in it, but there are reasons to believe that such manuscripts were removed, displaced and/or looted in the past) in the vicinity of Qumran ought to be mentioned here. In fact this cave had been excavated for two days 20 years ago in the mission «operation scrolls». It was then given the number 53 and the archaeological report was published in *Atiqot*. Although I am not going into detail because the material has yet to be thoroughly analysed, I can cite: «The finds from the excavation include not only the storage jars, which held the scrolls, but also fragments of scroll wrappings, a string that tied the scrolls, and a piece of worked leather that was a part of a scroll. The finding of pottery and of numerous flint blades, arrowheads, and a decorated stamp seal made of carnelian, a semi-precious stone, also revealed that this cave was used in the Chalcolithic and the Neolithic periods.» For further information about the discovery please see: <https://phys.org/news/2017-02-archaeologists-12th-dead-sea-scrolls.html>

the key to the enigma. In contrast to the other Judean desert caves, the Qumran caves were mainly a refuge for sacred manuscripts. The storage of these largely sacred manuscripts altogether reflecting a great intellectual and scribal activity point to a resistance movement by the people who deposited them, against — from their viewpoint—the urban impurity brought upon by the foreign rulers in Palestine with the duplicity of the Jewish authorities.

I argue that there are two main competing theories for Qumran; the second one being that the site of Qumran was used for mostly seasonal industrial activities rather than an “Essene monastery”. Yet, it is not necessary to argue that there are no links between the caves and the site of Qumran in order to propose an alternative hypothesis to the Essenes-Hypothesis. Indeed, we have to consider the Qumran caves manuscripts as archaeological artifacts and free ourselves from both the standard “Essenes-Hypothesis” and the standard “counter Essenes-Hypothesis”, in order to examine the data without any particular “agenda”.

The special attention I will pay to the “Qumran vicinity” caves in this study will be by contextualization. I will compare the archaeological material, including the scrolls, found in these caves as opposed to the other Judean desert caves. I will establish the grounds on which one can no longer deny the link between these caves and the site of Qumran. Finally I will expose my view on the functionality of these “Qumran vicinity” caves by revisiting both the theory of “the school of scribes” and that of “the Jerusalem Temple library”. For further clarity and in order to avoid the confusion making of the site of Qumran a centre for these caves, I will use the terminology “Qumran vicinity” caves and will restrict my study to the caves with manuscripts, 1Q to 11Q.

### **1- Contextualisation of the Qumran vicinity caves**

I shall attempt, in the following lines, to contextualize the “Qumran vicinity” caves in the network of the Judean desert caves. Indeed by contrast with the wealth and variety of the material found in the other Judean desert caves (daily life artefacts and personal documents)<sup>2</sup>, the paucity of the material other than manuscripts in the “Qumran vicinity”

---

See also Robert Cargill’s article here: <http://www.biblicalarchaeology.org/daily/biblical-artifacts/dead-sea-scrolls/new-dead-sea-scroll-cave/>

<sup>2</sup> See M. Popovic, “When and Why Were Caves Near Qumran and the Judean Desert Used?”, in M. Fidanzio (ed.), *The Caves of Qumran: Proceedings of the International Conference, Lugano 2014*, (STDJ 118; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2016) 177-183.

caves is indicative of the particular functionality that these caves must have had.

There is no evidence for considering that any of these “Qumran vicinity” caves were used for habitation. Rather, they were temporary shelters for shepherds, itinerary merchants and even for the teams who came to deposit some of the manuscripts. Indeed, Qumran was a caravansary<sup>3</sup> and therefore the caves were temporary refuges for the merchants. In addition, although the “Qumran vicinity” caves as a “*lieu d’habitat saisonnier*” makes no doubt for me as Jean-Baptiste Humbert puts it<sup>4</sup>, I would contend contrary to Humbert, that the trade was proportionately rich, considering the numerous Hasmonean and Herodian palaces on both shores of the Dead Sea and the prosperous Nabatean civilization at the time<sup>5</sup>. Moreover, one should especially consider the importance of

---

<sup>3</sup> See B. Callegher’s recent study on the monetarisation of the site of Qumran: “The Coins of Khirbet Qumran from the Digs of Roland de Vaux: Returning to Henri Seyrig and Augustus Spijkerman”, in M. Fidanzio (ed.), *The Caves of Qumran: Proceedings of the International Conference, Lugano 2014*, (STDJ 118; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2016) 221-237; see also D. Stacey in D. Stacey, G. Doudna and G. Avni, *Qumran Revisited, a Reassessment of the Archaeology of the Site and its Texts*, (BAR International Serie 2520; Oxford: Archaeopress, 2013) 7-73.

<sup>4</sup> “In any case the agricultural and industrial activities around the Dead Sea, despite the bitumen, the balsam, the palm dates, the pottery, the textiles, must have been relatively poor: another reason to consider Qumran as a seasonal dwelling location: *lieu d’habitat saisonnier*”, see J-B Humbert, “Cacher et se cacher à Qumrân: grottes et refuges. Morphologie, fonctions, anthropologie”, in M. Fidanzio (ed.), *The Caves of Qumran: Proceedings of the International Conference, Lugano 2014*, (STDJ 118; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2016) 34-66.

<sup>5</sup> See D. Stacey in D. Stacey, G. Doudna and G. Avni, *Qumran Revisited, a Reassessment of the Archaeology of the Site and its Texts*, (BAR International Serie 2520; Oxford: Archaeopress, 2013) 7-73. Also in light of what Jean-Baptiste Humbert has enhanced in his article above mentioned, I would contend that it is necessary to draw parallels with the oriental shore of the Dead Sea and especially with the Nabateans. Indeed, the Nabateans had built a very sophisticated canalisation and cisterns system around Petra. This system corresponds to the one at Qumran. Furthermore, the rock-cut tombs of Petra correspond by their external architecture at least, to the monumental tombs of the Kidron valley in Jerusalem of the same period, namely: the tomb of Zechariah, of the Bney Hezir and of Absalom. Another analogy has yet to be made ; it is the one between the individual graves at Qumran with the North-South orientation of the corpses, and the ones at Khirbet Qazone in Nabatea. Under Arétas IV, the best known nabatean king, who ruled from 9 BC to 41 CE, some nabatean hydro-engineers allowed an economic boost from the first century BC to the first century AD in Nabatea, see especially Z. Al-Muheisen, *The Water Engineering and Irrigation System of the Nabateans* (Jordan: Yarmouk University Press, 2009). This explains the architectural explosion between the year one and the year 75 CE. Diodorus Siculus, in his *Bibliotheca Historica* book XIX,

nearly Jericho as both a Hasmonean and a Herodian stronghold<sup>6</sup>.

In contrast with the other Judean desert caves the Qumran vicinity caves were used for the hiding/storage of sacred texts. Furthermore, without going into details, I shall refer the reader to the issue of the Qumran cemeteries here<sup>7</sup>. Indeed, they were mostly males buried at Qumran and in shafts. This corroborates the temporary aspect of the occupation of the caves with exclusively (until proven otherwise) male type activities. This being as it may, there are grounds to believe that the Qumran caves were linked to the site and I shall expand upon this aspect in the following section of this study.

What characterises the “Qumran vicinity” caves is the paucity of material attesting to longterm human occupation, let alone dwelling, by contrast with the refuges caves of the Bar Kokhba revolt. Mladen Popovic has established a well documented comparison of the archaeological material, including manuscripts, between the “Qumran vicinity” caves and the caves that were mostly known for occupation by the refugees in the time of the Bar Kokhba revolt. I shall refer the reader to his study which confirms the point I am making<sup>8</sup>. In fact, hand worked archaeological material like oil lamps for instance, other than the manuscripts, that were found at the entrance, or inside of some of these caves, may be related to the task performed by the people who came to deposit the manuscripts in the rocky hollows, or perhaps left by people who were occasional merchants, taking a rest in these marl crevices.

In addition, the paucity of “miscellaneous artefacts” material from the “Qumran vicinity” caves cannot be explained by natural catastroph-

describes the Nabateans as “the wealthiest people in the world”. The Nabateans were at the centre of the “arabic” trade at the time. However once Nabatea was transformed into the “Roman province of Arabia” in 106 CE, it corresponded to the end of the Nabatean civilisation per say.

Moreover, the onomastic in particular has shown that pottery sherds found on the Qumran site have diverse provenance including, Jericho, Hebron, Edom and Nabatea (Petra), this helps putting Qumran in context with diverse interrelations between Qumran and its surroundings, at least for trade.

<sup>6</sup> See supra, D. Stacey (2013); although I disagree with Stacey’s interpretation of the Qumran site’s archaeology.

<sup>7</sup> See G. Avni [https://www.academia.edu/12469684/Who\\_were\\_interred\\_in\\_the\\_Qumran\\_Cemetery](https://www.academia.edu/12469684/Who_were_interred_in_the_Qumran_Cemetery); see also R. Donceel, *Synthèse des observations faites en fouillant les tombes des nécropoles de Khirbet Qumrân et des environs/The Khirbet Qumran Cemeteries a Synthesis of the Archaeological Data*, in Z. J. Kapera (ed.), (The Qumran Chronicle 10; Cracow: Enigma Press, 2002).

<sup>8</sup> See supra, M. Popovic (2016).

ies or by the fact that they had been invested and/or looted. One thing we can be sure of and the “miscellaneous artefacts” confirms it, is that the “Qumran vicinity” caves were not used as permanent dwellings, not even as long term refuge. Dennis Mizzi enhances the paucity of “miscellaneous artefacts” from the “Qumran vicinity” caves in contrast with the other Judean desert caves<sup>9</sup>. Mizzi’s analysis of the “miscellaneous artefacts” confirms in my judgement, what we can consider a consensus now, concerning the inhabitability of the “Qumran vicinity” caves as a whole.

However, Joan Taylor contends that the Bedouin largely looted the “Qumran vicinity caves” of material, other than the scroll jars<sup>10</sup>. In my judgement, the real question in terms of the excavations of these caves and the paucity of the recorded “miscellaneous artefacts” material (or rather, the fact that it remains unpublished), is whether this material was considered substantial enough by the early excavators to be recorded. Or, did de Vaux (and other archaeologists) turn a blind eye to the alleged Bedouin looting of the non-textual material from these caves? In other words, are we forced to consider these caves in a different way from all other Judaean desert caves because de Vaux let the Bedouin loot archaeological material other than jars and the manuscripts, or did these caves mostly contain manuscripts and jars and were, therefore, always different because only manuscripts were ever hidden in them? Yet another scenario could be that the ancient teams behind the hiding (in the case of the “Jerusalem Temple library theory”), or the storage of the manuscripts in the Qumran caves (in the case of the school of scribes at or near Qumran), discarded all other material from these caves themselves in order to create a “sacred space for sacred manuscripts”. We may never have the answer. Notwithstanding the aforementioned considerations, scholars have to work on recorded and published material. It is simply a question of good methodology even though in this case, it is forced methodology, in a way. Given that the basis of the data

---

<sup>9</sup> See D. Mizzi, “Miscellaneous Artefacts from the Qumran Caves: an Exploration of their Significance”, in M. Fidanzio (ed.), *The Caves of Qumran: Proceedings of the International Conference, Lugano 2014*, (STDJ 118; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2016) 137-160.

<sup>10</sup> See J. Taylor, “The Qumran Caves in their Regional Context: A Chronological Review with a Focus on Bar Kokhba Assemblages”, in M. Fidanzio (ed.), *The Caves of Qumran: Proceedings of the International Conference, Lugano 2014*, (STDJ 118; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2016) 9.

basis should remain the existing published material<sup>11</sup>, it would be hard to argue against the position that the purpose of the Qumran caves was mainly for the hiding and storage of sacred texts<sup>12</sup>. Also in my judgement, one may assume that the caves, which are not easily accessible today could have been in antiquity. This being as it may, these caves could only have been hiding places for very precious manuscripts and temporary refuges for men, otherwise there would be no reason to go in them. Furthermore, the main road from Jericho to Ein Feshkha does not go through the cliff where these caves are located. It is obvious that these caves were very good hiding places since we discovered them only in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and only by chance. There is no doubt that the concern for long term conservation was behind the deposit of the manuscripts in the Qumran caves, especially in 1Q and 11Q. Indeed The Qumran caves under consideration in this study (1Q to 11Q), except for 11Q (and now 12 Q), contain only “scroll jars”, manuscripts and wrappers in very specific linen used to cover certain manuscripts, as main material.

Where did these manuscripts originated from? We have evidence that scrolls from the Temple library and probably some *bathey midrash* were hidden. We also have evidence that works from Jericho were stored in a Qumran annex and that there was a school of scribes in the area. Conversely, we are unable to prove that any of the documents in the caves of Qumran originated from private collections from the east shore of the Dead Sea as Jean-Baptiste Humbert<sup>13</sup> contends. According to Jean-Baptiste Humbert, the teams who deposited the manuscripts came mostly from the North: Jerusalem and Jericho, but also from Jewish communities of the eastern shore of the Dead Sea. For him this phenomenon has to be comprehended as a large process of cultural patrimony preservation. I find this idea interesting and worth further exploring, nonetheless Humbert has yet to convince me at this point.

Let's dwell for a moment on the thesis according to which the “Qumran vicinity” caves were a *genizah*. Indeed, regarding the “Qumran vicinity” caves' manuscripts the question remains whether they were buried or abandoned because they were improper for use and placed in caves that

---

<sup>11</sup> It is a well known fact that the *École Biblique et Archéologique Française* (EBAF) of Jérusalem has still many boxes of unpublished artefacts. However good methodology at this point consists in using the material that has been published.

<sup>12</sup> See M. Popovic, “Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crises ? A Comparative Perspective on Judaean Desert Manuscript Collections”, *JSJ* 43 (2012) 551-594.

<sup>13</sup> See supra, J-B Humbert (2016).

were relatively hard to access because the people who buried them had no intention of returning to get them. Or were they saved from possible destruction, in which case, they were very well hidden and saved for future use. In the first instance we can talk about a *genizah*; in the second, about deposits/archives stacks. I do believe that some of these Qumran caves documents could be considered as improper for use, especially the ones including scribal marks and the opistographs. But again the question is: “improper for use” for whom and what: for liturgy and priests reading them, for teaching by the scribes and rabbis? In my judgement it is the *genizah* theory that is “improper for use” when applied to the Qumran caves documents because of the anachronism implied in the very concept itself of a *genizah*.

Eleazar Sukenik was first to develop the *genizah* thesis, defining a *genizah* as a hiding place for sacred books which were damaged and out of use. He also established a link between the linen wraps of Qumran and the *mitpahoth hasefarim* in which were wrapped abandoned books<sup>14</sup>. The *genizah* thesis was followed by Joan Taylor (among others)<sup>15</sup> who saw the “Qumran vicinity” caves as “burials for manuscripts until the end of time”. Taylor is reluctant to use the term *genizah*, even though it is the same concept as a burial. She just wants to avoid a possible anachronism. Taylor then very much links the manuscripts to the sect of the Essenes with their esoteric, eschatological literature. In my view, she is wrong in neglecting the other type of literature which has also been “buried” in these caves, and according to her own terminology, is not concerned with the “end of time”.

Therefore these caves were likely at most “refuges” for sacred manuscripts and I argue that we need to free ourselves from the triangular framework of the Qumran site-manuscripts caves-Essenes<sup>16</sup>.

---

<sup>14</sup> Scroll wrappings are mentioned in the Mishnah but what I find most interesting is their rank in sanctity/purity as it is presented in this rabbinic source. Indeed, in the Mishnah *Meg.* 3, 1 one can find what I would call the «russian dolls of sanctity/purity»; the scroll wrappings being third in the scale of importance after the books (of the Scriptures) and the copy of the Law.

<sup>15</sup> See especially H. E. Del Medico, *The Riddle of the Scrolls*, (London : Burke, 1958); also see supra, J. Taylor “Burial Manuscripts and Empty Tombs : the Genizah Hypothesis Reconsidered”, in A.M. Maeir, J. Magness, L.H. Schiffman (eds.) ‘*Go out and Study the Land*’ (*Judges 18 :2*) : *Archaeological, Historical and Textual Studies in Honor of Hanan Eshel*’, (JSJSup 148, Leiden: Brill, 2011) 269-315.

<sup>16</sup> See C. Cohen-Matlofsky, “Réflexions sur Qumrân, les manuscrits, le site et les origines de la mystique dans l’Antiquité”, *The Qumran Chronicle* 22 (2014) 74-118 ; see also E. Tigchelaar, [https://www.academia.edu/354447/\\_The\\_White\\_Dress\\_of\\_the\\_](https://www.academia.edu/354447/_The_White_Dress_of_the_)

Nonetheless the issue of the habitability and of the functions of the Qumran vicinity caves had been discussed over the years. A short historiography is needed at this point of my study. Indeed, de Vaux<sup>17</sup> said that all the caves at Qumran were dwellings and that the site was a community centre. Broshi and Eshel<sup>18</sup> contend that only the marl caves were inhabited and the majority of scholars join them. Jean-Baptiste Humbert contends: “The natural caves of the vicinity of Qumran do not deserve this appellation because they were provoked by earthquakes therefore they are small and not proper for permanent dwellings, not even for the dwelling of “the Essene sect of the Qumran site”. Thus these caves are hiding places, or at the most refuges, temporary shelters for shepherds. Nothing in the arrangement, the furniture, not even the “foyers”, could lead us to different conclusions”. Moreover : “for caves that were difficult to reach, if they were considered for dwelling we would have found a network of paths between them at least. But we did not”, adds Humbert<sup>19</sup>. On this point he is contradicted by the study of Taylor and Gibson<sup>20</sup>. For Humbert, the marl caves were hewn for ultimate refuge but not for hiding manuscripts. I disagree with this statement given the fact that cave 4Q where two thirds of the manuscripts were found, had been human hewn. However others, like Joseph Patrich<sup>21</sup>, question even the habitability of the marl caves, in light of the paucity of the archaeological material. According to Joseph Patrich<sup>22</sup> these caves were temporarily or permanently used by diverse groups, including Roman

---

Essenes\_and\_the\_Pythagoreans; see also S. Mason, <http://orion.mscc.huji.ac.il/symposiums/programs/Mason00-1.shtml> and idem, <http://www.biblicalarchaeology.org/daily/biblical-artifacts/dead-sea-scrolls/josephus-on-the-essenes/>

<sup>17</sup> See R. de Vaux, *L'archéologie et les manuscrits de la mer Morte*, (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1959, London: Oxford University Press, 1961).

<sup>18</sup> See M. Broshi and H. Eshel, “Residential Caves at Qumran”, *DSD* 6 (1999) 328-48.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. my notes on J-B. Humbert’s presentation at the international conference on the Caves of Qumrân in Lugano in 2014.

<sup>20</sup> See J. Taylor and S. Gibson, “Qumran Connected: The Paths and Passes of the North-Western Dead Sea”, in J. Frey and C. Claussen (eds.), *Qumran und Archäologie-wechselseitige Perspektiven* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011) 1-51.

<sup>21</sup> See J. Patrich, “Khirbet Qumran in Light of New Archaeological Explorations in the Qumran Caves”, in M.O. Wise et al. (eds.), *Methods of Investigations in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, (ANYAS 722, New York : New York Academy of Sciences, 1994) 73-95.

<sup>22</sup> See supra, J. Patrich (1994) 90 ; see also J. Patrich, B. Arubas and E. Naot, “Jewish Caves of Refuge in the Cliffs of Nahal Mishmar”, *Qadmoniot* 19 (1986) 45-50 (Hebrew); see also J. Patrich, “Was There an Extra Mural Dwelling Quarter at Qumran?”, *Qadmoniot* 21/115 (1998) 66-67 (Hebrew).



soldiers. Indeed, for Taylor the nails and sandals found in the caves are to be related to Roman soldiers who occupied the site in 68<sup>23</sup>. The later scholars want to consider these caves as temporary refuges. According to Hirshfeld<sup>24</sup>, the “Qumran vicinity” caves were refuges for hermits, shepherds, passers-by. In addition, Taylor<sup>25</sup> and Stökl Ben Ezra<sup>26</sup>, contend that these caves functioned as storage places for manuscripts and/or as workshops. Jurgen Zangenberg distinguishes himself from the other scholars who studied the Qumran vicinity caves, in these terms: “The caves have their own history which may sometimes interfere with the one of the Qumran site and sometimes not”<sup>27</sup>. Whilst it is true that we need to free ourselves from the Essenes-Hypothesis, I disagree with Jurgen Zangenberg to a certain extent. Indeed, Zangenberg bases his hypothesis on the assumption that what de Vaux did not reveal is comparable to the Bar Kokhba caves material. I argue that as a matter of fact, among the material found in those “Qumran vicinity” caves and revealed through publication thus far, there are not enough artefacts from daily life, no traces of big *foyers* for meals, no personal documents to attest to the long-term dwelling or temporary refuge in any of these caves. In this sense already they should be considered as different from the other Judaean desert caves. Moreover, Zangenberg rightly reminds us that the “Qumran vicinity” caves were poorly excavated by Roland de Vaux who did not make systematic and scientific *rappports de fouilles*. According to Zangenberg, these caves are far from being unique in the Judaean desert. However, following the discovery of the first biblical

---

<sup>23</sup> See supra, J. Taylor (2016) 23; idem, [https://www.academia.edu/204973/\\_Kh.\\_Qumran\\_in\\_Period\\_III\\_PROOF\\_ONLY](https://www.academia.edu/204973/_Kh._Qumran_in_Period_III_PROOF_ONLY); see also M. Popovic, [https://www.academia.edu/402774/\\_Roman\\_Book\\_Destruction\\_in\\_Qumran\\_Cave\\_4\\_and\\_the\\_Roman\\_Destruction\\_of\\_Khirbet\\_Qumran\\_Revisited\\_.Forthcoming\\_in\\_2011\\_in\\_a\\_volume\\_edited\\_by\\_J%C3%B6rg\\_Frey\\_et\\_al.\\_on\\_Qumran\\_and\\_Archaeology](https://www.academia.edu/402774/_Roman_Book_Destruction_in_Qumran_Cave_4_and_the_Roman_Destruction_of_Khirbet_Qumran_Revisited_.Forthcoming_in_2011_in_a_volume_edited_by_J%C3%B6rg_Frey_et_al._on_Qumran_and_Archaeology)

<sup>24</sup> See Y. Hirshfeld, *Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence* (Massachusetts: Peabody, 2004).

<sup>25</sup> See J. E. Taylor, “Burial Manuscripts and Empty Tombs: the Genizah Hypothesis Reconsidered”, in A.M. Maeir, J. Magness, L.H. Schiffman (eds.) ‘*Go out and Study the Land*’ (Judges 18 :2): *Archaeological, Historical and Textual Studies in Honor of Hanan Eshel*’, (JSJSup 148, Leiden: Brill, 2011) 269-315.

<sup>26</sup> See D. Stökl Ben Ezra, “Old Caves and Young Caves: A Statistical Reevaluation of a Qumran Consensus”, *DSD* 14/3 (2007) 313-333.

<sup>27</sup> See J. Zangenberg, “The Functions of the Caves and the Settlement of Qumran: Reflections on a New Chapter of Qumran Research”, in M. Fidanzio (ed.), *The Caves of Qumran: Proceedings of the International Conference, Lugano 2014*, (STDJ 118; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2016) 195-212.

scrolls, Roland de Vaux undertook to systematically excavate as many caves as possible in order to recover as many manuscripts as was feasible. The caves, like the site of Qumran, far from being isolated dwellings, were easily and largely accessible from the north, the south and the west by a network of trails and paths used ever since the late Bronze Age. They were reused during the Hasmonean and Herodian periods, as Taylor and Gibson have proved<sup>28</sup>, and this without taking into consideration their accessibility from a possible route from the Mediterranean sea. For Zangenberg, therefore, caves and site are not to be linked to an Essene sect or other specific groups and we need to break the frame of de Vaux's concerning the link between the caves, the manuscripts, the site and the Essene sect. He adds that one cannot neglect the fact that these caves were refuges, like the Bar Kokhba ones. For Zangenberg still, one has to apprehend these caves as being part of a network of caves in the desert as opposed to isolated ones with a center being the Qumran site. At a certain moment some people decided to hide their valuable manuscripts in caves that had other functions before and perhaps after, he adds.

I argue that excavations show that the Bar Kokhba rebels occupied caves ranging geographically from the area of Jericho in the north, all the way to Ein Gedi in the south, including one near 11Q and one near 3Q<sup>29</sup>. However, it seems that the "Qumran vicinity" caves contained much less Bar Kokhba type material. Be that as it may, Joseph Patrich<sup>30</sup> says that the caves, from Jericho to Nahal Hever were occupied by refugees of the two revolts against the Romans but there was apparently no occupation of the "Qumran vicinity" caves by any of these refugees from the two revolts against the Romans. It is very likely that the Bar Kokhba rebels were looking for any strongfold position in the desert and the Qumran site having once served as a fort according to Yizhar Hirschfeld,<sup>31</sup> must have been at least investigated by them. However, the Bar Kokhba rebels did not use the "Qumran vicinity" caves as permanent refuges. In addition, Mireille B elis in her doctoral thesis, ad-

---

<sup>28</sup> See supra, J. Taylor and S. Gibson (2011).

<sup>29</sup> See Y. Yadin, *Bar-Kokhba, The Rediscovery of the Legendary Hero of the Last Jewish Revolt against Imperial Rome*, (London; Jerusalem: Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1971); see also P. Sch afer (ed.), *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered New Perspectives on the Second Jewish Revolt against Rome*, (TSAJ 100; T ubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003).

<sup>30</sup> See supra, J. Patrich (1994).

<sup>31</sup> See Y. Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence* (Massachusetts: Peabody, 2004).

vances the theory that the Bar Kokhba rebels may have even defended the “Qumran vicinity” caves against attacks from the Romans<sup>32</sup>. The Bar Kokhba rebels did not use these caves as refuges for a particular reason that I develop in my conclusion.

Furthermore, Bruno Callegher<sup>33</sup> has shown convincingly that the Qumran site had been used for commercial purposes, due to the considerable quantity of coins dating to the Hellenistic and Roman periods that were found there. He argues that there was a trade of fruit dates, pottery, bitumen, perfumes and oil/ resin with healing properties, balsams, textiles, etc. The fact that there were no coins found in the caves indicates that the “Qumran vicinity” caves were simply not inhabited.

Nonetheless, the fact that these caves were not inhabited does not prevent us to link them to the site.

## **2- The link between the Qumran vicinity caves and the site of Qumran**

Indeed whilst I found de Vaux and his followers’ methodology of linking the caves to the site of Qumran to be based on the “Essenes community hypothesis” unacceptable, I refute the opposing argument that involves breaking any links between the caves and the site in order to contradict this theory. My methodology is based on published archaeological data that allow me to link the Qumran vicinity caves with the site while refuting the “Essenes community hypothesis”.

As for the topography, the manuscripts caves are located 1km north and 1km south of the site of Qumran. This implies the undeniable participation of the site in the hiding/storage of these documents. I would add that the site of Qumran has to be understood at least both as a scroll jars manufacturing facility and as a centre for a school of scribes, some of whom may have had an interest in esoterica, during the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

That these early-numbered caves have to be linked with the site of Qumran is not in doubt, especially after the thorough analysis by Jodi Magness<sup>34</sup> of the cylindrical jars, so unique to Qumran; but also

---

<sup>32</sup> See M. Bélis’ doctoral thesis on: [https://www.academia.edu/12645690/Th%C3%A8se\\_de\\_doctorat\\_Les\\_textiles\\_de\\_Qumr%C3%A2n\\_Arch%C3%A9ologie\\_technologie\\_et\\_histoire\\_4\\_avril\\_2004\\_soutenue\\_%C3%A0\\_l'Ecole\\_Pratique\\_des\\_Hautes\\_Etudes\\_Section\\_des\\_Sciences\\_Religieuses](https://www.academia.edu/12645690/Th%C3%A8se_de_doctorat_Les_textiles_de_Qumr%C3%A2n_Arch%C3%A9ologie_technologie_et_histoire_4_avril_2004_soutenue_%C3%A0_l'Ecole_Pratique_des_Hautes_Etudes_Section_des_Sciences_Religieuses)

<sup>33</sup> See supra, B. Callegher (2016).

<sup>34</sup> See J. Magness, *The Archeology of Qumran and The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand

because kilns were found at the site. The “Qumran vicinity caves are linked to the site as well through the oil lamps, as Jolanta Mlynarczyk has shown<sup>35</sup>. I am also prepared to link the caves in the vicinity of Qumran, to the site itself, through their textiles since a whorl was found in cave 3Q, and especially through the color blue on the stripes of these textiles. In fact, Mireille Bélis was pointing out an *indigoterie* (indigo factory) at Ein Feshkha, only 3km South of Qumran<sup>36</sup>. Although Ehud Netzer’s<sup>37</sup> analysis of the pools at Ein Feshkha is different, I remain more convinced by Mireille Bélis’s<sup>38</sup>. Indeed the site and the caves can be linked through the textiles. Eight out of the eleven caves of the vicinity of Qumran contained textiles with attested provenance, especially 1Q and 11Q. There were more manuscripts preserved in linen than was previously thought. The social background of the people who obtained these textiles was a privileged one since the indigo, largely used, was an expansive pigment and the linen needed twice as much dye than wool to be sustainably colored. The preparation of the textile, the dye, the cut with the right dimensions in order to wrap the manuscripts, discredits the Essenes theory but also the theory that these manuscripts were hidden in a hurry. Indeed, manuscripts, textiles and the wrapping then the deposit in jars in the caves could not have been done speedily, but rather with the intention for storage as a library/archives<sup>39</sup>.

Some of the Qumran cave 1Q textiles have fringes, just like textiles of other Judaeen desert caves. We still have to question the function of the fringes on cloth. Bélis and Taylor agree on the fact that the use of textiles with fringes would not have been very convenient in the wrapping process of the manuscripts. Therefore the textiles with fringes must have had another function in the Qumran caves. The Temple Scroll of

---

Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).

<sup>35</sup> See J. Mlynarczyk, “Terracota Oil Lamps (Roland de Vaux’s Excavations of the Caves)”, in M. Fidanzio (ed.), *The Caves of Qumran: Proceedings of the International Conference, Lugano 2014*, (STDJ 118; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2016) 109-122.

<sup>36</sup> See M. Bélis, [https://www.academia.edu/22936379/QUMRAN\\_a\\_MODE-NA\\_-L\\_INDIGO\\_DES\\_TEXILES\\_DE\\_LA\\_GROTTE\\_1Q](https://www.academia.edu/22936379/QUMRAN_a_MODE-NA_-L_INDIGO_DES_TEXILES_DE_LA_GROTTE_1Q)

<sup>37</sup> See E. Netzer, “Did any Perfume Industry Exist at ‘Ein Feshkha?’”, *IEJ* 55 (2005) 97-100.

<sup>38</sup> See M. Bélis: [https://www.academia.edu/6989709/The\\_Production\\_of\\_Indigo\\_Dye\\_in\\_the\\_Installations\\_of\\_Ain\\_Feshka\\_by\\_Mireille\\_B%C3%A9lis\\_pp\\_253-61\\_Qumran\\_The\\_Site\\_of\\_the\\_Dead\\_Sea\\_Scrolls\\_Archaeological\\_Interpretations\\_and\\_Debates\\_BRILL\\_2006\\_Author\\_J.-B.\\_Humbert\\_J.\\_ZANGENBERG\\_K.GALOR\\_ed](https://www.academia.edu/6989709/The_Production_of_Indigo_Dye_in_the_Installations_of_Ain_Feshka_by_Mireille_B%C3%A9lis_pp_253-61_Qumran_The_Site_of_the_Dead_Sea_Scrolls_Archaeological_Interpretations_and_Debates_BRILL_2006_Author_J.-B._Humbert_J._ZANGENBERG_K.GALOR_ed)

<sup>39</sup> The Nag Hammadi manuscripts in Upper Egypt dating to the second and third centuries were also found stored in jars.

cave 11Q was wrapped in a fringed textile for instance. The question remains regarding the wraps with fringes. According to Mireille Béliis the fringes could have allowed the scrolls to be tightened in a special way<sup>40</sup>? Furthermore, she writes: “Le corpus textile ne manque pas de fragments unissant du lin et du cuir. Il provient exclusivement des grottes de Qumrân ou de leurs abords immédiats ... Il est bien établi que dans les grottes 1Q, 4Q, 8Q et 11Q les pièces de cuir et les vestiges ‘d’étoffes et de ficelles’ ont bien été trouvés ensemble<sup>41</sup>.” As far as I am concerned, the fringes make me think of *talithim* with *tsitsit*. Especially if we consider the double lines of indigo which are identical to the ones found on *talithim*. Are the Qumran textiles very specific? Yes they are; and the specificity has to do with the fact that these textiles are associated with the deposit of the manuscripts. However, this is not always the case, since in minor caves as well as in the Qumran cemeteries, typical Qumran textiles were found without any accompanying manuscripts. This may have been because the manuscripts were taken out of their wrappings; in one case, fragments of parchment were found in one of the textiles.<sup>42</sup> Furthermore, it is a known fact that Bedouin unwrapped the Qumran manuscripts and discarded the linen wrappings sometimes *in situ*. Sometimes folded textiles were used as lids for the manuscripts jars, as was the case in cave 1Q<sup>43</sup>. One may argue that there is an homogeneous corpus of Qumran textiles with lines or rectangles of indigo dye. The fabrics found in the Qumran vicinity caves were woven for a particular aim: to preserve the manuscripts, especially to protect them from water, from vermin and from dampness in general. In some cases Béliis was even able to match the linen wrap with a particular scroll. TQ1 (textile found in cave 1Q) was most probably wrapping the scroll of Hodayot<sup>44</sup>. Moreover, since sometimes fragments of linen were found inside a scroll whilst sometimes fragments of skin were found inside

---

<sup>40</sup> See M. Béliis, “Des textiles catalogues et commentaires”, in J-B Humbert and J. Gunneweg (eds.), *Khirbet Qumrân et ‘Ain Feshkha II, Études d’anthropologie, de physique et de chimie*, (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus, Series Archaeologica 3; Fribourg: Academy Press, 2003) 231.

<sup>41</sup> See supra, M. Béliis (2003) 238-239 and 241, especially in her catalogue D027 from 11Q and D052 from 4Q with the description saying that a leather thong was attached to the linen of the kind that was used to fasten scrolls.

<sup>42</sup> See supra, M. Béliis (2003) 225.

<sup>43</sup> See supra, M. Béliis’ doctoral thesis; see also supra, M. Béliis, 2003, 207-276, especially No. D053 of her catalogue most probably originating from cave 4Q.

<sup>44</sup> See supra, M. Béliis (2003) 234-237 for the details of her hypothesis.

a textile, Bélis infers that there were diverse techniques of wrapping. Linen is ideal, because it is almost impermeable for a while as opposed to wool. As for the decoration, blue stripes or rectangles, or for the indigo dye, they play no role in the preservation. Nevertheless, it is interesting to notice that the *talithim* also have blue stripes<sup>45</sup>. I will attempt an explanation at this point, even though it may seem rather far-fetched and here I am opposing Dennis Mizzi<sup>46</sup> at least for some of the scrolls. In my view, the practice of wrapping these sacred manuscripts in some cases with fringed textiles, moreover decorated with blue stripes, would correspond to the practice of wrapping oneself in a prayer shawl. In other words, shouldn't we see in the fact of wrapping these manuscripts a precursor to the one consisting in wrapping oneself in a prayer shawl for liturgy? These manuscripts being sacred and protected from impurity by these fringed linen wraps just like human beings would have purified themselves and been wrapped in *talithim* in order to protect themselves from impurity prior to communicating with God. However, whilst I realize that I am anthropomorphizing the manuscripts, I would argue that a further study in the historiography of the use of the *talith* is now needed<sup>47</sup>.

One has to notice as well the absence of *Sha'atnez* in the textiles of Roman Palestine, as opposed to Palmyra or Coptic Egypt where many garments of mixed wool and linen were found.

All of the Qumran caves textiles are of linen. The use of linen for weaving is quoted in Pliny<sup>48</sup>, Strabon<sup>49</sup> and the Mishnah<sup>50</sup>. However the other sources do not mention this activity in Roman Palestine, not Flavius Josephus in any case. Meanwhile Josephus mentions all kinds of other agricultural activities. Therefore Shamir and Sukenik<sup>51</sup> infer that

<sup>45</sup> As for the rectangle decorations, some scholars (Yadin, Crowfoot, Magness), wanted to see a symbolic representation of the Temple basis.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. his presentation at the EABS /IOQS 2016 meeting in Leuven: "Were Scrolls Susceptible to Impurity? A Possible Halakhic Justification for a Cave 'Library' at Qumran", forthcoming in an article of the proceedings to be published at Peeters.

<sup>47</sup> See Harry Fox's presentation at the EABS/IOQS 2016 conference in Leuven: "The Sociology of Signs: Tefillin and Tzitzit in Tannaitic Literature", forthcoming in an article of the proceedings to be published at Peeters.

<sup>48</sup> See *Naturalis Historia*, XIX.

<sup>49</sup> See *Geographica*, VII.

<sup>50</sup> See M. *Shab* 7 : 2.

<sup>51</sup> The paper of Orit Shamir and Naama Sukenik was finally not published in the volume of the Lugano 2014 international conference proceedings. Therefore this is quoted out of my personal notes taken while attending this conference.

this activity became important in Judea-Palaestina only in the second half of the second century CE. I argue that there are a number of other things that Josephus does not mention. In fact he could not tell us about every aspect of the society at the time. Interestingly, Flavius Josephus does not mention either Qumran or the Dead Sea Scrolls<sup>52</sup>. Nor does the

---

<sup>52</sup> In a lengthy private exchange that I recently had with Steve Mason, he was pointing out to me the following: “to your question: ‘has anyone ever wonder why Josephus does not mention the Dead Sea Scrolls phenomenon?’ I suspect that the answer is ‘Yes, many people’, but more implicitly than explicitly. The question why Josephus *doesn’t mention* any particular X (e.g. in *War*: Jesus, John the Baptist, the early Christians, Justus of Tiberias, taxation, economic causes of the war, biblical covenant, several procurators and some legates in Antioch, the structure and weaponry of auxiliary cohorts, Bannus, the Fourth Philosophy, many towns and villages of the region, money or coin production, ritual baths, meals ...) tends to arise from a certain view of Josephus: as an observer and recorder of everything significant (to us). So, if he doesn’t mention something we consider significant, we consider that a problem needing an explanation. When I suggest that the question has been noticed with respect to Qumran and the Scrolls, implicitly, I mean that the Qumran-Essene identification is based upon this issue to a large extent ... Over there we have Josephus’ accounts, which do not mention these groups or their scrolls or Qumran but DO describe in some detail the ‘Essenes’, whose way of life overlaps in significant ways. *Ergo, the communities of the Scrolls must be Essenes*. That is the only rational explanation of Josephus’ silence about such an important phenomenon: that he was not silent about it, but called it by a different name. This is a cornerstone, as you know, of the Q-E hypothesis, and repeated often, by Jim Vanderkam and others. But the logic is only impressive if one ignores the *hundreds or thousands of other interesting phenomena that Josephus fails to mention* ... The reality is that Josephus does not tell us about *the vast majority of events, groups, and personalities of his time*. This is no criticism of him. He could not have done otherwise. He wrote stories, and stories are highly selective in relation to the complexity of real life with its huge casts of actors ... Josephus doesn’t even tell us much about *himself* during the war, outside of his allegedly brilliant defence of Iotapata...So, my answer would be twofold. First, yes: Josephus’ failure to mention Qumran and scrolls etc. has been a recognised problem for people who considered him a universal chronicler or database of interesting things. But second, once we recognise the actual nature of his writings — as highly selective, shaped narratives, which include only (a) what he considers useful for his story and (b) what he thinks his Roman audiences will understand...I replied to Steve then: “As for your response to my first question, ... I do believe that **Josephus could have mentioned** the scrolls cache in his *Antiquities* since they were the first tangible evidence of ‘the Bible’, then he even could have directed his audience to Qumran to find them. Let alone the Q-E hypothesis **Josephus could have mentioned** a school of scribes near Qumran or any other school of scribes in Judea. Even more, he could simply have mentioned the DSS along with his description of the Essenes. **Or he could have mentioned** the ‘authority behind the decision’ to hide the Temple library or other Jerusalem libraries (Norman Golb’s theory) in the Qumran caves ... Hence I am inclined to believe that these scrolls (over 900) were hidden in the most secret way that not even ‘a Josephus’ would have known of. Besides, do you really think that Josephus knew

New Testament and the rabbinic literature mention them. Moreover, the Essenes are mentioned neither in the Qumran documents, the rabbinic literature nor in the New Testament.

Furthermore unlike the other Judaeen desert caves, the “Qumran vicinity” caves should only be taken in consideration with the site of Qumran to which they are strictly linked. Indeed for Mizzi<sup>53</sup> the general lack of everyday objects in the “Qumran vicinity” caves, above all so-called “miscellaneous artefacts” implies that activities linked to various commonplace items took place on the site of Qumran, not inside the caves. I would just argue that some of the manuscripts came from elsewhere therefore some of the other artefacts found in the caves could have been brought, like oil lamps for instance, by the team behind the hiding of the manuscripts. Nevertheless, the Qumran caves were linked to the site of Qumran for industrial activities such as pottery and textiles, along with manuscript preparation (in some instances).

In summary thus far, the caves are linked to the site of Qumran through the typical cylindrical jars, the oil lamps, the kilns, the textiles with the color blue, the whorl, the ink wells, also the composition of the ink with bromine from the Dead Sea<sup>54</sup> and perhaps the *kalamoi*. I shall expand on the three later items in the following section.

### 3- The school of scribes<sup>55</sup> theory revisited

The peculiar orthography, morphological features of the Qumran caves manuscripts besides evidence of scribal practices on some other archaeological support found on the site of Qumran, lead me to reconsider, along with Emanuel Tov and André Lemaire (among others), the theory of a school of scribes at or near Qumran<sup>56</sup>.

---

everything about life and people in Judaea-Palaestina ... ? I do not. Therefore, I contend that there may have been matters Josephus was not aware of, one of them being the DSS phenomenon” ...

<sup>53</sup> See supra, Mizzi (2016).

<sup>54</sup> See D. Stökl Ben Ezra, “Le mystère des rouleaux de Qumrân, perspectives historiques et archéologiques”, *Les Cahiers du judaïsme* 29 (2010) 104-119 ; see also I. Rabin, O. Hahn, T. Wolff, A. Masic, and G. Weinberg, “On the Origin of the Ink of the Thanksgiving Scroll (1QHodayot)”, *DSD* 16/1 (2009) 97-106.

<sup>55</sup> On the profession of scribe in Jewish Antiquity see C. Hézszer: [https://www.academia.edu/32196693/\\_Scribes\\_proofs\\_](https://www.academia.edu/32196693/_Scribes_proofs_)

<sup>56</sup> See E. Tov, “Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible and Qumran: Collected Essays”, *Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism* 121 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008) 116-119.



The most recent cave discovery (or rather rediscovery) led me to believe that the piece of parchment found in this cave, which is not inscribed and thicker than usual, could have been “a parchment in process”, being prepared by the scribes for copying. Robert Cargill writes: “Gutfeld and Price’s recent discovery of curing jars, leather, textiles and a blank piece of parchment is but the latest piece of evidence supporting the theory that Qumran was, in fact, a place of scribal activity, and perhaps even of scribal implement production”<sup>57</sup>. Moreover Sidnie White Crawford reminds us about other uninscribed parchment being reported by Roland de Vaux: “In addition, de Vaux mentions re-covering debris of cloth, wood and leather (uninscribed?)”<sup>58</sup>.

Furthermore, three ink wells<sup>59</sup> were found *in situ* and perhaps some *kalamos*<sup>60</sup> and even though no fragments of manuscripts were found on the site of Qumran, I am still inclined to contend that there was scribal activity at the site of Qumran and that there was a school of scribes hence the imperfections, including scribal marks<sup>61</sup> on some of the man-

<sup>57</sup> See R. Cargill, <http://www.biblicalarchaeology.org/daily/biblical-artifacts/dead-sea-scrolls/new-dead-sea-scroll-cave/>. Interestingly, besides the “parchment in process” a little box with linen fibres before weaving was found in this cave, as if it was indeed a scribes’ workshop.

<sup>58</sup> See S. White Crawford: <https://www.academia.edu/33083023/Cave4BrookeFestschrift.pdf> (2017) 108; see also W. Fields, “*The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Full History*”, Vol I, (Leiden: Brill, 2009) 153.

<sup>59</sup> Found in locus 30 and 31, with the one of locus 30 being made out of clay from Jerusalem.

<sup>60</sup> For instance the “*pointe de bois*” from a cave illustrated in *DJD* III pl. VII, p.9 and in the Appendix of M. Fidanio (ed.), *The Caves of Qumran: Proceedings of the International Conference, Lugano 2014*, (STDJ 118; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2016) 308; also “*une tige de bronze*” from cave A grotte A mentioned in *DJD* III p. 13. As a comment on an excerpt of this study that I had published here: <http://www.bibleinterp.com/articles/2017/05/coh418011.shtml>, Stephen Goranson wrote: “... We agree that there were scribes at Qumran (there was writing on pottery and stone there) ... The Schöyén palm item, reported by Kando, not an archaeologist, to be from a 11Q jar, despite ink traces, is probably not a pen, according to Ira Rabin in *Gleanings from the Caves*, though it may be a scribal tool of some other sort. Similarly, the item in the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary does not appear to be a pen, and in any case it is unprovenanced ...” My reply was: “... As for the *kalamos* I shall refer you to the unpublished *rappports de fouilles* of Roland de Vaux that you can access at the library of the (ÉBAF) École biblique et archéologique de Jérusalem. Furthermore we have yet to reopen some boxes of Qumran material stored at the Rockefeller Museum and which was never properly analyzed ... This being as it may, I acknowledge that we still have to double check the other examples of pens including their provenance”.

<sup>61</sup> See supra, E. Tov (2016) 92-94.

uscripts, but also some inscriptions found *in situ*. This scribal activity gives us yet another way of linking the caves to the site. One may open the debate here on the issue of the “tanneries” at or near Qumran, linked to the unusual number of cisterns. The tanneries constitute evidence of parchment preparation, with salt from the Dead Sea as facilitating the removal of hair from the animals skins<sup>62</sup>. As for the manuscripts found in the Qumran caves Emanuel Tov notices: “Undoubtedly, at least some of the leather scrolls were produced locally (as can be proven by DNA analysis comparing the scrolls with hides of local animals, both ancient and present day)”<sup>63</sup>. Moreover, going in the direction of scribal activity at Qumran, Sidnie White Crawford reconsiders cave 4Q’s inner architecture, its archaeology and manuscript collection. I refer the reader to her article that corroborates the point I am making in this part of my study<sup>64</sup>.

My intention is not to revisit the controversy on the *scriptorium* (in medieval terminology) that led Stegemann<sup>65</sup> following de Vaux<sup>66</sup> to think that all the manuscripts were copied at Qumran, whereas Golb’s<sup>67</sup>

<sup>62</sup> See J. B. Poole and R. Reed, “The ‘Tannery’ of ‘Ain Feshkha”, *PEQ* 93 (1961) 114-123; especially on page 120: “Significantly, however, sodium is generally present in the scroll ashes in considerable amounts and this would strongly support the view that solutions of common salt were used in the preparation of the scroll skins as, indeed, Maimonides states in his description of the preparation of skins for scroll purposes”; see *Mishneh Torah*: Laws concerning Phylacteries, the *Mezuzah* and the Scroll of the Law, I, 6. Poole and Reed were not able to test any of the pools in Qumran itself for their use as tanneries, but they do mention salt from the Dead Sea as being used in the process of parchment preparation at Qumran: see supra, D. Stacey, (2013) 54. It was because de Vaux assumed that scrolls were written at Qumran that Poole and Reed were not able to test for residues of tanneries there. This could have helped determining whether or not the numerous cisterns of Qumran could have been used as tanneries. I do not see why we could not have tanneries at Qumran and a school of scribes.

<sup>63</sup> See E. Tov, “Scribal Characteristics of the Qumran Scrolls”, in M. Fidanzio (ed.), *The Caves of Qumran: Proceedings of the International Conference, Lugano 2014*, (STDJ 118; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2016) 87.

<sup>64</sup> See S. White Crawford: <https://www.academia.edu/33083023/Cave4BrookeFestschrift.pdf> (2017) 105-119.

<sup>65</sup> See H. Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran: on the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist and Jesus* (Grand Rapids, MI/Leiden: Eerdmans/Brill, 1998) 51-55.

<sup>66</sup> See supra, R. de Vaux (1961) 23-26; see also idem, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1959; rev. ed.; London: Oxford University Press, 1973) 29-33; see also R. Reich, “A Note on the function of room 30 (the ‘Scriptorium’) at Khirbeth Qumran”, *JJS* 46 (1995) 157-60.

<sup>67</sup> See N. Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?: The Search For the Secret of Qumran* (New York: Scribner, 1995).

view is that they were brought to the Qumran caves from Jerusalem. Rather I shall attempt to prove that the scribal activity at Qumran is based on other kinds of links that can be established between the caves and the site of Qumran, leaving the “Essenes Hypothesis” aside.

For example, *mezuzot* and *tefillin* were found in cave 4Q. In my judgement, the Qumran *tefillin* and *mezuzot* were also prepared by the school of scribes of Qumran and were deposited in the caves just like some of the manuscripts. They belong to the works in process of the scribes and were not deposited by the owners. Moreover, it seems that some *tefillin* cases were dyed black in antiquity but some were not so, why? I would say the answer is both sociological and historical. The scribes deposited unfinished works of all kinds, including manuscripts, *tefillin* with or without cases the latter being dyed in black or not, and *mezuzot* in some of the Qumran vicinity caves. Moreover some of these works in process were deposited just prior to the Romans destruction of the Qumran site in 68 CE.

Yonathan Adler says we ignored the *tefillin*<sup>68</sup> found in the Qumran

---

<sup>68</sup> Although it is not the purpose here, I thought that it would be interesting to report what I wrote to Gideon Bohak in a private conversation on *tefillin* and *mezuzot* at Qumran: “I am presently working on Qumran and the liturgical/possibly mystical texts found in the caves. It would help me if we could consider *tefillin* and *mezuzot* as first examples of written amulets. Here are some of my comments/questions: I am assuming (and I realise it is a big assumption) that traditionally and over time, *mezuzot* were to replace the sacrifice of a lamb in Egypt for the Hebrews to avoid the plague of the first-born child. Therefore instead of the blood that they were supposed to paint the lintel of their door with, which was perhaps a practice still followed by the Hebrews, and then the Israelites even in Canaan, the Jews began to hang a *mezuzah* on their door, likely in the Second Temple period. As a result, I am inclined to attach mostly an apotropaic property to the *mezuzah*. It became a *halakhah* from Deuteronomy 6:4-9 and 13:13-21. Therefore:

1-could we date this *halakhah* to the Hellenistic period in Palestine since Deuteronomy is a Hellenistic text?

2-could we say that the first examples of *mezuzot* were found among the Qumran material?

3-there is a liturgical text in the *mezuzah*, is it possible to know if it was always there or if not, is it possible to record in what period of History it was added?

4-if we consider the *mezuzot* as apotropaic amulets is it then the biblical verse in it that became a liturgical text since the ‘*Shema Israel*’ is recorded as part of the liturgy in the Second Temple in Jerusalem, that gave the *mezuzah* its apotropaic property? Almost the same questions apply to *tefillin*, which were found in considerable amounts in the Judaean desert at Qumran and in the Bar Kokhba caves. In my judgment, the *tefillin* have ‘the binding’ and the fact that they are worn by the person, for them to be even more considered as written amulets of the Second Temple period”.

caves for too long, since the *DJD* 1 1955 article that talked about them including in it's title: "Minor finds"<sup>69</sup>. Twenty three *tefillin* cases were found at Qumran, four in 1Q, three in 4Qa, eleven (purchased from Bedouin) and attributed to 4Q, one in 5Q, three in 8Q and one (also purchased from a Bedouin) but coming from a non-specified cave of Qumran. These cases were found for the most part, empty. For the moment only two parchments of these boxes were unscrolled and deciphered. In 1Q, 4Q and 8Q, 23 other *tefillin* parchments were discovered without their cases. The content, the spelling, and the textual characteristics of the Qumran *tefillin* are very diverse. Both for the dye, the type of cases and the text contained in them one can see at Qumran the attestation to diverse halakhic opinions. Concerning the content we find both *tefillin* parchments with long and short versions of the text (by comparison with the later rabbinic tradition). With reference to the spelling, Emanuel Tov had showed that the typical Qumran spelling distinguishes the *tefillin* parchments of Qumran caves 4Q and 8Q, while others do not show the same. As for the textual characteristics some can see some of them as proto-massoretic while others may not. Therefore one may conclude that there was a plurality of manuscript origins.

For Adler the presence of these *tefillin* in the Qumran caves, which also contained manuscripts, indicate that either the caves did not function as libraries or that this material had been stored in these caves. Because in the case that these caves functioned as libraries one then has to provide an explanation for the presence of *tefillin* in them. Adler agrees more with the view according to which the Qumran caves were emergency hiding places. However the *tefillin* in their cases could be worn easily on the body and thus easily carried. The question is then: why would anyone hide them with the other scrolls? Adler concurs with the explanation of the Qumran caves, especially cave 4Q, as a *genizah* for both the manuscripts and the *tefillin*<sup>70</sup>. The Qumran *tefillin* for Adler were therefore either damaged or considered non-conforming by their owners, who deposited them in the Qumran *genizah* rather than discarding them because of their sacred character. I disagree with Adler's

---

<sup>69</sup> See G. Lankester Harding, "The Archaeological Finds: Introductory. The Discovery, the Excavation, Minor Finds", in D. Barthélémy and J.T. Milik (eds.), *Qumran Cave I* (*DJD* I; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955) 7, pl. I: 5-7.

<sup>70</sup> See J. Adler, "The Distribution of the Tefillin Finds among the Judaean Desert Caves", in M. Fidanzio (ed.), *The Caves of Qumran: Proceedings of the International Conference, Lugano 2014*, (*STDJ* 118; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2016) 161-176.

view because first of all it is prematured since the *tefillin* parchments of Qumran are yet to be deciphered. Secondly there is an anachronism in his view since he is taking later rabbinic opinions for “*the kashrut of the tefillin*” and *shemot* which were not to be discarded because of their sacred character, especially if the texts contained the *tetragrammatous*. This being said, the Mishnah may be said to be a compilation of earlier rabbinic tradition and may reflect halakhic opinions current in the Hellenistic and Roman times. But then what do we conclude about the *tefillin* which were found in the Bar Kokhba caves besides other artefacts of daily life rather than together with sacred scrolls only, like in the “Qumran vicinity” caves? For Adler the *tefillin* found in the Bar Kokhba caves besides other daily life artefacts are evidence that some of the Qumran caves were troglodytes habitat where people would have left *tefillin* along with other daily life artefacts, including pottery, etc, just like the Bar Kokhba rebels. I disagree again with Adler, because archaeology is unable to prove that any of the Qumran caves had ever been either a permanent dwelling or a long time refuge. Therefore, I suggest that the Qumran *tefillin* and *mezuzot* were prepared by the school of scribes of Qumran and deposited in the caves just like some of the manuscripts. These were all part of orders to the scribes and were not deposited by the owners.

In my judgment, the most probable scenario is that the Dead Sea Scrolls as well as the Qumran *tefillin* reflect the plurality of movements/communities/associations/schools of thought (including *halakhah*) that characterise Hellenistic and Roman society as a whole. These movements/communities/associations/schools of thought had diverse views on the writing process of the later called biblical texts, on liturgy, on *halakhah* and on other concepts, in particular messianism, eschatology, resurrection, angeology, etc. The textual fluidity acknowledged in the “biblical” manuscripts of Qumran is the reflection of the diverse movements/schools of thought of Hellenistic and Roman Palestine in the hands of different scribes. It also constitutes an implicit trace of “biblical exegesis”, or of aurality all together. The same applies for the textual fluidity of the Community Rule. In other words there were many rules rather than just many versions of the same one.

Furtermore, among the most tangible evidence for scribal activity at the site of Qumran that links the site to the caves are some inscriptions. Among them, the two abecedaries, one penned inscribed with black

ink<sup>71</sup>, the other incised on stone, found *in situ*. The one penned inscribed, of a student scribe as Lemaire puts it, following de Vaux<sup>72</sup> (KhQ 161 of Lemaire's catalogue), was found in "*tranchée A*"; it is familiar to us from alphabetic scripts on parchment found among others in cave 4Q.

The other one (KhQ 2289 of Lemaire's catalogue) was found in locus 135. Also of interest for the link between the site and the caves is QUM 311 of Gunneweg and Balla's<sup>73</sup> chart with text paralleled in cave 4Q. On top of which we can add the list of proper names, a usual scribal practice, and signs of scribal apprenticeship of the Judeo-Aramaic script, since a jar was found *in situ* at Qumran with such evidence: (KhQ 2553a of Lemaire's catalogue). Moreover, there is evidence of a copying exercise of a literary text inscribed with black ink on stone uncovered in locus 129 (Kh Q2207 of Lemaire's catalogue). This is paralleled in a partial copy of the psalm found in the caves. Students' paraphrasing exercises have been found in caves 4Q to 10Q (at least seventeen are known). There is also the "perfect" inscription that reads: HONYAH found in locus 61 (KhQ 1313 of Lemaire's catalogue). It is written in exactly the same script as used for the parchment scrolls, which means that the people who wrote it were similar if not the same as those who wrote the scrolls, or part of their group. According to Lemaire the "HONYAH" inscription was done by a scribe most probably well versed in the copying of manuscripts: "inscription parfaite probablement l'oeuvre d'un scribe plus habitué à copier des manuscrits qu'à faire des inscriptions sur poterie". Although there are other interesting inscriptions that Lemaire catalogued<sup>74</sup>, I shall restrain my choice here to the ones

<sup>71</sup> A type well attested in the Second Temple period, especially at Herodium, Wadi Murabbaat and Masada.

<sup>72</sup> See André Lemaire's catalogue of inscriptions in A. Lemaire, "Inscriptions du Khirbeh, des grottes et de 'Aïn Feshkha" in J-B Humbert and J. Gunneweg (eds.), *Khirbet Qumrân et 'Aïn Feshkha II, Études d'anthropologie, de physique et de chimie*, (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus, Series Archaeologica 3; Fribourg: Academy Press, 2003) 341-388.

<sup>73</sup> See J. Gunneweg and M. Balla, "Possible Connection Between the Inscriptions on Pottery, the Ostraca and Scrolls Found in the Caves", in J-B Humbert and J. Gunneweg (eds.), *Khirbet Qumrân et 'Aïn Feshkha II, Études d'anthropologie, de physique et de chimie*, (Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus, Series Archaeologica 3; Fribourg: Academy Press, 2003) 389-394.

<sup>74</sup> For example: "KhQ 192 sur le site locus 8: si l'inscription incisée en grec veut dire: membre d'animal alors elle aurait été inscrite par un scribe de Qumrân puisque la pratique d'ossements d'animaux retrouvés dans des jarres n'est attestée nulle part ailleurs, si je ne m'abuse..." Two other penned inscribed with ink ostraca found *in situ*

relevant to my revisiting of the theory of a school of scribes at or near Qumran. Furthermore, Lemaire writes: “D’une manière générale en ce qui concerne les inscriptions sur poterie, il faut aussi tenir compte de l’indication d’origine fournie par l’analyse neutronique qui n’a malheureusement pu être pratiquée dans tous les cas. Il est ainsi assez clair que, si le vase provient de l’atelier de Qumrân, il n’y a aucune raison pour que l’inscription ait été réalisée ailleurs que sur le site-même. C’est le cas pour les trois petites inscriptions fragmentaires à l’encre noire KhQ 386, KhQ 2176 et KhQ 2556 ainsi que de l’inscription sur jarre à l’encre rouge KhQ 621 du locus 34. Elle montre que les scripteurs de Qumrân pouvaient utiliser aussi bien l’encre rouge que l’encre noire”<sup>75</sup>. Indeed the use of red ink attested on both pottery sherds and manuscripts uncovered at Qumran constitutes another evidence of a school of scribes at or near Qumran. Lemaire adds: “De fait la plupart des inscriptions sur plâtre des loci voisins (KhQ 498 et 498bis; locus 30; KhQ 572: locus 9A) sont à l’encre rouge. L’emploi de l’encre rouge aux côtés de l’encre noire dans le complexe central apparemment lié à une activité scribale (cf. les encriers et probablement les tables de préparation des manuscrits) concorde avec le fait que l’encre rouge ait été utilisée dans certains manuscrits des grottes (cf. 2QPS et 4QNmb)”<sup>76</sup>.

On red ink used by Jewish scribes Antony Perrot, Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra and Eibert Tigchelaar wrote: “In Hebrew-Aramaic texts, the first attestation of red next to black ink are the rubrics in the Deir ‘Alla *Balaam* inscription from around the ninth or eighth century BCE that indicate some beginnings. Red ink is also used in some of the inscriptions in, but the purpose is less clear. After this, there are very few attestations of bicoloured Hebrew manuscripts. Tov mentions four Dead Sea Scrolls using red ink: 2Q14 (2QPs), 4Q27 (4QNumb), 4Q270 (4QDe), and 4Q481d (4QFragments with Red Ink)”. In addition, Perrot, Stökl

---

KhQ 386 locus 23 and KhQ 439 “sceau à pain inscrit incisé en grec: JOSEPH”... “KhQ 621 locus 34 inscription à l’encre noire: YOHANAN LE BAVARD sur une jarre (près du col) typique de Qumran, suivie de 3 traces de cinq doigts (comme des hamsa)”... Also not included in Lemaire’s catalogue because discovered afterwards, is Magen and Peleg’s ostrakon discovered at Qumrân near caves 1Q, 3Q and 11Q that reads: “ELEAZAR THE SON OF YESHUAH THE SOAP MAKER” published in Y. Magen and Y. Peleg, *The Qumran Excavations 1993-2004: Preliminary Report* (JSP 6; Jerusalem: Staff Officer of Archaeology, Civil Administration of Judea and Samaria/Israel Antiquities Authority, 2007) 21-22.

<sup>75</sup> See supra, A. Lemaire (2003) 381-382.

<sup>76</sup> See supra, idem (2003) 381-382.

Ben Ezra and Tigchelaar add that red ink was used as well on 11Q22<sup>77</sup>.

As for the composition of the ink. I believe that the ink that was used on some of the Qumran manuscripts (as I argue), the ones stored in the caves by the Qumran school of scribes (not the ones emerging from the Temple library and the *bathey midrash*'s collections), was made of water with bromine from the Dead Sea. In fact following David Stacey's reasoning, if the cisterns of Qumran were used for tannery (as I too believe they were) and/or for indigo dying, then why would the scribes use this dirty water for their manuscripts whilst they had plenty of clean water available near by from the Dead Sea?

Based on two ostraca Greg Doudna<sup>78</sup> has attempted to counter the theory of a school of scribes at Qumran. However I argue that for a scribe the writing of an inscription on stone or pottery is different from one on parchment or papyrus. Therefore, this is not an argument for refuting the school of scribes at Qumran.

As for parchment preparation, David Stacey writes<sup>79</sup> quoting Frank Moore Cross<sup>80</sup>:

<sup>77</sup> See A. Perrot, D. Stökl ben Ezra and E. Tigchelaar: [https://www.academia.edu/12064006/More\\_red\\_ink\\_on\\_the\\_Qumran\\_manuscript\\_11Q22](https://www.academia.edu/12064006/More_red_ink_on_the_Qumran_manuscript_11Q22); see also J. Hoftijzer and G. van der Kooij, *Aramaic Texts from Deir 'Alla*, Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui, 19 (Leiden: Brill, 1976); E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judaean Desert*, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 54 (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

<sup>78</sup> See G. Doudna, OSTRACA KHQ1 AND KHQ2 FROM THE CEMETERY OF QUMRAN: A NEW EDITION [HTTP://WWW.JHSONLINE.ORG/COCOON/JHS/A035.HTML#FOOTNOTE1](http://www.jhsonline.org/cocoon/jhs/A035.html#footnote1), especially paragraph 13: "No writing found at the actual site of Qumran has yet been identified as matching any of the hundreds of scribes who produced the literary texts in the caves, nor has distinctive phrasing or wording associated with a text in the caves turned up in any writing found at the site. The present ostraca do nothing to change this situation. The shape of the *bet* of KhQ1 and KhQ2 is distinctive with an exaggerated "tick". In the huge quantity and variety of scribal hands represented in the literary texts found in the caves at Qumran no such *bet* has been identified. Based on this point alone it appears that the writer of KhQ1 was not a copyist of any of the texts found in the caves. Davies, Brooke, and Callaway correctly note that "the script [of KhQ1] bears no resemblance to the beautiful and usually skilled hands known from the manuscripts from the caves". These ostraca only deepen the questions concerning the circumstances by which huge numbers of literary texts with their astonishingly diverse variety of professional scribal hands came to be deposited in the caves near Qumran."

<sup>79</sup> See D. Stacey, G. Doudna and G. Avni, *Qumran Revisited, a Reassessment of the Archaeology of the Site and its Texts*, (BAR International Serie 2520; Oxford: Archaeopress, 2013) 52.

<sup>80</sup> See F.M. Cross, "Two Aramaic Ostraca from En-Gedi", in E. Stern, *En-Gedi Ex-*



“it is even conceivable, that because, as noted by Cross, ‘the manufacture of leather was odorous and despised so that isolation was desirable’ the work on the skins had been carried out at Qumran”. In his reassessment of the site of Qumran David Stacey stresses the seasonal character of the industrial activities at Qumran especially the ones linked to the flocks. For Stacey Qumran was “predominantly a seasonally occupied, industrial suburb of Jericho”. In particular for the industries associated with sheep and goats he writes: “...The smelly, ritually polluting and water-intensive processes such as the preparation of wool and hides from sheep, whose seasonal presence in the winter is a certainty”... And this, of course, reduces the number of cisterns interpreted as *miqwaot* at Qumran. Moreover not all stepped pools are to be interpreted as *miqwaot* ...The large cisterns along the western face of Masada would have contained ritually pure water but it is extremely unlikely that they were used as *miqwaot*...Many of the Qumran pools were more likely cisterns whose suitability for use for ritual purification would have been compromised by the extraction of water for industrial purposes, and their replenishing by use of a *shaduf*.”<sup>81</sup>

Moreover, Ada Yardeni has already proven that more than 70 documents from Qumran and Masada are to be attributed to the same scribe. In addition, Eibert Tigchelaar has also identified a scribe for several Qumran documents<sup>82</sup>. There is more to come hopefully from scholars of this area of expertise. Therefore there is every reason to believe that there was a school of scribes at or near Qumran with all the related industry but also that some of the scrolls which were carefully wrapped were brought from Jerusalem.

#### 4- The Temple Library theory revisited

The linen wraps lead me to explore again the Jerusalem Temple library theory. Indeed they could be the ancestors of *talithim* with *tzitzit* but they could also be copies of priests’ garments in the Jerusalem Temple as evidenced by the fact that these garments (like the Qumran manuscript wraps) were made of pure linen. There were also priests garments made out of pure wool but never *sha’atnetz* just like for the Qumran

---

*cavations I*, (Jerusalem: IES, 2007) 377-380.

<sup>81</sup> See supra, D. Stacey (2013) 72.

<sup>82</sup> See E. Tigchelaar, “In Search of the Scribe from 1QS”, in *Emanuel. Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, (Leiden: Brill, 2003) 439-452.

manuscripts wraps which were made of pure linen. Furthermore, the color blue, is common to both of these Qumran manuscript wraps and the priests' garments.

The deposit of the manuscripts in the Qumran caves renders the latter "sacred spaces" because of the nature of the manuscripts. Therefore these caves were certainly neither visitable, nor habitable; indeed this was a well known fact among the Jews in antiquity. This also explains the paucity of other artefacts found in these Qumran caves.

It is interesting to notice that numerous documents of various natures were found in a Murabbaat cave (2Mur), apparently deposited at various periods as well. Among these documents one can find manuscripts but not wrapped in linen and not put in jars. Therefore there is no doubt that the concern for long term conservation was very much behind the deposit of the manuscripts in the "Qumran vicinity" caves, especially 1Q and 11Q. Furthermore, another aspect of interest: the 2Mur cave attests to multiple deposits of material by various people at different periods and for multiple reasons. I shall use this for the elaboration of my theory, or rather my revisiting of the theory, of the Temple library being stored in the "Qumran vicinity" caves also by various people, at different periods and for multiple reasons.

The specially high proportion of skin texts found in the Qumran caves also led me to the revisiting of the Temple Library theory<sup>83</sup>. Emanuel Tov contends: "...We have to accept the assumption that some or many scrolls were brought to Qumran ... The Greek scrolls were brought to Qumran from elsewhere."<sup>84</sup>Then: "...the majority of the documents in Qumran were written on leather, in the other sites they were mainly written on papyrus ... the most valid and obvious parallels are probably the libraries which were lost, that is, the collections stored in Alexandria, Pergamon and Ephesus from the Hellenistic period, Roman libraries from later periods, and Christian libraries from the fourth century CE in Jerusalem ... While it remains unknown what would have been included in the Jerusalem Temple library, we can assume that it would have contained at least all the Scripture scrolls on leather."<sup>85</sup>

Let's now dwell on the Jerusalem Temple "library". I refer the read-

---

<sup>83</sup> See supra, E. Tov (2016) 90-91, especially his table 5.1 showing that 86% of the total of 930 Qumran documents were leather texts.

<sup>84</sup> See supra, E. Tov (2016) 88.

<sup>85</sup> See supra, E. Tov (2016) 91.

er to Corrado Martone's article here<sup>86</sup> although in my judgement one should compare the Jerusalem Temple library with Egyptian Temples libraries rather than with "lay" Greek or Roman ones.

Furthermore in an article on the concept of harmonisation Corrado Martone develops the idea of the Temple library<sup>87</sup>. Based on the passage of the *Letter of Aristeas*<sup>88</sup> Martone reminds us: "...we may infer that a Temple library existed in which the Zadokite priesthood kept its sacred literature; Tov's study has shown there was a time when a harmonizing Hebrew text of the Pentateuch was part of this sacred literature and of its library. This text has survived not only in the Greek translation but also in the Qumran library, which in part constituted the library of the Zadokite priesthood. From this perspective, one might evaluate the well-known agreements between the Qumran biblical and parabiblical scrolls and the LXX as a further connection between the Zadokite high priests and the Qumran community."

Already in pre-exilic times, Hilkiah, the High Priest, discovered "the book of the Law", identified by many as the book of Deuteronomy, or a version of it, when repairs were being made to the Temple in Jerusalem<sup>89</sup>.

Rengstorf was the first, prior to Golb, to develop the thesis of the Jerusalem Temple library for Qumran<sup>90</sup>. But whilst for him it is exclusively the collection of the Jerusalem Temple library that was hidden in the Qumran vicinity caves, Golb offers a slightly different theory. Golb says that the Dead Sea Scrolls collections were the product not only of

---

<sup>86</sup> One should not consider it in the modern sense of the term, implying that people could borrow books from but rather as a storage place. See on that issue C. Martone: [https://www.academia.edu/33889337/The\\_Qumran\\_Library\\_and\\_Other\\_Ancient\\_Libraries\\_Elements\\_for\\_a\\_Comparison](https://www.academia.edu/33889337/The_Qumran_Library_and_Other_Ancient_Libraries_Elements_for_a_Comparison), especially pages 63 to 65 and 66 where he writes: "...Again, we are in a legendary context that might nevertheless allude to historical traditions about sacred writings being passed down through generations of priests." See also idem, page 76: "The interesting point is that the link between the Jerusalem (Zadokite) priesthood and the Qumran literature is strengthened by the presence at Qumran of the LXX *Vorlage*, if we consider this *Vorlage* the text kept in the Temple under the Zadokite high-priesthood. Moreover, the largely predominant pre-masoretic text-type found at Qumran does not weaken this link, particularly if we take into account the many cases where the MT and the LXX are in agreement."

<sup>87</sup> See C. Martone : [https://www.academia.edu/33883151/From\\_Chaos\\_to\\_Coherence\\_and\\_Back\\_Some\\_Thoughts\\_on\\_the\\_Phenomenon\\_of\\_Harmonization\\_in\\_the\\_Bible\\_and\\_the\\_Dead\\_Sea\\_Scrolls](https://www.academia.edu/33883151/From_Chaos_to_Coherence_and_Back_Some_Thoughts_on_the_Phenomenon_of_Harmonization_in_the_Bible_and_the_Dead_Sea_Scrolls), especially pp. 36-38.

<sup>88</sup> See *Letter of Aristeas* 32-33.

<sup>89</sup> See II kings, 22, 8.

<sup>90</sup> See K.H. Rengstorf, *Hirbet Qumran und die Bibliothek vom Toten Meer*, (Studia Delitzschiana 5; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960).

the Temple library but of multiple libraries in Jerusalem<sup>91</sup>.

I shall base my own analysis of the issue of the Temple library on three articles: one of Moses Hirsh Segal<sup>92</sup>, another of Henri Cazelle<sup>93</sup> and a third of Albert Baumgarten<sup>94</sup>.

Segal says that the key to the enigma related to the provenance of the Dead Sea Scrolls, resides in the dating of the authoritative text of the Hebrew Bible and according to him, its circulation would have taken place in between the two copies of the Book of Isaiah found at Qumran. Segal makes us notice as well that Flavius Josephus, while talking about the reliability of the biblical books as opposed to the Greek books, writes in his *Contra Apionem* 1, 42:

“For during so many ages as have already passed, no one has been so bold as either to add anything to them, to take anything from them, or to make any change in them.”

It seems therefore that at the time that Josephus writes (end of the 1<sup>st</sup> century CE), there was an authoritative version of the Hebrew Bible texts. Moreover, Segal makes us notice that the first book of the Maccabees, I Macc 1, 56-58 says:

“They would through in the fire, after they had torn them down, the books of the Law that they could find; if we had found at someones’ place the books of the Covenant, was someone in favor of the Law, the king’s edict would condemn him to death.”

Here we are talking about the Seleucid government. Therefore one can easily infer that, as a consequence, there was a lack of sacred books in Jerusalem and in Judaea. As a result of all this, it is easy to imagine that after the Maccabean victory and the purification of the Jerusalem Temple, with its service, but also with the one of the *bathey midrash*, there was a great need for new copies of the sacred books. Hence on Judah Maccabee’s instructions, the scribes were put to work, probably on the basis of copies that would have been preserved here and there. Especially following the model of the codex known in the rabbinical

<sup>91</sup> See supra, Golb (1995).

<sup>92</sup> See M. H. Segal, “The Promulgation of the Authoritative Text of the Hebrew Bible”, *Journal of Biblical Literature* LXXII (1953) 35ss.

<sup>93</sup> See H. Cazelle, “Y eut-il une liturgie de la Parole au Temple ?”, in B. Botte, H. Cazelle, I. H. Dalmais, etc. (eds.), *La Parole dans la Liturgie* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1970) 9-22.

<sup>94</sup> See A. Baumgarten, “The Torah as a Public Document in Judaism”, *SR / Studies in Religion* 14/1 (1985) 17-24.

tradition<sup>95</sup> as “The book of the Temple court” (*Sefer haEzrah*) which contained only the Pentateuch, preserved there as a model for the copies and reviews of copies. Indeed one can read in II Macc 2, 14-15:

“As equally Judah gathered all of them (the sacred books) which had been dispatched because of the war, and they are now at our disposal.”

Therefore, some copies would have been preserved from destruction by their owners, some others escaped destruction while a faction of the *Hasidim*, fleeing Jerusalem towards the caves of the Judaeen Desert, had carried with them as part of the Temple library as well as copies of books from the library of the *bathey midrash*<sup>96</sup>.

Indeed one can read in I Macc 2, 29:

“At that time, many who were in search of justice and equity, went down to the desert to settle there, they took their sons, their wives and their cattle with them, for their miseries were more than they could bear”.

Furthermore, this Temple’s codex would have been carried away by Titus and preserved in the Severus synagogue of Rome<sup>97</sup>.

A second article is the one of Henri Cazelle’s. Cazelle contends that the synagogue had known a liturgy of the Word and that this was the reading of the Word instructed in the Scriptures and its explanation. However, it is more difficult to apprehend the place and the delimitations of the Word in the Temple liturgy. The latter being essentially sacrificial with sacred meals of which would precede the Jewish meals of the *havurot* and the Christian ritual as well. The Psalms belong to the Temple liturgy (see Psalm 100: Thanksgiving in the Temple). However it is not really a divine Word.

Let’s then examine the sources at our disposal concerning the liturgy of the Word in the Temple.

Ben Sirah chapter 50 describes the High Priest Simon in his liturgical office but does not make a single allusion to a sacred reading. The *Letter of Aristeia* does not mention it either although it talks about the Law and the cult in the city of Jerusalem. Josephus and Philo do not mention the

---

<sup>95</sup> See Talmud Yerushalmi Sanh. 2,6, Tal Babli Baba Bathra 14b; Bab. Moed Qatan 18b, Mishnah Kelim, 15, 6; Bab. Shabbat, 14a; Mishnah Yadayim, 4,6; Tosefta Yadayim, 2, 19; Mishnah Moed Qatan, 3,4.

<sup>96</sup> Conversely holy books were not just deposited in the Temple ; they were also found in the synagogues or more accurately named for the time being “*bathey midrash*” : see Flavius Josephus *Ant XVI*, 164.

<sup>97</sup> According to Flavius Josephus, *War VII*, 150, 162.

reading of the divine Word in the Temple either, nor do the Apocrypha. In the so called “Qumran sectarian texts” they would read the Law in private, they would copy it, meditate on it, one can even ask to speak in public on it and we know the reserves of some of the Qumran text communities *vis a vis* the Temple. The *Serekh Hayahad* is considering readings that are close to Psalms 78, 105 and 106 that are referring to the History of the people of Israel and of its covenant with God. The text of the *Serekh Hayahad* is to be approximated with Deuteronomy 31, 10-12, which anticipates also a public reading of the Law. Nehemiah chapter 8 mentions the public reading of the Law by Ezra in front of the “square of the waters”, a non-sacred space, not included then in the Temple square<sup>98</sup>. Exodus chapter 24, 3-4 also talks about the public reading of the Law, but before Moses had built an altar so the public reading is considered here again outside the Temple sacred space. Nonetheless the public reading of the Law was probably done following the model of the public reading of the Law in Babylon, which was the reading of the Babylonian poem of the creation during the great festival of the New Year of Aikitu<sup>99</sup>.

Therefore by way of the theology of the Covenant, a liturgy of the Word could have penetrated the ritual of the Temple, through the Psalms and the narrative of the creation and its parallels with the Babylonian narrative of the creation. Thus in the Temple there was a liturgy of the Psalms of the Covenant. However, it seems that this liturgy of the Word, this great liturgy of the Covenant, rendered popular especially by Josias, would have disappeared after the return from Exile. What was left of it then was in fact perhaps the Temple library itself.

The fact that, according to Henri Cazelles, there was no public reading of the Law at the Temple in the period we are focusing on, is not sufficient to prove, as far as I am concerned, that there was no library at the Temple, including books of the *Tanakh*. Indeed, Flavius Josephus reports that at the capture of Jerusalem “the Law of the Jews” was taken as

---

<sup>98</sup> See Lisa Cleath’s presentation at the EABS/IOQS 2016 meeting in Leuven: “Public Reading in Nehemiah 8: Authorizing an Oral-Written Text”, forthcoming in an article of the proceedings to be published at Peeters.

<sup>99</sup> A ceremony during which the king, after having done penance, was solemnly inducted and the royalty of the national God proclaimed. This sacred text, with a mystical flavor, was celebrating the domination of the national God upon the rebelling cosmic forces. It is to relate to the scene of Isiah’s vocation in Jerusalem where Yahwe’s royalty was proclaimed (see Psalm 92) celebrating his might on the cosmic forces, oceans and rivers.

booty along with the golden table, candlesticks and lamps to Rome to be deposited in Vespasian palace<sup>100</sup>. Josephus also tells us that he obtained as a privilege from Titus, at the time of the siege of Jerusalem, permission to take some sacred books, most likely from the Temple library:

“And I, now that my native place had fallen, having nothing more precious to take and preserve as a solace for my personal misfortunes, made request to Titus for the freedom of some of my countrymen; I also received by his gracious favor a gift of sacred books.”<sup>101</sup>

A third and relevant article is the one of Albert Baumgarten. For him the first source is the book of Deuteronomy, that is, a public book. As Bickerman says, the Torah was a public document because it was the only one translated into another language, which was Greek, and that this was in order for all the Jews of the world to have access to it.

Philo<sup>102</sup> insists on the expertise of the Jews in terms of ancestral laws, and tells us about weekly public gatherings during which they would listen to the teachings of the Law. Flavius Josephus says the same thing:

“For ignorance he had no pretext. He appointed the Law to be the most excellent and necessary form of instruction, ordaining, not that it should be heard once for all or twice or on several occasions, but that every week men should desert their other occupations and assemble to listen to the Law and obtain a thorough and accurate knowledge of it, a practice which all other legislators seem to have neglected.”<sup>103</sup>

Philo in *Hypothetica* and Josephus in his *Contra Apionem* again considered the fact that the Jews had a good knowledge of their Law, as a distinctive characteristic of Judaism. This was noticed as well by Eusebius of Caesarea<sup>104</sup>. That the Torah was a public document and above all given outside the land of Israel in the desert, is a fact also attested to in the rabbinic literature (cf. *mekhilta de rabbi Ishmael*). Since then there was no public reading of it in the (Second) Temple; however the tradition wants that there was a library in the Jerusalem Temple as

<sup>100</sup> See *War* VII, 148, 150, 162.

<sup>101</sup> See Flavius Josephus, *Vita* 418.

<sup>102</sup> See Philo of Alexandria, *De specialibus Legibus*, 2.62, *De Vita Mosis*, 2.216.

<sup>103</sup> See Flavius Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, 2.175. See also H.St.J. Thackeray's comment: “Josephus follows the Rabbinical tradition (Talmud Yerushalmi *Megilla*, IV. 1), which ascribed to Moses the introduction of the custom of public reading of the Law on Sabbaths and festivals”.

<sup>104</sup> See *Praeparatio Evangelica* 8, 7, 21.

it was the tradition in Antiquity to constitute libraries in Temples; for instance the Memphis library in the Temple of Phtah. Furthermore one can read this reference to the Temple library in II Macc 2, 13-15:

“These same facts are set out in the official records and in the memoirs of Nehemiah. Just as Nehemiah collected the chronicles of the kings, the writings of the prophets, the works of David, and royal letters about sacred offerings, to found his library, so Judas also has collected all the books that had been scattered as a result of our recent conflict. These are in our possession and if you need any of them, send messengers for them.”

The above constitutes the evidence of the archives/library of Nehemiah in the Jerusalem Temple. In addition, Flavius Josephus talks about the Septuagint translation on the basis of a library of the Jews in Jerusalem, most probably the Temple library because Josephus mentions the High Priest in the same context<sup>105</sup>. It is not in doubt that the Temple served as a depository of some of the Scriptures, especially the Torah and the Psalms, as Josephus states<sup>106</sup>.

Back to Qumran, when we compare the Qumran documents with other documents of the Judaeen desert (like Masada, Nahal Hever, etc.), we must come to the conclusion that while the sacred manuscripts found in all other sites of the Judaeen desert belonged to personal collections and were written for the most part on papyrus, the ones at Qumran were largely written on skin and came from library stacks and some from the Temple library. However while Stegeman had a maximalist position according to which all the Qumran scrolls were written and copied at Qumran, Golb contends that all Qumran manuscripts were written and copied elsewhere. I contend, along with Emanuel Tov<sup>107</sup>, that only some of the documents were written and copied at Qumran. The scribal analysis had led us to this conclusion. Furthermore, compared to other sites of the Judaeen desert, at Qumran and at Masada there is a majority of texts written on parchment rather than papyrus. This being as it may, even though we do not know exactly what the content of the Jerusalem Temple library was, the biblical manuscripts belonging to it, were most probably written on parchment.

---

<sup>105</sup> See *Ant.* XII, 14-17.

<sup>106</sup> See *Ant.* XII, 323.

<sup>107</sup> See E. Tov, “Scribal Characteristics of the Qumran Scrolls”, in M. Fidanzio (ed.), *The Caves of Qumran: Proceedings of the International Conference, Lugano 2014*, (STDJ 118; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2016) 87-95.



As for the dating of the deposits of the manuscripts, while I believe with Greg Doudna<sup>108</sup> that we should look for a period preceding the first Jewish Revolt, I disagree with his main arguments and will not restrict the dating of the deposits strictly to the Herodian period, even though one can consider a major move of stacks from the Jerusalem Temple on the occasion of Herod's works on the Temple as Flavius Josephus describes<sup>109</sup>. Here is how I discuss Doudna's theory<sup>110</sup>.

1-For the dating of the Qumran manuscripts the *terminus ante quem* is their deposit(s) in the caves since there is no date included in a "colophon" on any of them, as Emile Puech<sup>111</sup> rightly noted.

---

<sup>108</sup> See G. Doudna, "Dating the Scroll Deposits of the Qumran Caves: A Question of Evidence", in M. Fidanzio (ed.), *The Caves of Qumran: Proceedings of the International Conference, Lugano 2014*, (STDJ 118; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2016) 87-95.

<sup>109</sup> See *Ant.* XV, 380-425.

<sup>110</sup> I will quote here in French from a lecture that I gave in January 2015 at the "Séminaire Qumrân de Paris": " Selon Greg Doudna le fait qu'il n'y ait plus d'allusions historiques dans les textes de Qumrân après la fin du 1er siècle avant notre ère (cf. Michael Wise) est un bon argument en faveur du fait que les manuscrits auraient été déposés bien avant la révolte de 66 contre les Romains. Je ne suis pas d'accord car le contenu des manuscrits n'est pas à lier avec le moment de leur dépôt dans le cas de Qumrân. En effet, il s'agit de textes essentiellement spirituels. En revanche, ce que nous pouvons avancer c'est que s'il y avait eu une allusion historique postérieure à la révolte de 66 dans les manuscrits alors bien sûr il nous eût été impossible de dater leur dépôt dans les grottes avant cette révolte. En fait l'élément déterminant c'est que vraisemblablement les manuscrits d'où qu'ils aient été transportés, ont été mis en jarres sur place dans les grottes des environs de Qumrân. Aussi pour ma part je dirais: puisque 1-les jarres à manuscrits sont de la période hérodiennne, 2-elles ont été fabriquées à Qumrân-même puisque typique de ce site, et 3-que vraisemblablement donc les manuscrits ont été transportés en partie de Jérusalem et mis en jarres sur place à Qumrân pour certains et pour d'autres réalisés par l'école de scribes de Qumrân, alors oui le dépôt n'a pas pu précéder en tous cas la période hérodiennne, car il est peu probable que l'on ait déposé des manuscrits de ce type (spirituel pour la grande majorité) à même le sol étant donné la tradition bien documentée de préservation de manuscrits dans des jarres dans l'Antiquité (en Egypte et en Palestine); cependant cela reste spéculatif. Ce dépôt se serait-il fait, pour ce qui est des manuscrits provenant de la bibliothèque du Temple, à l'occasion des grands travaux de rénovation du Temple entrepris par Hérode Le Grand et dont nous parle longuement Flavius Josèphe? Cela dit on peut aussi envisager le dépôt depuis les premières exactions des souverains étrangers contre le Temple de Jérusalem donc Antiochus IV Epiphane (2ème siècle avant notre ère) et une mise en jarre ultérieure à l'époque hérodiennne sur place à Qumrân."

<sup>111</sup> See E. Puech, " La paléographie des manuscrits de la mer Morte", in M. Fidanzio (ed.), *The Caves of Qumran: Proceedings of the International Conference, Lugano 2014*, (STDJ 118; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2016) 96.

2- The dating of the majority of the Qumran manuscripts<sup>112</sup> through paleography (even though it is not precise) has been proved to be roughly 2nd century BCE (150-31: “la phase hasmonéenne” defined by Puech) to 1st century CE (30-70: “la phase hérodiennne” defined by Puech) and Doudna is right to insist that it does not necessarily mean that it ends precisely in 66 to 70 CE. However, both of the scientific means of analysis (paleography and Carbon 14) do not prove the date that the work was composed, let alone the time it was deposited in the caves, but rather, the date it was copied by a scribe.

3- Although these manuscripts are not historical works but rather copies of “spiritual literature” some do mention historical figures and/or events which gives us a *terminus a quo* for their composition<sup>113</sup>. The earliest being the mention of the siege of the Temple under Antiochus IV (168 BCE; please see 4Q248), the latest the first quarter of the first century BCE. However again this does not preclude the fact that the manuscripts might have been deposited at a later date in the caves.

5- The “biblical scrolls” and the “apocrypha” are all scrolls or local copies of more ancient scrolls -originating most probably from the Temple library, including the book of Ben Sira which is dated to the first quarter of the second century BCE.

6- Doudna argues that the textiles, the jars, the lamps and the leather strips are also dated to the Herodian period. I am saying that nothing precludes the suggestion that all of these artefacts were still in circulation after the Herodian period and that at least some of the manuscripts (perhaps the works of the Qumran scribes) were attached, wrapped and put in jars in situ at Qumran in a later period in Antiquity, following their deposit(s).

7- The dating of the deposit(s) of manuscripts in the Qumran caves depends on the dating of the manuscripts themselves which remains for me uniquely based on scientific grounds such as paleography and Carbon 14. Here too, manuscripts dated to up to the Herodian period could very well have been deposited in the caves after the Herodian period.

8- The jars, containing some of the manuscripts, being typical of

---

<sup>112</sup> See S.White Crowford: <https://www.academia.edu/33083023/Cave4BrookeFestschrift.pdf> (2017), note 39.

<sup>113</sup> See again supra, E. Puech (2016) 96.

Qumran and of Herodian type may tend to help us differentiate between manuscripts originating from Jerusalem (Temple and *bathey midrash*) and the ones deposited by the scribes of Qumran. Indeed, my argument that the people (most probably priests) behind the deposit of the manuscripts coming from Jerusalem would not have left them on the ground in the Qumran caves but rather put them in jars immediately, tends to prove that this deposit at least was made with a *terminus ad quem* in the Herodian time. However, this is speculation at this point. Either we can prove that all the manuscripts from the Temple of Jerusalem and the *bathey midrash* were all put in jars *in situ* at Qumran or our (mine and Doudna's) argument of a *terminus ad quem* for a Herodian deposit does not stand.

9- My main argument that some manuscripts were originating from the Jerusalem Temple and some from *bathey midrash*'s collections while some were "works in process" of a Qumran school of scribes follows the chronological window of 2nd century BCE to 1st century CE, when the Qumran school of scribes most probably disappeared.

10-That is why I believe it is safer to say that the deposit(s) from the Jerusalem Temple and the *bathey midrash* were done over a few centuries starting from Antiochus IV all through to Titus. Some of them were put in jars *in situ* later. This of course does not preclude my argument that the works in the Temple of Jerusalem in the time of Herod were an incentive behind the deposit(s) during the Herodian period. Therefore scrolls were brought to the caves by priests and placed in jars, and scribes from elsewhere, including Qumran also brought manuscripts to the caves.

11-Finally the fact that there is no clear and reliable chronological indication in the manuscripts themselves after the first century BCE does not impact on the chronology of the deposits of the manuscripts as I was stating in a lecture in French<sup>114</sup> because one is not to be linked to the other in the way Doudna does it.

### Conclusion

In my judgement, the manuscripts found in the Qumran vicinity caves belong to a phenomenon of storage/preservation or (hiding/storage), which occurred over several centuries. The function of the

---

<sup>114</sup> See *supra*, note 106.

Qumran vicinity caves is therefore also to be understood and evaluated over a number of centuries. Indeed one can date the deposits of the manuscripts in the Qumran caves from the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE to the 1<sup>st</sup> century CE. Furthermore, paleography<sup>115</sup> and Carbon 14<sup>116</sup> attest to manuscript ages of between the mid-3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE to the last quarter of the 1<sup>st</sup> century CE. The sacred scrolls had been deposited in the “Qumran vicinity” caves from Hellenistic times through to the time of Vespasian and Titus, corresponding with various profanation of the Jerusalem Temple by the Greek and Roman rulers. Therefore, the reasons behind the storage/preservation of these manuscripts are historical: abuses of foreign rulers towards the Jerusalem Temple, and sociological: a school of scribes at or near Qumran. Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra<sup>117</sup> talks about a “Qumran library” as constituted *in situ*, by the Essenes community over several centuries. I only agree with the part of his argument saying “over several centuries”, *id est* “old caves young caves”.

I contend that these manuscripts came, at least in part, from the Jerusalem Temple library. However, in contrast to Norman Golb<sup>118</sup>, who holds the view that they were hidden in a hurry before the siege of Jerusalem by the Romans in 70 CE, I am convinced that this could not have been done speedily. Indeed, for part of these documents in the Qumran vicinity caves, we should consider it as a phenomenon of deliberate storage/preservation, done in the context of abuses of the different sovereign rulers towards the Jerusalem Temple. Moreover, part of the manuscripts found in the Qumran vicinity caves were the work, sometimes unfinished or in draft forms, of the school of scribes at or near Qumran. The scribes would have directly stored their works in the Qumran vicinity caves over several centuries from the Seleucids through to the Roman domination. These scribes would have stored their works gradually.

Furthermore, the reason why Flavius Josephus does not mention the Qumran hiding caves is, in my judgment, because this “phenomenon” was being kept secret in Antiquity during his time until the destruction

<sup>115</sup> See supra, E. Puech (2016) 99.

<sup>116</sup> Please See especially the tables in the articles of G. Bonani, M. Broshi, I. Carmi, S. Ivy, J. Strugnell, W. Wölfli, “Radiocarbon dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls”, *Atiqot* 20 (1991) 27-32 and of A. J. TimothyJull, D. J. Donahue, M. Broshi and E. Tov, “Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls and Linen Fragments from the Judean Desert”, *IAA [RADIO-CARBON, VOL. 37, No. 1, 1995, P.11-19]*.

<sup>117</sup> See D. Stökl ben Ezra (2007).

<sup>118</sup> See N. Golb (1995).

of the second Temple of Jerusalem. It is likely that the people behind the hiding/storage were some Temple priests. In addition, nowhere in their description of the Essenes do the classical authors, Philo, Flavius Josephus or Pliny allude to the writing of the Qumran manuscripts by them. Nevertheless all of these manuscripts were put in jars *in situ* at Qumran. The cylindrical jars are typical and exclusive of Qumran.

In addition, I propose that warehouses of manuscripts in the Qumran vicinity caves had in Antiquity, become traditional knowledge among select Jews, especially after the destruction of the Second Temple. Hence, the Bar Kokhba rebels, did not use these caves either for habitation or for refuge. Indeed, the Bar Kokhba rebels, were known for their respect for *halakhah* and sacred texts according to the so-called Bar Kokhba letters<sup>119</sup>, therefore they would not have dwelled in caves containing sacred texts, especially for some of them, pertaining to the Jerusalem Temple collection, like the “Qumran vicinity” caves. The few manuscripts/*Tanakh* books found in the other Judaeen desert caves, came from private collections of educated and privileged individuals, like the Babatha family for instance. Since then it also explains the paucity of the other types of artefacts found in the “Qumran vicinity” caves, compared to the other Judaeen desert caves, like the ones which were used as refuges by the Bar Kokhba rebels for instance.

The Temple library origin also explains both the linen wraps and the color blue for the stripes on the linen wraps to protect the manuscripts. Indeed the linen and the color blue were also used for the priests garments in Jerusalem.

It is interesting to notice the very special function that the desert had consistently been given in the Judeo-Christian civilization; indeed, the function of a womb for the gestation of thoughts as well as for resistance to enemies. Numerous examples can be found in literary and archaeological sources attesting to this. Exodus, the Books of the Maccabees describing the resistance to the Seleucid rulers, the “Qumran” documents and the Bar Kokhba letters found in the various Judaeen desert caves, the excavations at Masada, to cite only a few, are all witness to the special desert phenomenon. But beyond all of this, the Qumran

---

<sup>119</sup> See Y. Yadin (1971) 24-27 and 124-139, especially the letters dealing with the festival of *Sukkoth and Shabbat* and coins with *lulavim* and *ethrogim*; see also Y. Yadin, J. Greefield, A. Yardeni, B. Levine (eds.), *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters* (JDS; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2002) 277-363, especially P.Yadin 50 and P.Yadin 57.

literature itself refers to the camps in the desert reflecting a Judaism that used the metaphor ideologically. This led some scholars to perceive the Qumran community, *id est* “one of the communities in the texts” as returning to the biblical firstfruits of a “pure/unspoiled” judaism in some way: “the desert-stage judaism”. In my judgment, the “Qumran vicinity” caves, because of the specificity of their contents, correspond literally and metaphorically in the best way to the “desert phenomenon” described above: a refuge from the urban impurity.

I combine both *scenarii* of a deposit of the Temple library and collections from *Bathey midrash*, and of the Qumran vicinity school of scribes. Therefore the challenge remaining is to determine which of the manuscripts came from the Temple, which from the *Bathey midrash* and which were stored by the Qumran vicinity school of scribes. Perhaps the manuscripts with scribal marks should be considered as originating from the school of scribes ? This being said, nothing was «heretic» (let alone canonized or codified) at the time so I have no problem considering «subversive» literature stored in the Temple library. Even though I realize that this is a whole discussion.



Prof. Claude Cohen-Matlovsky and Prof. Emanuel Tov  
Qumran conference, Lublin 2017  
Photo © Joanna Łastowska