

available to maintain bathhouses and a swimming pool on the summit. [See Masada.]

[See also Archaeology; Baths and Baptism; Miqva'ot; Purity; and Water Systems.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Hirschfeld, Yitzhar. *The Judean Monasteries in the Byzantine Period*. New Haven, 1992. Discusses cisterns and reservoirs on pp. 148-162.
- Netzer, Ehud. *The Swimming Pools of the Hasmonean Period at Jericho*. Leichtwiess Institut für Wasserbau der Technischen Universität Braunschweig, Mitteilungen 89. Braunschweig, 1986.
- Tsuk, Tsvika. "Cisterns." In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East*, edited by Eric M. Meyers, vol. 4, pp. 12-13, translated from Hebrew by Ilana Goldberg. New York, 1997.
- Tsuk, Tsvika. "Pools." In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East*, edited by Eric M. Meyers, vol. 4, pp. 350-351, translated from Hebrew by Ilana Goldberg. New York, 1997.
- Wood, Bryant G. "To Dip or Sprinkle? The Qumran Cisterns in Perspective." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 256 (1984), 45-60. Presents evidence to show that the stepped cisterns at Qumran were used for religious purposes.

BRYANT G. WOOD

COFFINS. See Cemeteries.

COINS. See Numismatics.

COMMENTARY. See Interpretation of Scriptures.

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION. [This entry comprises three articles: Community Organization in the Rule of the Community, Community Organization in the Damascus Document, and Community Organization in Other Texts.]

Community Organization in the Rule of the Community

The Qumran community (*ha-yahad*) was organized according to a strict and rigid hierarchy. Many scholars maintain that it was controlled, at least during the early period of its existence, by priests and Levites. However, 4QS^d, a copy of the Rule of the Community which dates from the later decades of the first century BCE (see Cross, 1996), may represent an earlier version than that of the Rule of the Community from Cave 1 at Qumran (hereafter, 1QRule of the Community; 1QS), the scroll in which the Rule of the Community is best preserved and which dates from approximately 100 to 75 BCE. 4QS^d is conspicuously missing the words "the priests, the Sons of Zadok" (see Charlesworth and Strawn, 1996; Vermes and Metso correctly think 4QS^d witnesses to "an earlier stage of the literary evolution of the Community Rule"). According to

4QS^d, "the men of the Community" are not "answerable to the Sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant" (1QS v.2).

Foremost in the Qumran community is the overall concept of "oneness" (*yahad*); that is, the full members of the community held all things in common and were devoted in oneness to all responsibilities and the task of preparing the way for God's final act of judgment, the final war at the end of time, and to the coming of the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel, at least beginning in the first century BCE (1QS ix.11; this section of 1QRule of the Community seems to reflect a later period in the community's existence; it is not present in 4QS^d, which seems generally to be an earlier version; see Charlesworth in *Qumran Messianism* [1997] and Metso). They ate "(in) unity," said "benedictions (in) unity," and gave "counsel (in) unity" (1QS vi.2-3). All members of the community were predestined to be "the Sons of Light" in contrast to "the Sons of Darkness," who were all those who were not members of their sect, even (and especially during the first phase of the community's existence) the ruling priests in Jerusalem. It took at least two years to become a member of the community; during this probationary period the novices, "the Sons of the Dawn" (Words of the Sage to the Sons of Dawn 4Q298), were instructed by a *maskil* ("master") and eventually examined by the "examiner" (*mevaqquer*) regarding their knowledge and purity.

In the community the hierarchy was so strict that predetermined "lots" were discerned and then assigned, by discerning God's will; hence, love was measured out according to the lot of a Son of Light. That is, the members of the community are exhorted "to love all the Sons of Light each according to his lot in the council of God" (1QS i.9-10). At least during the early years at Qumran, the hierarchy, from the top down, consisted of the Righteous Teacher (Teacher of Righteousness) to whom God alone had revealed all the mysteries of the words of the prophets (Peshar Habakkuk, 1QpHab 7), the priests (the Sons of Zadok), the Levites, and then Israel (all members of the community). [See Teacher of Righteousness.] The hierarchy was centered upon the priests (1QS vi.3-4). During special ceremonies, as at the yearly ceremony for the renewal of the covenant, the hierarchic distinctions were strictly demanded and followed (1QS ii.19-25). Josephus was most likely thinking about this sect of Jews and this phenomenon when he reported that the Essenes were so hierarchical that a member lower in rank must not touch one above him; otherwise the latter must purify himself from the resulting pollution (*The Jewish War* 2.150). [See Josephus Flavius.]

Numerous technical terms designating social groups or leaders are found in the Rule of the Community. It is not wise to seek to systematize the meanings of all these

terms and relate them, because this quintessential Qumran document reflects the evolutionary nature of the Qumran community; that is, the terms most likely had different meanings at different periods in the history of the community and perhaps also at the same time.

Technical Terms for Social Groups within the Community. The Qumranites called their group the "community" (*yahad*) and sometimes the "Community of God" (1QS i.12). The use of *yahad* in this sense is unique to Qumran. While in the Rule of the Community the term *serekh* denotes the "rule" that contains the regulations of the community, in the War Scroll (1QM) it designates the military organization of the Qumranites.

The "Council of the Community" (*'atsat ha-yahad*) usually indicates a group of twelve men, including three special priests (1QS viii.1, however, can also be read to mean twelve men plus three priests [see Weinfeld]). The council of the community had awesome responsibilities; it was "a most holy assembly for Aaron, (with) eternal truth for judgment, chosen by (divine) pleasure to atone for the land and to repay the wicked their reward" (1QS viii.5-7). These twelve leaders were to be "perfect in everything which has been revealed from the whole Torah" (1QS viii.1-2); thus each one was "to perform truth, righteousness, justice" and "merciful love," and to walk circumspectly "with his fellow" (1QS viii.2). According to some passages in the Rule of the Community the members of the "Council of the Community" seem to have been the judges (1QS viii.3, viii.10); but, according to other passages in this composite document, it is possible that they arrived at some judgments, while most jurisdiction within the community was not before the council but before the "Many" (1QS vi.1). Either the priests in the council of twelve men must be "Sons of Aaron," since they are the only leaders who administer justice and property according to the end of the Rule of the Community ("the Sons of Aaron alone shall rule over judgment and property"; 1QS ix.7), or the latter rule applied only to an earlier phase in the life of the community.

The "Many" (*rabbim*; 1QS vi.7-21) is the name of the whole assembly when it deliberates over the business of the community. It is not wise to attempt to distinguish always between *rabbim* and *yahad*; they are virtually synonyms. The "Many" constituted all who have remained faithful, the novices who have passed all requirements, and those members who have been reinstated in the community. They made judicial decisions and were responsible for excommunications and readmission (1QS viii.19-ix.2). Thus, although the community was controlled in the early years by the Righteous Teacher, in practice it was sometimes oligarchic and even democratic; it seems likely that after the death of its "Teacher," "the Priest," the community became less monarchical. The "Many"

also gather together to worship and study: "The Many shall spend the third part of every night of the year in unity, reading the Book, studying judgment, and saying benedictions in unity." (1QS vi.7-8). During a session of the Many a member may not mention anything that is not pertinent to the Many (1QS vi.11).

The technical term *rabbim* does not appear in other Jewish literature that antedates 70 CE. It is, however, found in rabbinic literature. There it denotes a large gathering of Jews organized together for some business (i.e., *Qiddushin* 4.5; see also B.T., *Yev.* 86b, which Weinfeld suggests is close to Qumran usage).

Technical Terms for Leaders in the Community. "The Righteous Teacher" (*moreh ha-Tsedeq*) was the founder of the community. While he was alive he was the most important figure in the community. He was the bearer of God's special revelation (1QpHab), he was considered like Moses "the Lawgiver," he was the author of some of the hymns chanted in the community, and he most likely composed many of the rules to be memorized by members of the community (most likely, but not certainly, 1QS iii.13-4.16). It is unlikely that his office was inherited by others; rather, he was revered and praised by his followers far above any of his near or far contemporaries.

The "priests" (*ha-kohanim*) were the elite members of the community. They marched at the head of the yearly ceremony for covenant renewal (1QS ii.19-20). They were the first to sit in the session of the Many (1QS vi.8). Their authority was prescribed; a priest must be present when ten men gathered (1QS vi.3-4). The priest was to be the first to stretch out his hand to bless the bread and the new wine (1QS vi.5). The priests, as "the Sons of Aaron," "alone" were in charge of judgment and property (1QS ix.7).

All who joined the community swore to be "answerable to the Sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant" (1QS v.2). The "Sons of Zadok" (*benei tsadoq*), who seem to be synonymous with the "Sons of Aaron" (*benei 'aharon*), are, of course, priests. They are the ones who were in charge of almost everything, especially the interpretation of Torah. The "Interpreter of Torah" (*doresh be-Torah*) mentioned in 1QRule of the Community (1QS vi.6) is not necessarily a separate office but a function performed by a leader (in Testimonia 4Q175 1-3.11 he is a messianic figure who will arise "in the latter days"). Each leader was most likely empowered to interpret Torah, but there were probably ceremonial events in which a specially designated person was recognized as the "Interpreter of Torah," following the model of the Righteous Teacher, the interpreter of Torah par excellence for the members of the community.

The "elders" (*zeqenim*) are mentioned only in 1QRule

of the Community (1QS vi.8), and there they are second in authority and power only to the priests; that is, for the "session of the Many" the priests are to sit first, then the "elders," and finally all others. Because of this brief reference to the "elders," it is impossible to discern their functions at Qumran or compare them with the "elders" who were officials in synagogues and the Sanhedrin (cf. *Acts* 4.5, 4.8) or "the elders" (*hoi presbuteroi*) mentioned in the New Testament as heads of a church (i.e., *Acts* 15–16, *1 Tm.* 5.17, *Ti.* 1.5, *Js.* 5.14, *1 Pt.* 5.1, *2 Jn.* 1, *3 Jn.* 1).

The "Examiner" (*mevaqquer*; 1QS vi.12, 20; CD xiii.6, 7, 13; xiv.13; xv.8, 11, 14) was the most important official and functioned as the head of the community (the president or General superior). He was responsible, perhaps with the counsel of the *maskil*, for examining the novices (Rule, 5Q13 frg. 4.1, CD xv.11). He controlled discussions (1QS vi.11–13) and presided at plenary sessions. His authority was not absolute and could not become autocratic, since a member who was not recognized to speak by the examiner could appeal to the Many, and if they allowed him to speak, then he could address them (1QS vi.11–13). The examiner recorded all that went into the common storehouse (1QS vi.20). He had to be between thirty and fifty years of age, according to the Damascus Document (CD xiv.8–9; cf. Rule of the Congregation 1Q28a i.14–18), but it is not clear if that rule applied to the Qumran community.

The "Overseer" (*paqid*) was most likely the second most important officer, although it is conceivable (especially because the "Community" and the "Many" tend to be synonymous) that one person sometimes performed the tasks assigned to the "Examiner" and the "Overseer." He was "at the head of the many." He also examined the insight and works of all those who wished "to join the council of the community"—here meaning anyone who wished to join the community (1QS vi.14). The "Overseer" was to be between thirty and sixty years of age, according to the Damascus Document (xiv.6–7; cf. 1Q28a i.14–18), but it is impossible to discern if that rule applied at Qumran.

The "Master" (*maskil*), a wise and learned man, was the officer who taught the novices (4Q298). The *maskil* is not "only another title for the *mevaqquer*" (against Trebolle Barrera, 1995, p. 57). He was the one who had mastered "all understanding" (1QS ix.12–14). He evaluated "the Sons of Righteousness" (Rule of the Community⁶ 4Q259), who are "the chosen ones of the end time" (1QS ix.14), which probably denoted the novices. He was responsible for their advancement (1QS ix.15–16). His major task was to guide the devotees and "instruct them in the mysteries of wonder and truth in the midst of the men of the community" (1QS ix.18–19). The most important lesson to be taught to "the Sons of Light" by the "Master" is the in-

struction regarding "the two spirits," by which all humans are influenced:

It is for the Master to instruct and teach all the Sons of Light concerning the nature of all the sons of man, . . . From the God of knowledge comes all that is occurring and shall occur. . . . In a spring of light emanates the nature of truth and from a well of darkness emerges the nature of deceit. In the hand of the Prince of Light (is) the dominion of all the Sons of Righteousness; in the ways of light they walk. But in the hand of the Angel of Darkness (is) the dominion of the Sons of Deceit; and in the ways of darkness they walk. (1QS iii.13–21)

Structure of the Community. Men who wished to join the community faced at least two years of examination in knowledge and in conduct (1QS vi.21). If after the probationary period a novice passed all tests, he was admitted by the decree of the Many. He was then recorded and given a rank in the community. Finally, his property was placed in the common storehouse (1QS vi.22). Members could be punished, primarily by losing a portion of their food, be dismissed for a specified period of time, and even banished (1QS vi.25–7.18). Meals were eaten together, probably in one large room.

New Testament and Christian Origins. After the publication of the scrolls found in Cave 1, some New Testament specialists claimed that the *mevaqquer*—a term found at Qumran only in the Damascus Document and in the Rule of the Community, but nowhere else in other Jewish literature, including the apocryphal compositions and rabbinic writings—significantly helps explain the title and function of the bishop in the early church (Dupont-Sommer, 1950). The links, however, are not so persuasive, and the *mevaqquer* is not as dominant as the bishop seems to have been, and certainly became, in the church (Nötscher, 1961; Reicke, 1957). The parallel between twelve men with three special members is strikingly similar to the twelve men Jesus chose, among which were three special leaders (Peter, James, and John); but the number twelve symbolized Israel and its twelve tribes and the early synagogues may well have been led by twelve men. [See Twelve Patriarchs, Testaments of the.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, Philip S. "The Redaction History of Serekh ha-Yahad: A Proposal." *Revue de Qumrân* 17 (1996), 437–456.
- Charlesworth, James H. "Challenging the Consensus Communis Regarding Qumran Messianism (1QS, 4QS MSS)." In *Qumran-Messianism*, edited by James H. Charlesworth, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Gerbern S. Oegema, pp. 120–134. Tübingen, 1998.
- Charlesworth, James H. et al., eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen and Louisville, 1994. This volume contains the critical texts, translations, and introductions to all the copies of the Rule of the Community. Translations of the document in this article are from this critical edition.
- Charlesworth, James H., and Brent A. Stawn. "Reflections of the Text

- of *Serek ha-Yahad* Found in Cave IV." *Revue de Qumrân* 17 (1996), 405-435.
- Cross, Frank M. "Paleographical Dates of the Manuscripts." Appendix to E. Qimron and James H. Charlesworth, "Cave IV Fragments." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Rule of the Community*, edited by James H. Charlesworth, p. 57. Tübingen, 1994.
- Dupont-Sommer, André. *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la mer morte*. Paris, 1950.
- Maier, Johann. "Zum Begriff *yhd* in den Texten von Qumran." In *Qumran*, edited by Karl Erich Grötzinger et al., pp. 225-248. Wege der Forschung, 410. Darmstadt, 1981.
- Metso, S. *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 21. Leiden, 1997.
- Nötscher, Friedrich. "Vorchristliche Typen urchristlicher Ämter? Episkopos und Mebaqqer." In *Vom Alten zum Neuen Testament*, pp. 188-220. Bonner Biblische Beiträge 17. Bonn, 1961.
- Reicke, Bo. "The Constitution of the Primitive Church in the Light of Jewish Documents." In *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, edited by Krister Stendahl with James H. Charlesworth, pp. 143-156. New York, 1957.
- Trebolle Barrera, Julio. "System of Government." In *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs, and Practices*, edited by F. García Martínez and Julio Treballe Barrera, translated by Wilfred G. W. Watson, pp. 55-58. Leiden and New York, 1995. The presentation is confused because it is assumed, incorrectly, that the Rule of the Community and the Damascus Document should be read as if they pertain to the same community. Only the Rule of the Community describes the procedures for organization at Qumran; the Damascus Document applies to the Essenes who lived elsewhere.
- Vermes, Geza. "Preliminary Remarks on Unpublished Fragments of the Community Rule from Qumran Cave 4." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 42 (1991), 250-255.
- Vermes, Geza. "Qumran Forum Miscellanea I." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 43 (1992), 299-305.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect: A Comparison with Guilds and Religious Associations of the Hellenistic-Roman Period*. *Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus*, 2. Göttingen, 1986.

JAMES H. CHARLESWORTH

Community Organization in the Damascus Document

The discovery of fragments of eight manuscripts of the Damascus Document in Cave 4 at Qumran (4Q266-273) significantly increased our knowledge of the text of this work, which previously had been known only from two manuscripts found in the Cairo Genizah (CD MS A and MS B). Small fragments of the Damascus Document were also found in Caves 5 and 6 at Qumran (5Q12, 6Q15), but these were much less important. The Damascus Document consists of two sections, the Admonition and the Laws, but the Cave 4 discoveries showed that the text preserved in the Cairo Genizah manuscripts lacked the beginning of the Admonition, and the beginning and the conclusion of the Laws, as well as part of the Laws section itself. The corpus of Laws can now be seen to form about two-thirds of the entire work, and the Admonition

essentially serves as an introduction to the Laws; it is within the Laws that the sections of the Damascus Document concerned with community organization are to be found.

The Laws section provides legislation for a community of Jews who lived among other Jews and gentiles, were married and had children, had male and female slaves, practiced agriculture, engaged in trade, had private income from which they were expected to contribute the wages of at least two days per month to support members of the community who were in need. They adopted a positive attitude toward the Temple, in that they were concerned about maintaining its purity and participated in its cult. In short, the legislation was intended for a group of Jews who were not cut off from society, even though they formed a separate community. It is assumed here that this community was Essene and that the legislation essentially was Essene legislation. But it has been widely recognized that the corpus of Laws is a composite and that it consists of two main types of material: general *halakhah* and interpretation of the Torah on the one hand, and communal laws on the other. The former is represented, for example, by the detailed regulations concerning the observance of the Sabbath (CD x.14-xi.18); this type of material appears to have been intended for all Israel (cf. CD xii.19-22) and may include interpretations of the Torah that go back to the time before the formation of the Essenes. The latter is represented above all by CD xii.22-xiv.19, which is set off in the manuscript by the heading "And this [is] the rule for the settlers of [the] c[amps]." Other parts of the corpus of Laws are also concerned with communal organization, particularly the passage concerned with admission procedures (CD xv.5-xvi.6), the list of punishments for infringements of community law (4Q266, 270), and a ritual for expulsion from the community (4Q266, 270).

The community legislation of the Damascus Document invites comparison with that of the Rule of the Community (hereafter, 1QRule of the Community; 1QS v-ix). The relationship between the two works has often been explained on the basis that the Damascus Document was intended for those members of the sectarian movement who lived in towns and villages among other Jews, while 1QRule of the Community, which appears to embody a stricter law, was intended for those Essenes living at Qumran itself. It is perhaps more accurate to say that the two documents belong to different, but related, communities, and that, whatever the chronological relationship between the Damascus Document as a whole and 1QRule of the Community, the legislation of the Damascus Document is older than that of 1QRule of the Community, dating in its final form from about 100 BCE.

The Damascus Document refers to the community with

which it is concerned as a "congregation" (*'edah*; e.g., CD x.4, 5, 8; 4QD^a 8.i.9, 8.iii.4 4QD^e 7.i.14), but it also uses the expressions "association" (*hever*; CD xiv.16; 4QD^a 10.i.10) and "association (*hibbur*) of Israel" (CD xii.8). Like Israel in the wilderness period, the congregation is said to live in "camps" (*maḥanot*; e.g. CD ix.11; x.23; 4QD^a 11.17; 4QD^e 7.ii.14); behind the references to the term *camps* we should envisage groups of members of the community living among their fellow Jews in towns and cities—just as the Essenes were said to do by both Philo and Josephus. Each camp consisted of a minimum of ten men (cf. CD xiii.1), and each group was under the direction of a priest and an officer called "the overseer of the camp."

A summary of the duties of the priest (CD xiii.2–7) is introduced by the statement "And where there are ten, let there not be lacking a priest learned in the Book of Hagu" (CD xiii.2; cf. 1QS vi.3–4). What precisely is meant by the term the *Book of Hagu* (*Book of Meditation*) remains uncertain, but it may refer to the Torah or a collection of interpretations of the Torah. [See Hagu, Book of.] The priest was to exercise authority ("by his word shall they all be ruled" CD xiii.2–3); this probably refers to determining the interpretation of the Torah) and to hand down decisions in cases of skin disease (see *Lv.* 13). In interpreting the Torah, if the priest was "not experienced in all these [matters]" (CD xiii.3) and a Levite was, authority was to be exercised by the Levite. In cases involving skin disease, the priest was to be instructed in the interpretation of the law by the overseer; but even if the priest was ignorant, it was he who had to pronounce the legal decision. The application of the laws on skin disease was evidently a matter of concern to the members of the community, and more information on the role of the priest in applying the law is contained in a separate section on skin disease, which is preserved in fragmentary form in Damascus Documents^{a,d,g,h}.

The "overseer [*mevaqer*] of the camp" is also referred to as "the overseer of the many" (CD xv.8) or simply "the overseer." His duties consisted of exercising pastoral oversight over members of the camp and being responsible for the admission of new members, in which he had the final word (CD xiii.7–13). The duties assigned to the overseer are similar to those assigned to the "wise leader" or "master" (*maskil*) in the Rule of the Community (1QS ix.14–21), which suggests that the two offices were related. It is worth noting that in 1QRule of the Community (1QS vi.12) the title *overseer over the many* is used, apparently to refer to the individual called elsewhere the "wise leader," and that in the Damascus Document the title *wise leader* occurs several times but only in contexts too fragmentary to interpret. The overseer also was assigned to keep a record of witness statements in cases where a

capital offense was witnessed by a single individual, so that, if further offenses were committed, the requirement of the law of *Deuteronomy* 17.6 might be met by the cumulative record (CD ix.16–22). In a passage concerned with proper arrangements for marriages (Damascus Document^f 4Q271 3) the overseer was responsible for the arrangements for confirming the good moral character of a prospective bride (3.14).

The procedure for admission to the community is treated in more detail in the Damascus Document (CD xv.5–xvi.6) and was much simpler than that described in the 1QRule of the Community (1QS vi.13–23). According to the Damascus Document a potential member first was examined as to his suitability by the overseer and then required to swear "the oath of the covenant that Moses made with Israel, the cove[na]nt to re[turn t]o the law of Moses with all [his] heart and [with all his] soul." Sons of members were also required to take the oath, at the age of twenty (cf. *Ex.* 30.14). Once the new member had taken the oath, the community was free of the blame incurred by him if he transgressed; but he was eligible to be instructed by the overseer for one year. Those who were mentally or physically impaired were not permitted to join the congregation "because the holy angels [are in their midst]" (Damascus Document^a 4Q266 8i.6–9), the implication being that no person should be included who might offend the angels.

The section of the Damascus Document that is headed "The rule for the session of all the camps" is concerned with the organization of the entire community and describes the hierarchical order in which the members were to be registered and to conduct their meetings: "the priests first, the Levites second, the sons of Israel third, and the proselyte[s] fourth" (CD xiv.3–17). This passage also refers to two officers, "the priest who is appointed at the head of the many" and "the overseer of all the camps," whose responsibilities covered the entire congregation, not just an individual camp. The former, like the priest attached to each camp, had to be "learned in the Book of Hagu" in order to be capable of expounding the Torah. The latter, who was required to be master of "every secret of men and every language of their cla[n]s," was the ultimate source of authority in the congregation (CD xiv.9–17). He was responsible, together with the judges (see CD x.4–10), for receiving the contributions of at least two days' wages per member of the community, for the support of fellow members who were in need. With regard to commercial relations between members, in the Damascus Document it is said that they should not buy from or sell to fellow members, here called the "Sons of Dawn," except "hand to hand" (CD viii.14–15). Apparently, this means that they should not seek to profit from commercial dealings with fellow members of the community, but

provide for their needs on the basis of exchange and mutual trust. They were not to make agreements for buying or selling without informing the overseer of the camp (CD xiii.15–16).

Communal discipline was enforced by a series of punishments, and a list of these is given near the end of the corpus of Laws. The beginning of the list survives in fragmentary form in the Cairo Genizah manuscript of the Damascus Document (CD xiv.20–23) but much more has been preserved in Damascus Document^a and Damascus Document^c (4Q266 10.i, ii; 4Q270 7.i). Similar lists of punishments are found in 1QRule of the Community (1QS vi.24–vii.25) and in the fragments of Serekh Damascus (4Q265). Punishments range from a penance of ten days for interrupting the speech of another member or for leaving the assembly three times without reason, to thirty days exclusion and ten days of penance for falling asleep in the assembly or for indecent exposure, to exclusion for one year and six months of penance for insulting a fellow member. The ultimate sanction—expulsion—was levied for at least five offenses: a malicious accusation in a capital case, slandering the community, fornication with one's wife in violation of the law (where the precise nature of the breach of the law is unclear), murmuring against "the fathers" (apparently an honorific applied to senior members of the community), and despising the communal law. A good deal remains unclear about the list of punishments, including the precise nature of the penance—whether it involved loss of rations or some other punishment, such as exclusion from communal deliberations—but the list provides a revealing insight into the issues that were important to members in relation to the internal working of the community.

As noted above, the punishment for those who despised the communal law was expulsion, and the final part of the corpus of Laws consisted of a ritual of expulsion for "everyone who despises these regulations in accordance with all the statutes that are found in the law of Moses." The ritual is preserved in Damascus Document^a and Damascus Document^c (4Q266 11; 4Q270 7.i, ii) and the expulsion occurred at the time of the annual ceremony of the renewal of the covenant in the third month (4Q266 11.17), almost certainly on the occasion of Shavu'ot. The ritual of expulsion includes a prayer uttered by "the priest who is appointed over the many" (4Q266 11.8). Those who were associated with the man being expelled were to leave with him, and a record was to be kept by the overseer, presumably the "overseer of all the camps" (4Q266 11.14–16). [See Cairo Genizah; Damascus Document; and Rule of the Community.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baumgarten, Joseph M. "The 'Sons of Dawn' in CDC 13:14–15 and the Ban on Commerce among the Essenes." *Israel Exploration Journal* 33 (1983), 81–85.

Baumgarten, Joseph M. "The Cave 4 Versions of the Qumran Penal Code." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 43 (1992), 268–276.

Baumgarten, Joseph M. *Qumran Cave 4, XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, 18. Oxford, 1996.

Hempel, Charlotte. *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Traditions, and Redaction*. Forthcoming in the series Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah. Analysis of the different layers within the Laws of the Damascus Document.

Knibb, Michael A. "The Place of the Damascus Document." In *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects*, edited by Michael O. Wise et al., pp. 149–162. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, vol. 722. New York, 1994.

Qimron, Elisha. "The Text of CDC." In *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*, edited by Magen Broshi, pp. 9–49. Jerusalem, 1992. Recent edition of manuscripts A and B of the Damascus Document from the Cairo Genizah.

Vermes, Geza. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*. 3d., rev., pp. 85–99. London, 1994. Discussion of the community organization reflected in the Damascus Document and its relation to that reflected in the Community Rule.

MICHAEL A. KNIBB

Community Organization in Other Texts

The Rule of the Community from Cave 1 (hereafter, 1QRule of the Community, 1QS) and the Damascus Document (CD 4Q266–4Q273, 5Q12, 6Q15) are not the only texts found at Qumran that reflect something of the communal life of those responsible for the Dead Sea Scrolls. Three other texts deserve to be mentioned on account of their communal legislation: Serekh Damascus (4Q265), Rebukes by the Overseer (4Q477), and the Rule of the Congregation (1Q28a).

Serekh Damascus, which survives only in fragmentary form, reveals affinities with both 1QRule of the Community and the Damascus Document, but its legislation does not correspond exactly with that of either work. Thus, affinities with the 1QRule of the Community can be observed in the list of punishments, specifically the provision for a cut of half the food ration (4Q265 1.i, cf. 1QS vi.25) although the amount is not the same) in the procedure for admission (4Q265 1.ii, cf. 1QS vi.13–23), and in the provision for a council of fifteen men, the members of which would make atonement for the land (4Q265 2.ii, cf. 1QS viii.1–10; ix.3–6). The passages in 1QRule of the Community indicate that the atonement would be made, not by sacrifice, but by prayer and by proper observance of the Torah. On the other hand, the Sabbath legislation of Serekh Damascus (4Q265 2.i) is very similar to that of the Damascus Document (CD x.14–18).

The few small fragments of the work known as Rebukes by the Overseer preserve the remains of a record of rebukes of community members who had committed an offense. Both 1QRule of the Community (1QS v.24–vi.1) and the Damascus Document CD ix.2–8 refer to the

duty of members to rebuke their fellows, apparently as a preliminary stage in the judicial process, and the Damascus Document (CD ix.16–20) provides that a record of such rebukes was to be kept by the overseer. Rebukes by the Overseer perhaps would be better entitled "The Overseer's Record of Rebukes." The offenses listed are essentially ones that affected the internal life of the community, such as being short-tempered or offending the spirit of the community, and the text is additionally important because it is the first in which the actual names of members are preserved.

1QRule of the Congregation is a short text that appears as a kind of appendix at the end of the version of the Rule of the Community found in Cave 1 at Qumran. It provides legislation for a community living "at the end of days," and it includes regulations for the common meals that would be eaten when the two messianic figures expected by the community, the priest and the Messiah of Israel, had appeared. But at the same time it seems very likely that the legislation contained in the document reflected the actual practice of the community that produced it. As in the case of the Damascus Document, the community with which the Rule of the Congregation is concerned is frequently described as a "congregation" (*edah*; e.g., 1Q28a i.1, 6)—hence the title given to the work—but terminology familiar from the Rule of the Community, namely, "the council of the community" (see e.g., 1Q28a i.26, 27), is also used. The Rule of the Congregation legislates, again, like the Damascus Document, for a community whose members were married and had children: The first part of the document (i.6–25) is concerned with the education of children and the stages in the lives of members. Thus, at the age of twenty, members were registered in the community and were permitted to marry, and at the ages of twenty-five and thirty they achieved higher levels of seniority in the community; these thresholds were based on biblical precedent (cf. *Ex.* 30.14; *Nm.* 1.3; 4.3; 4.23; 8.24) and may be compared with the ages in the Damascus Document (CD x.6–10; xiv.6–10) and the War Scroll (1QM vi.13–vii.3).

The central part of the Rule of the Congregation (1Q28a i.25–ii.11) is concerned with procedure at assemblies of the congregation, from which those who were ritually unclean or who suffered from a physical defect were to be excluded. The reason given is the same as the reason given in Damascus Document^a (4Q266 8.i.6–9) for exclusion from the congregation, namely, "because the holy angels are [in] their [congregat]ion." The final part of the text (1Q28a ii.11–22) contains the legislation for the communal meals to be eaten in the messianic age. At these meals the messianic priest, who no doubt is to be identified with the Messiah of Aaron in 1QRule of the Community, would have precedence over the Messiah of Israel. The legislation in the Rule of the Congregation concerned

with the common meal of the messianic age bears an obvious similarity to the regulation in 1QRule of the Community, (1QS vi.4–5) which, although in much briefer form, is concerned with the common meals of the community responsible for that scroll; this suggests that the common meals were seen as an anticipation of the common meals that would be eaten in the messianic age.

The legislation in the Rule of the Congregation for the common meals ends as follows: "It is in accordance with this statute that they shall proceed at every me[al at which] at least ten men [g]ather" (1Q28a ii.21–22). The group of ten is referred to in both 1QRule of the Community (cf. 1QS vi.3–4, 6–7) and the Damascus Document (CD xiii.1–2) Josephus also refers to such a group of ten in his account of the Essenes, and the rabbinic writings likewise regard ten men as the minimum needed to perform certain religious activities.

The above texts reveal a number of interesting connections with the communal legislation of the 1QRule of the Community and the Damascus Document, which make it clear that all the texts stem, if not from the same community, at least from related communities. But it is also clear that no simple picture is likely to do justice to the complexities of the relationships between the texts or the communities that lie behind them.

The texts mentioned above are explicitly concerned with community organization. There are, however, a number of other legal texts which, although they consist primarily of interpretations or amplifications of biblical law, nonetheless do occasionally touch on matters of community organization. To mention just one example, Ordinances^a (4Q159; cf. Ordinances^{b-c} [4Q513, 4Q514]) has been described as an anthology of elaborations of biblical laws on diverse topics and has been thought to be close in style to parts of the corpus of Laws in the Damascus Document. Here, alongside laws on such topics as the amount of the harvest that the poor may garner (cf. *Dt.* 23.24–25) or on slavery (cf. *Lv.* 25.39–46), there is reference to a tribunal of twelve men, including two priests, which had the power to impose the death penalty. By contrast, the Damascus Document (CD x.4–10) provides for a tribunal of ten judges, four of whom were to be priests.

[See also Damascus Document; Rule of the Community; Rule of the Congregation; and Serekh Damascus.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allegro, John M., ed. "Ordinances." In *Qumran Cave 4. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, 5. Oxford, 1968.
- Baillet, Maurice. "Texte halachique." In *Qumran Grotte 4: 4Q482–4Q520. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, 7. Oxford, 1982.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. "The Cave 4 Versions of the Qumran Penal Code." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 43 (1992), 268–276. Includes discussion of the penal code of 4QSerekh Damascus (4Q265) in relation to the penal codes of the Damascus Document and the Community Rule.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. "Purification after Childbirth and the Sacred

Garden in 4Q265 and Jubilees." In *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris, 1992*, edited by George J. Brooke and Florentino García Martínez, pp. 3–10, Pl. 1. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 15. Leiden, 1994. Preliminary edition and study of parts of 4Q Serekh Damascus.

Eshel, Esther. "4Q477: The Rebukes by the Overseer." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 45 (1994), 111–122.

Hempel, Charlotte. "Who Rebukes in 4Q477?" *Revue de Qumrân* 16 (1995), 655–656.

Knibb, Michael A. *The Qumran Community*, pp. 145–155. Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200, 2. Cambridge, 1987. Translation of and commentary on the Rule of the Congregation.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation*. Society of Biblical Literature, Monograph Series, 38. Atlanta, 1989.

MICHAEL A. KNIBB

CONSERVATION. The first of the Dead Sea Scrolls was discovered in 1947 and exploration continued in the area of Qumran until 1956. Some of the scrolls were found wrapped in linen cloths in jars, other in niches in the walls of caves or on the floor buried in dirt and partially disintegrated by the action of water, insects, and mold. By the end of 1959, most of the fragments that had been found, and those that had been bought from bedouin who searched the area as well, were arranged in the so-called Scrollery, on the premises of the Rockefeller Museum. After two thousand years in the caves, the scrolls began to be treated by the scholars under drastically different climatic conditions, raising a number of issues concerning the scrolls' conservation.

The majority of the scrolls are written on hides, the others on papyrus. The skin of the Dead Sea Scrolls is neither leather nor parchment, as we understand these terms today.

Previous Conservation. When the international team of scholars began preparing an edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls for publication, the scrolls were moistened, then flattened and sorted, according to the text. In the course of sorting, pressure-sensitive tape was used for backing and connecting. The flattened fragments of parchment and papyri were placed between sheets of ordinary window glass without framing. Fragments lay loose between glass plates, sometimes slipping out. These plates were piled one above the other, causing additional pressure on the fragments. Thus, the process of penetration of the greasy and sticky adhesive of the cello tape into the parchment was accelerated.

It is interesting to note the description of the state of the scrolls given by John M. Allegro, one of the first editors of the scrolls, in 1966: "On a recent visit to the Museum I saw for myself just how perilous is the situation. Fragile fragments, which have been out of their desert

habitat now for more than fourteen years, are lying still between the glass plates where we left them many years ago, mostly unsecured, and in some cases, as I was horrified to see, subjected to intolerable pressure by the plates lying on top of one another in a large cabinet."

In 1955, Harold Plenderleith, the Keeper of the Research Laboratory of the British Museum, was approached about the matter. In his technical notes of that year he describes how he attempted to separate and analyze scroll fragments contained in three boxes that had been sent to London. "After many experiments the process eventually adopted was to expose the scroll fragments at 100% relative humidity for a few minutes and then to transfer them to a refrigerator for a like period. The degree of freezing was sufficient to congeal the surface of the black material while leaving the membrane sufficiently limp."

When Plenderleith came to Jerusalem in March 1962 he tried to unroll a rigid scroll. The method just described having failed, he carried out a dissection with appropriate tools, using as support the thinnest white silk, spread thinly with polyvinyl acetate and brought into intimate contact with the clean flat surface of the scroll. In 1963, Valerie H. Foulkes of the British Museum visited the Rockefeller Museum in order to prepare the scrolls for an exhibition in the British Museum. She wrote in her report: "It was a shock to discover the extent of the contamination caused by Scotch Tape. The cello tape was removed with trichloroethylene as recommended by Mr. Plenderleith. Gunned silk strips or gold beater skin was used in order to join the fragments, with polyvinyl acetate as adhesive. Special leather dressing was applied to the reverse."

Only in the 1970s and 1980s were some of the parchments and papyri (that were stored in glass plates) restored in the laboratories of the Israel Museum. According to documentation, the cello tape was removed with a scalpel, and greasy spots of adhesive with trichloroethylene. The fragments were treated with the disinfectant thymol. They were then backed with white lens tissue, using perspex glue as a solution in acetone and polyvinyl acetate glue. Some of the glass plates were replaced by acid cardboard, the kind available in Israel at that time.

Thus, the scrolls passed through many hands, were exposed to drastic environmental changes, and treated by various methods. Unsuitable treatments in the fifties, sixties and seventies—excessive humidity, leather dressing, polyvinyl acetate, and perspex solution—compounded the deterioration.

Current Methods. In 1991, a laboratory for the conservation of the scrolls was established by the Israel Antiquities Authority in the Rockefeller Museum. The state of the scrolls had deteriorated further. The fragments had been penetrated by the adhesive of the cello tape; they were darkened; on some, the text was no longer legible; and,