

BRIAN J. CAPPER
Canterbury Christ Church University,
Canterbury CT1 1QU, UK

**THE JUDAEAN CULTURAL CONTEXT
OF COMMUNITY OF GOODS IN THE EARLY
JESUS MOVEMENT**

Part VI

**VI. The Employment of Extended Entrance
Procedures in Fully Property-sharing Groups**

1. Introduction

The *serekh ha-yachadh* document from the Dead Sea Scrolls was found in one almost complete copy (1QS = 1Q28a and 1Q28b) and ten incomplete copies (4Q255–264) and two very small fragments (5Q11). This rule document is attested in different recensions, palaeographically dated c. 125 BC to c. 50 AD. It has formed a primary piece of evidence in the identification of the ancient buildings near the outflow of the *wadi Qumran* into the north-western Dead Sea and the community which lived in and near them as ‘Essene’ on account of discerned parallels with the classical notices on the Jewish religious grouping of the Essenes in Philo, Josephus and Pliny the Elder. Primary amongst these parallels are hostility to wealth/property and the apparent practice of ‘community of property’ or ‘community of goods’.

A school of opinion has arisen in recent years, however, which opposes the view that *serekh ha-yachadh* legislates for community of property. A much earlier challenger was Chaim Rabin in his *Qumran Studies* (Oxford University Press, 1957), who argued that members merely registered their property for trade within a closed trading circle of Pharisees who insisted, for example, that all property was properly tithed (the Pharisaic *Chaburah*). Rabin took the root “*rabh* in 1QS to reflect combination for purposes of mutual trade, the verb meaning ‘to have business dealings with’, and this view of the meaning of the term still has some currency.¹ It is presently common to find scholars of the Dead Sea Scrolls taking the position that one or more passages of *serekh ha-yachadh* presuppose that full members of the Community (the *yachadh*) retained personal property. A representative treatment and summary of this view was given by Charlotte Hempel’s ‘Community Structures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Admission, Organisation, Disciplinary Structures’, in Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam’s two volume collection, *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*.² She concluded that the *Rule* “allows” “for a certain amount of private ownership”. This collected work’s title shows that its editors and Hempel sought to represent the scholarly guild. Similarly, Catherine M.

¹ Rabin presented his case against community of goods in 1QS on pp. 22–36. Earlier opponents to community of goods in 1QS were addressed in the important treatment of David L. Mealand, ‘Community of Goods at Qumran’, *Theologische Zeitschrift* 31 (1975), pp. 129–139.

² Leiden: Brill, 1999. Hempel’s paper is in Volume 2, pp. 67–92; the quotation here is from p. 74.

Murphy's massive treatment, *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community*³ accepts that members of the *yachadh* retained certain personal property rights. Murphy argues that members retained title to property handed over to the community, but gave the usufruct from their for common use.

This paper will first consider the objections which have been raised against the long-standing earlier view that 1QS legislates for a complete communalising of property amongst full members. It will be argued that these objections are incorrect, since all the texts concerned can be read comfortably within the social context of real situations faced by probationers and full members of the *yachadh*. I will then go on to argue that the complexity of the regulations of 1QS VI.13–23 governing the extended process of entry into the *yachadh*, especially the probationer's handing of his property into the community's administration in the last year of the entry procedure while still retaining title to his property at 1QS VI.20, yields very strong arguments supporting, when compared with other cases of the probationer's loss of the right to administer his own property in the final stage of probationary membership in various fully property-sharing communities through history, the view that 1QS legislates for the complete sharing of property amongst full members.

2. Objections to Community of Goods in 1QS

I here deal with what I consider misreadings, including mistranslations, of texts in 1QS on the part of those who deny full community of goods to full members of the *yachadh*.

2.1 Against misreading "Except for Payment" in 1QS V.17

V.10, 14–17 He will bind himself by oath though the Covenant to separate from all the men of wickedness who walk in the way of evil... for uncleanness is in all who transgress his word. No one shall unite with him his work or in his property lest "he cause him to bear guilt;" [Lev. 22:16] for he shall keep far from him in every matter for thus it is written "Thou shalt keep far from every false matter." [Exodus 23:7] And further, a man of the men of the Community shall not turn away to their opinion in any Law or judgment. Moreover, he shall not eat from their property anything and he shall not drink and he shall not take from their hand anything whatsoever 17 except for a price [=payment]...

For some scholars, 1QS V.10–17 seems to imply that members of the *yachadh* purchased items from personal resources. Simply put, the new school of opinion likes to take the payment mentioned in V.17 as payment from personal funds, rather than from community resources. However, this text may be taken to imply payment from community resources when full members made unusual journeys. We may also think in terms of payments made from the personal resources of probationary members when on journeys.

The member of the *yachadh*, the "Community" or "Unity" was not to enjoy any material benefit from non-members. To employ a phrase of 1 Enoch and Luke's Gospel, outsiders' property was "Mammon of unrighteousness".⁴ The Enoch literature is well attested amongst the Qumran Scrolls, so we should not detach the *Rule of the*

³ *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*, Leiden: Brill, 2002.

⁴ Luke 16:6, 11 and 1 Enoch 63:10.

Community from 1 Enoch's detestation of wicked elite landlordism.⁵ Outsiders' wealth was in part generated by the unjust economic practises of those who did not hold to God's righteous laws in matters of property, but accumulated great wealth in money and landed property by illegitimate means. Therefore, outsiders who were under the obvious sway of the Spirit of Falsehood, the dominion of Belial (cf. 1QS I–IV), included: wicked estate owners who deprived workers of just wages (cf. the New Testament Letter of James, 5:1–5), or who stole the lands of others by obtaining unfair judgements in the courts, or who ignored the Sabbath year release of debt and the Jubilee; those who neglected their traditional duty of care for the indigent poor (cf. Jesus' parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, Luke 16:19–31); tax-collectors who defrauded (cf. the Gospel story of Zacchaeus, Luke 19:1–10); soldiers who extorted (cf. John the Baptist's exhortations, Luke 3:10–14); and money-lenders who charged interest forbidden by the Law. Outsiders might make gifts from untithed crops. And who knew if an outsider was a thief? To accept material benefit from those who did not keep the Law according to the Community's very strict legal standard was to share the guilt of those who broke the law in matters of property.

Does this regulation assume that group members had private property, and therefore contradict the view that 1QS legislates for groups that practised community of property? This seems to me an unreasonable contention. We must allow, for example, that sometimes Community emissaries might have to travel where no fellow members of the *yachadh* could offer hospitality.⁶ These might be furnished in trust with funds belonging to the *yachadh* to buy necessities from accepted sources. On journeys, emissaries were not allowed to receive hospitality from strangers, i.e. non-members of the *yachadh*, however generously proffered.

I would suggest that a group particularly in view are probationers in their earlier periods of provisional membership, when they continued both to own and administer their property (cf. 1QS VI.13–17). These probationary members might need to travel to wind up unexpected issues arising from former or remaining business assets, or to deal with matters relating to land they still owned, or perhaps to return to discuss reasonable questions raised by families. Business associates or family members who needed visiting might be complete outsiders of the Essene movement or belong to the secondary order of the *Damascus Rule* (CD). It may have been often necessary to wind up such associations prior to the sale of property and its handing into the administration of the *yachadh* at the beginning of the final phase of provisional membership (cf. 1QS VI.20–23). It might prove necessary or expedient to resolve matters regarding property with family members or former business partners inclined to raise claims against assets soon to be handed to the Community. Such

⁵ For bibliography and a particular view regarding the connections between the Enoch literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls see Gabriele Boccacini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) and *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans: 2005); note also Paul Heger, *Challenges to Some Conventional Opinions on Qumran and Enoch Issues* (STDJ, Leiden: Brill, 2011).

⁶ Normally Essenes travelled without possessions since they received hospitality from the local fellow community at their destination (cf. Josephus, *Jewish War*, 2.8.4 §§124–127). But there may have been instances when emissaries travelled further afield (perhaps in pairs, as was conventional for emissaries in ancient Judaism, cf. Joachim Jeremias, 'Paarweise Sendung im Neuen Testament', in his *Abba: Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte* [Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966] pp. 132–139), perhaps when seeking unusual resources for their community or more distant markets for community wares.

matters probably often arose with family, since kinship ties to the assets of relatives offered the first line of economic defence in the ancient distressed agrarian economy. Land and other assets of blood kin destined for a place outside kinship structures were probably often jealously viewed by relatives; the issue of their donation to a group outside the family might easily precipitate a hot debate and even legal challenges.

Since occasionally travellers might sometimes be forced to meet basic needs from outside sources, the Community reflected on the moral and spiritual dimensions of having to acquire food and other necessities when travelling. The regulation clarified an obvious point of difficulty. The Community judged, shrewdly, that so long as payment was made, the member incurred no guilt and the Community no taint. Payment also ensured no possible entanglement of the *yachadh* in obligations arising from emergency assistance offered to its travelling members. The regulation, interestingly, implies that even gifts and hospitality from blood kin could not be accepted. This emphatically separated the first-year probationer from enticements from blood kin, especially when smoothly finalising relations with relatives proved expedient or necessary.

2.2 Against misreading ration withdrawal as ‘fines’ in 1QS VI.25

VI.24–25 If there is found among them a man who has lied knowingly in a matter of property they shall exclude him from the Purity of the Many for one year and he shall be punished [by withdrawal of] one fourth of his bread.

Rabin suggested that in 1QS VI.25 the term *lechem* should be rendered “wages” and distinguished from “the Purity”, which term described the meal of the community. Thus rendered the regulation ascribes wages, and therefore private property, to members⁷ However, the lexica offer no support for translating *lechem* as “wages”, for which the natural term was *shakhar*, Greek *misthos*. At Matthew 10:10 the wages of the *ergatēs*, paid in kind are *trophē*, ‘nourishment, food’. In the Septuagint *trophē* sometimes translates *lechem*, since bread was the staple of antiquity. But 1QS VI.25 uses the term for bread, *lechem*, which is never rendered *misthos*. If it is correct, with many interpreters, to understand the regulations of VI.13–23 as requiring the candidate for membership in a full community of property to hand over his property into the administration of the Community at the beginning of the last year of his provisional membership, during which it continued to remain his own, and if VI.24–25, which follows soon after, was formulated to refer specifically to false declarations made in that context, the regulation causes no difficulty. The candidate in the last year of his membership, having passed his property into community administration, would become very dependent on the community for his rations, and the fine is specifically a quarter of his ‘bread’. Rabin read the idea of wages into the text against the literal meaning of the term employed, which makes good sense in its context. Rabin’s argument has not been taken up in recent discussion. The regulation imposes on the misdemeanant a reduction in ration as well as dining separately from the common table.

⁷ Chaim Rabin, *Qumran Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957), p. 25.

2.3 Against misreading the case of negligence/accidental damage and repair

VII.5–10 ...And if 6 he is negligent with his neighbour he shall be punished for three months. But if he is negligent with the property of the Community, to destroy it, he shall restore [=repair] it {...} 7 completely. [Ll. 7a-7b or 8–9 blank] 8/10 But if his hand does not reach [cf. Lev. 5:7, 11, 14:21, 22, 32; 27.8] to restore [=repair] it, he shall be punished for sixty days.

This second regulation here, when translated differently from the above, has provided the most commonly used argument against the view that 1QS legislates for a community of property. Here I follow Martínez and Tigchelaar in translating the two occurrences of *yithrameh* in line 6 as “he is negligent”.⁸ This is a common rendering. Brownlee commented that the *hithpa’el* stem is not attested for the verb elsewhere in Hebrew, noted that Jastrow gives the meaning of the Aramaic *ithpa’el* as “to happen, or to chance”, and that he himself followed a process of reasoning independent of Jastrow to deduce the meaning “to be careless” for the verb.⁹ Dupont-Sommer translated *yithrameh* ‘il se montre négligent’.¹⁰ Lohse translated “fahrlässig handelt”,¹¹ Vermes translated “failed to care”,¹² as does VanderKam.¹³

We must first establish that it is the consequences of accident or negligence that are at issue in line six. Leaney translated *yithrameh* “defraud”.¹⁴ Wernberg-Møller rendered the verb as “behave fraudulently”.¹⁵ Wise, Abegg and Cook took a somewhat different path, translating *yithrameh* “is drawn unawares into a fraudulent scheme;”¹⁶ Murphy goes further, translating “acts treacherously”.¹⁷ However, the logic of the relative punishments dispensed clearly precludes these translations, and shows that we are here dealing only with accidental damage or negligence. If the consequences of the action against the property of the Community can be restored by the misdemeanor, no other punishment is imposed. No other crime in the long penal code is punished so mildly. Even a gesticulation with the left hand receives an unavoidable ten days of ration reduction and exclusion from the common table. Only accidental damage to inanimate objects can be so mildly culpable that only restoration alone is sufficient punishment. This is the law of ‘tort’, the law of damages, in the specific case of accident or carelessness.

Murphy wrongly classifies these negligence regulations in a group with the preceding regulation in VII.5, “And whoever speaks to his fellow with deception or knowingly deceives him, shall be punished for six months.”¹⁸ Murphy translates this

⁸ Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*, Vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), p. 87.

⁹ William H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline: Translation and Notes* (BASOR Supplementary Studies 10–12 (New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951) p. 29 n. 14.

¹⁰ A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les Écrits Esséniens Découverts près de la Mer Morte* (Paris: Payot, 1960), p. 104.

¹¹ Eduard Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1971) p. 27.

¹² Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Allen Lane, 1997) p. 107.

¹³ James C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994) p. 83.

¹⁴ A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning* (London: SCM, 1966), pp. 198, 204.

¹⁵ P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline* (Leiden: Brill, 1957).

¹⁶ M. Wise, M. Abegg Jr. and E. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: HarperCollins 1996), p. 136.

¹⁷ Murphy, *op. cit.*, p. 520.

¹⁸ Here in the translation of Martínez and Tigchelaar, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

regulation “speaks deceit or does treachery to his fellow intentionally”. But how, then, is dealing treacherously with one’s fellow here, which is stated to be intentional, any different from, according to her translation, the crime of ‘acting treacherously to a fellow’ in the succeeding regulation (VI.5[*end*]-6)? Treachery is by its nature always intentional; it can hardly be thought less in the latter regulation through the omission of ‘knowingly’, while the former regulation explicitly uses this term. Yet the punishments vary between these crimes, the former receiving a punishment of six months while the latter receives three months.

Moreover, the comparison with the third regulation in Murphy’s block classification, in VI.6-7, equally disproves her translation and her classification of all three under the heading ‘acts treacherously’. Here she translates ‘And if with the wealth of the community he acts treacherously’¹⁹ Yet this crime completely escapes punishment is restoration can be made. Even if restoration cannot be made, the punishment is only sixty days. We should expect a greater punishment for acting treacherously with the wealth of the *yachadh* than against a fellow (VII.5); yet this receives the greater punishment of six months.

If a member has been negligent ‘with his neighbour’, this means injury to a person, which is more serious than damage to property. Not only should we expect the greater penalty for ‘acting fraudulently’ against the community; deception worked against the *yachadh* itself would be a heinous crime indeed and deserve a very serious punishment. Members belong — and probationary members aspire to belong — to the ‘Community of Truth’ (II.24, 26); they seek cleansing through and follow after the ‘Spirit of Truth’ (III.18-19; IV.21, 23) and are twice called the ‘sons of Truth’ (IV.5-6).²⁰ Such a crime moves even into the terrible orbit occupied by Ananias and Sapphira’s lies to the Holy Spirit in Acts 5:1-11. At VI.25 the punishment for lying in matters of property (i.e. to the *yachadh*) results in a year’s punishment; for the crime of ‘acting fraudulently’ against the Community we should expect a similar, severe punishment. Yet the first punishment option at VII.6-7, merely restitution, if possible, is negligible. It is even less than that prescribed both for the crime of ‘lying’ in VI.25 and the same misdemeanour against one’s neighbour (*r-m-h* in *hithpa ‘ēl*) in VII.5-6. These comparisons shows that the second part of this double regulation in VII.5(*end*)-8 is formulated to deal with the essentially *nugatory* matter of accidental or negligent damage to property, albeit the property of the *yachadh*.

There is no difficulty at all with translating *r-m-h* in *hithpa ‘ēl* as simply ‘deal negligently, carelessly’ rather than finding a malicious quality in the action denoted (‘act deceitfully, fraudulently’). Murphy reads *r-m-h* in *hithpa ‘ēl* as having the intensive force of *r-m-h* in *pi ‘ēl*, i.e. ‘beguile, deal treacherously with’.²¹ This is, however, to over-read the root, which in *qal* simply means ‘to cast, shoot’. We may deduce that the reflexive *hithpa ‘ēl*, literally ‘to cast oneself’, meant simply ‘to fall accidentally’ or ‘to cast oneself’, without intensive force. Both of these senses naturally extend naturally to the meaning ‘to behave carelessly, negligently’.

¹⁹ Murphy, *op. cit.*, p. 504.

²⁰ Cf. “the sons of his/your truth” (1QH XIV.32; XV.32-33; XVII.35; XVIII.29; XIX.14).

²¹ Cf. F. Brown, S. Driver and C. Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon*, (Boston, Mass.: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1906), p. 941.

Murphy lays, with many scholars who support the revisionist view which denies full community of property in 1QS, particular weight on 1QS VII.5(end)–10. As we have seen, her understanding of the key verb in both regulations, *r-m-h* in *hithpa'el*, is ‘to deal treacherously’.²² I consider now a further issue of translation, in which she supports an unlikely option from which her case for some private property remaining to full members builds. She argues that if the member acted wrongly in this way against the property of the community, the second of the pair of regulations, then the misdemeanor was to make restitution from personal resources if possible. Here she understands the root *sh-l-m* to refer to financial restitution, along with other revisionists who base their understanding of the verb on later, Rabbinic usage. In Rabbinic parlance, *shālam* often refers to making good through financial compensation, ‘to financially compensate’. In my view, much mischief has been done in the interpretation of the *Rule of the Community* by forcing *l'shalmô* in lines 6 and seven to denote financial compensation. Certainly, the root in *pi'el* can indicate financial compensation (cf. Lev. 24:18, 21). But the root is about all forms of wholeness, not merely the financial. The adjective *shalēm* means ‘whole, complete’; *shalôm* is ‘completeness, soundness, welfare, peace.’ The meaning of *sh-l-m* in *qal* is ‘to be complete, finished, ended’ and ‘to be sound, uninjured’, and the meanings of the root in *pi'el* are: 1) ‘complete or finish’; 2) ‘make safe’; 3) ‘make whole or good’ or ‘restore the thing lost’; 4) ‘make good, i.e. pay vows’; 5) ‘requite, recompense, reward’.²³ It is self-evident that those who regulated regarding accidental damage to property would allow a (perhaps hapless) misdemeanor the opportunity to undo any damage done by his own efforts. This is well and naturally expressed with this root — he is to restore, make good, make whole again, in full, the damage he has caused. It is not a matter of payment, but of extra labour and the expense of skill. Only if his skill is insufficient — not his money — or if the damage is irrevocable because of its nature — must punishment follow. It is true, of course, that the probationer who causes accidental damage to fabric or articles belonging to the Community might be able to pay for some otherwise irreparable accidental damage from his personal property. That particular case of financial compensation *may* be covered by the wording of the regulation, and this because of the general notion of restoration and making good in the verb used, not because of a necessary connotation of financial compensation in the verb itself.

That Murphy’s preference for reading the root *sh-l-m* from the specifically Rabbinic legal context, hence as necessarily referring to financial compensation, proves incorrect, in my view suggests that it is incorrect to look to later Rabbinic technical usage as a primary guide for reading the Hebrew of the Scrolls. I prefer to follow the Martinez and Tigchelaar,²⁴ and many others, in translating this regulation as simply about carelessness, negligence, an obvious and even necessary matter for the *Rule of the Community* to deal with in its long-lived communal setting. Those who lived by and applied to others this rule in a communal setting must often have faced the issue of accidental or negligent damage. This is the only point in the *Rule* where the matter appears to be addressed; it is the point where we find this expected content.

²² Murphy, *op. cit.*, pp. 144, 504, and 519–520, ‘acts treacherously’.

²³ Cf. Brown, Driver and Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon*, pp. 1022–1024.

²⁴ 1QS VII.5–6 ‘if he is negligent to his fellow’, ‘if he is negligent with the possessions of the Community’; Martínez and Tigchelaar, *op. cit.*, p. 87. However, I prefer to translate *sh-l-m* in 1QS VII.10 as ‘repair’ rather than ‘replace’, since the misdemeanor is clearly first required to attempt to repair damage that he has caused.

Moreover, it is indeed necessary for a community which shares property, and uses property in common, such as accommodation buildings and utensils of work and pleasure, to regulate about how negligence resulting in damage to property or persons is to be dealt with. We find much later in Christian monastic communities which practised renunciation of personal property and complete sharing in Christian monasticism, such as the *Rule of St. Benedict*, for example, rules dealing with the need to care for communal property and the issue of its negligent treatment. Benedict decreed in chapter 32 of his rule:

Let the Abbot appoint brethren on whose life and character he can rely, over the property of the monastery in tools, clothing, and things generally, and let him assign to them, as he shall deem proper, all the articles which must be collected after use and stored away. Let the Abbot keep a list of these articles, so that, when the brethren in turn succeed each other in these trusts, he may know what he giveth and what he receiveth back. If anyone, however, handleth the goods of the monastery slovenly or carelessly let him be reprimanded and if he doth not amend let him come under the discipline of the Rule.²⁵

It is entirely natural that the penal code of a community sharing communal premises should include a regulation about accidental damage. It is necessary to determine how to handle both the clumsy member and the member who fails to respect community property because it is not his own personal property. 1QS VII.6–8 is the only point in the penal code where the matter is apparently addressed; it is certainly the subject of this double regulation.

I emphasise that comparison of the two punishments in VI.6–8 clearly shows that the issue is accidental harm/damage. The accidental wounding of a neighbour's physique cannot be restored by the misdemeanor; pain has been caused and natural physical healing, the only remedy, may not occur, and even if complete is only a partial remedy of the total ill caused, since there is probably also both pain and inconvenience. So the misdemeanor unavoidably receives three months' punishment. But accidental damage to the fabric of the community may be within the means of the misdemeanor to restore and repair perfectly. He may, for example be able to repair a damaged wall or table if he has sufficient skill, or to scrape clean and rewrite a stained section of scroll, or to set right again a disturbed row of garden seedlings. If the task is an impossibility or beyond his skill, he receives the lesser punishment of sixty days since damage to physical items or building fabric is obviously less significant than wounding a fellow member's body and causing him pain. It should also be noted that the verb used to describe the damage done to the property of the Community is *'abhadh*, which means: 1) 'to perish; die; be ruined; be destroyed'; 2) figuratively 'to perish, vanish'; 3) 'be lost, strayed' (e.g asses, 1 Samuel 9:3, 20; sheep, Jeremiah 50:6).²⁶ It is entirely natural to denote breakage and damage with this root. *'Obēdh* is destruction; *'abaddôn* is (the place of) Destruction, Ruin. The root describes the destruction of loss of objects. Jastrow gives no examples of its use denoting financial loss.²⁷

²⁵ Translated by Rev. Boniface Verheyen, *The Rule of St. Benedict*, (Atchison, Kansas: St. Benedict's Monastery, 1949).

²⁶ Brown, Driver and Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon*, pp. 1–2.

²⁷ Marcus Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (London: Luzac & Co., 1926).

Given the strength of the above arguments regarding relative punishments in particular, it is surprising that this regulation has become a linch-pin of the argument that the *Rule of the Community* cannot legislate for community of goods. Klinghardt is wrongly convinced that 1QS VII.6-8 regulates “financial liability for damages”.²⁸ J. Ian H. MacDonald thought the regulation “suggests access to private means”.²⁹ Charlotte Hempel, whose general view has already been noted, thought the regulation shows that the *Rule of the Community* allows “for a certain amount of private ownership”.³⁰ All these wrongly support a revisionist case about the *Rule* based on wanting analysis of the terms of this regulation. Over against this case earlier scholarship, especially that of Brownlee and Dupont-Sommer, proves better reasoned and philologically superior.

2.4 Against the misreading of mingling of property in 1QS VII.24–25

1QS VII.24–25 was taken by Rabin and others to be about personal business dealings with banished former members, implying that members had personal resources. Yet Rabin’s understanding of the verb “*rabh* as it appears in *hithpa’el* in this regulation is incorrect.³¹ This verb’s essential meaning in *hithpa’el* is ‘mix’ or ‘mingle’. Its sense in 1QS naturally means the mingling of property individuals into a commonly held property, an entirely natural application. Two Greek texts show how likely this application of the idea of ‘mixing’ is. I note first Plutarch, *Conjugal precepts*, 34.142–143 on the uniting of property and all within marriage, property becoming common:

“As the mixing (*krasis*) of liquids, according to what scientists say, extends throughout their entire content, so also in the case of married people there ought to be a mutual mixing (*anameichthēnai*) of their bodies, property, friends and relations. In fact, the purpose of the Roman lawgiver who prohibited the giving and receiving of presents between man and wife was, not to prevent them sharing in anything, but that they should feel they shared all things in common.”

Here Plutarch’s second verb for ‘mixing’ is *anameignymi*. We find the same verb in a description in Josephus³² of the sharing of property amongst the Essenes:

‘They despise wealth, and their communal life is admirable; not one is to be found among them who owns more than another. For their law is that those entering the sect surrender their property to the order, with the result that neither the humiliation of poverty nor excess [=pride] of wealth appears amongst them; the possessions of each one being mixed (*anamemigmenōn*) theirs is as to brothers one substance.’

The use of the Greek verb *anameignymi* in the Jewish writer Josephus’ account of Essene community of goods strongly suggests that both Greek and Hebrew could naturally make the same move, using verbs of mixture when seeking to describe the

²⁸ “The Manual of Discipline in Light of Statutes of Hellenistic Associations”, in Michael O. Wise et al., *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site* (New York, NY: New York Academy of Science, 1994) pp. 251–270, see p. 255.

²⁹ “‘What Did You Go Out to See?’ John the Baptist, the Scrolls and Late Second Temple Judaism”, in Timothy H. Lim et al. (eds.) *The Dead Sea Scrolls In Their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000), pp. 53–64, see p. 60.

³⁰ ‘Community Structures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Admission, Organisation, Disciplinary Procedures’, in Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam (eds.) *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), Vol. 2, pp. 67–92, see p. 74.

³¹ The root “*rabh* appears four times in *hithpa’el* (VI.17; VII.24; VIII.23; IX.8) and one in *qal* (IX.8).

³² Josephus, *Jewish War*, 2.8.1 §122.

combination of property into a single whole, a somewhat unusual matter to need to describe. Since Josephus claimed in his *Vita* to have personally passed through the stages of Essene training without joining the group (2 §§10–11), he may actually reflect the terminology of the *Rule*, or of general Essene parlance, though the observations on Plutarch's usage above show this need not be the case.

3. The entrance procedure of 1QS VI.13–23 and comparative examples of the use of the “blocked account” method in Christian sects: a new argument for full community of goods in 1QS

A *prima facie* reading of 1QS suggests that the community for which it legislates practised full community of goods. This community of goods is practised voluntarily ('those who freely volunteer', I.7, cf. I.11, VI.13), but those who volunteer for the high calling of renunciation of property must 'convey all their knowledge, their energies, and their riches to the Community of God' (I.11–12).³³ New members, however, deliver their property to the Community through a prolonged and relatively complex process legislated in VI.13–23.

And everyone who freely volunteers from Israel 14 to join with the Council of the Community, the man who is the Guardian at the head of the Many shall examine his understanding and his works. And if he is fitted for discipline, he shall cause him to enter 15 into the Covenant to turn to the truth and to turn away from all evil and he shall instruct him in all the precepts of the Community. And after, when he comes to stand before the face of the Many they shall be questioned, 16 all of them, concerning his affairs. And according as the lot comes forth, according to the Council of the Many, he will either draw near or draw away. But when he draws near the Council of the Community, he must not touch the Purity of the 17 Many until they examine him as to his spirit and his works, until the completion by him of a full year. Neither shall he mingle with the property of the Many. 18 Upon the completion by him of a year in the midst of the Community, the Many will be questioned about his affairs, concerning his understanding and his works in the Law. 19 And if the lot goes forth for him to draw near to the Conclave of the Community, according to the priests and the majority of the men of their Covenant, they shall cause to draw near also his property and his earnings to the hand of the man 20 who is Overseer/Visitor over the earnings of the Many and he shall write it in the reckoning in his hand [=to his account] but for the Many he shall not cause it to come forth. He shall not touch the drink of the Many until 21 the completion by him of a second year in the midst of the men of the Community. But on the completion by him of the second year he will be examined under the direction of the Many. And if goes forth for him 22 the lot to draw near to the Community, he shall inscribe him in the Order of his rank in the midst of his brothers for Law and for Judgment and for Purity and for mingling his property. And his Counsel will be 23 for the Community and his judgment.

We may deduce from this passage the following five stages of social integration:–

1. Early, informal acquaintance.
2. Following examination and entry into the covenant, an indefinite period of instruction, probably a year or less ('and after', line 15).
3. First full year of probationary membership: during this phase no property was handed to the Community administration and the candidate was allowed no participation in the common meal.

³³ From the refreshing translation of Martínez and Tigchelaar, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

4. Second full year of probationary membership: during this phase the candidate's property was transferred, provisionally, into the care of the Community administration, but remained retrievable; the candidate was allowed participation in the common meal but not the drink of the common meal.

5. Full membership: legal title to the candidate's property was transferred irrevocably; the member's property was no longer retrievable; transition to full membership included full participation in the common meal including the drink of the common meal.

In order to better understand the motivations for this complex procedure and issues which had most likely been a part of the community's experience as it developed, in particular, the device of provisional property surrender during the second probationary year, I would like to point to comparative social examples from historically unconnected communities which have practised complete community of property. These groups will include, in terms of their sociological definition, both 'sects' and 'religious orders (=groups of religious virtuosi)'. I begin deliberately with a group with no possible historical connection with the Essenes, in order to show how the endeavour common to both groups, the creation of a full community of goods, alone, may fairly be said to determine those aspects of entry procedure common to both groups.

3.1 Comparative example: Hutterite Community of Goods and the provisional surrender of property procedure c. 1650

My first example is from a Hutterite document written before 1650. As a research student I published, more than twenty-five years ago, my first article on the exegetically difficult story of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1–11), which appears to derive from a context of community of property practised in Jerusalem by early Jerusalem believers in Jesus (cf. Acts 2:42–47; 4:32–36; 6:1–6). In that piece I argued that no other interpretation is possible of Peter's words to Ananias regarding his property in verse 4, "remaining did it not remain yours, and sold did it not remain in your power" than that they refer to the unchanged status of the couple's property during successive stages of a progressive entrance procedure. My main comparative evidence was the procedure of 1QS VI.13–24, with its provisional surrender of property in the penultimate phase, and reports of a similar provisional surrender of property in accounts of the community of Pythagoras from the second century AD onwards. I also offered points of philology, including the obvious one that while the English translation tradition likes to say that Ananias "held back" his property (vv. 2, 3), the verb *nosphisasthai* elsewhere uniformly denotes illegitimate action, "to purloin, to embezzle, to pilfer", as it does in Titus 2:10, where according to the New Revised Standard Version slaves are urged "not to pilfer" from their masters. I have since catalogued some evidence on this point.³⁴ Of course, the events of the Ananias and Sapphira account become seemingly yet more obscure if this verb is correctly translated, and in my view the only possible explanation of Peter's words is the adoption within the nascent Jerusalem community of believers in Jesus of an entrance

³⁴ Brian J. Capper, 'Holy Community of Life and Property amongst the Poor: A Response to Steve Walton', *Evangelical Quarterly* 80.2 (2008), pp. 113–127, see 122–124.

procedure involving the complexity of that employed in the fully-property Essene communities as legislated in the *Rule of the Community*.

At the time of writing my first publication I was further persuaded of the value of my case by my discovery of an historically quite unconnected social parallel in a text from the seventeenth century preserved by the Anabaptist, communitarian *Hutterites*. The Hutterite leader Andreas Ehrenpreis wrote a formal letter in which he explained how his community had developed, through painful experience, to facilitate their practice of community of goods, the habit of not accepting the applicant's property immediately, but instituting a probationary period during which the newcomer's property was placed on one side, ready to be returned should the applicant demand it again. I argued that the provisional surrender of property on the part of the applicant, allowing time for mutual acquaintance, experience of life without personal possessions, and careful deliberation by both sides of the decision to proceed to irrevocable integration of the applicant's property, was a general social necessity if community of goods is to be instituted in practice with minimal coercion and trouble. I added a footnote on Ehrenpreis' letter, which offered good support for my case.³⁵ Though my article has been cited by others, I have not noticed that any scholar has developed this note or followed up my precise point about the parallel between the provisional surrender of property in 1QS VI.13–24 and that found in Ehrenpreis' letter of the then current Hutterite entrance procedure. This is true even of Eyal Regev's monograph *Sectarianism in Qumran*, which draws on studies of Hutterite communities.³⁶ Regev notes only a general parallel between the Hutterite process of admission in the twentieth century and that found in 1QS VI.13–23, basing his understanding of Hutterite procedure on the observations of Peters³⁷ rather than, it appears, primary written sources or fresh interviews with practising Hutterites.

In the intervening years since 1983 I have noticed other communities in Christian history which have adopted this device of provisional property surrender, and offer in this piece a selection of these comparative examples. I draw attention to this comparative material in order to argue that wherever a voluntarist community is found which successfully practises ultimately irrevocable community of goods, we are likely also to find the mechanism of provisional property-surrender, and that wherever a voluntarist community is found for which the practice of community of goods is claimed, the presence of hints or full descriptions of this mechanism provides evidence of the truth of this claim. In my view explicit mention of the mechanism of provisional property-surrender in connection with what appear to be internal legislation or external reports of community of property is strong evidence that the documents concerned do in fact testify to an ultimately irrevocable community of goods. This contention is relevant to the *Rule of the Community* from Qumran; I argue that the attestation of a provisional property-surrender mechanism in 1QS VI.13–24

³⁵ Brian J. Capper, 'The Interpretation of Acts 5.4', *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 19 (1983), pp. 117–131, see 130–131, n. 24.

³⁶ Eyal Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007), pp. 272–273. Eyal Regev first published sociological comparisons between the Essene covenanters and some Christian communitarian groups in 2004: 'Comparing Sectarian Practice and Organisation: The Qumran Sects in Light of the Regulations of the Shakers, Hutterites, Mennonites and Amish', *Numen* 51 (2004); pp. 146–181.

³⁷ Victor Peters, *All Things Common: The Hutterian Way of Life* (New York: Harper&Row, 1965). Regev, *op. cit.*, p. 272 n. 11, cites Peters, pp. 179–180.

provides a strong argument that this document legislated for a complete and irrevocable community of goods, incumbent upon all full members.

The Hutterites trace their origins to the beginnings of anabaptist believer's baptism in Zürich in 1525. Early pacifist anabaptist groups received sanctuary in Moravia from 1528; in 1529 these were joined by Jakob Hutter, a native of the South Tyrol, who by 1531 successfully united some fourteen groups in the practice of community of goods, which practice became their distinguishing mark within Anabaptism.³⁸ The Anabaptist debacle in Münster (1534–35) led to difficulties for anabaptists everywhere. Hutter was burnt at the stake on February 25, 1536, and many of his followers fled to forests and mountains. After the heat was off, the Moravian nobility were again eager to have the profitably hard-working, diligent and religiously motivated Hutterites on their estates. The Hutterites enjoyed their "Golden Period" 1565–1592 in Moravia. Since then Hutterites have, despite persecutions, maintained their distinctive way of life in community of goods for much of their history, which involved, following persecution in the early seventeenth century, progressive migrations eastwards through Slovakia (where substantial fragmentation occurred in the eighteenth century), Transylvania, Wallachia (Rumania) and finally from the southern Russian empire (where community of goods was abandoned 1819–1859) to settle in South Dakota. (1874–1879). Today their communities are mainly found in the United States and Canada.³⁹

Andreas Ehrenpreis was the Hutterite leader between 1629 and 1662. He collected all the *Ordnungen* devised in the past to regulate community life on the *Bruderhof*. Some time before 1650 Ehrenpreis composed his *Sendbrief an alle diejenigen, so sich rühmen and bedünken lassen, daß sie ein abgesondertes Volk von der Welt sein wollen... brüderliche Gemeinschaft, das höchste Gebot der liebe, betreffend*. In the following section of his letter he explains how the Hutterite procedure of provisional surrender of property during a probationary phase grew out of experience:⁴⁰

"Private Property Becomes Church Property.

"To establish community life takes all our strength. It is nothing less than the cause, the cause of Him who is our Lord. We should count the cost beforehand!

³⁸ The constant threat of persecution contributed to the creation of the community of goods project, but could not preserve it from maladministration by its original elders. Cruelty and unfairness arose, including the death of many infants for want of milk despite the wealth which some of their parents had brought into the community, and the patent better clothing of the elders and especially their wives. Ultimately a dispute led a more blameless group of three hundred and fifty, many of whom were too sick, to establish a new colony. The charismatic leader Jakob Hutter, away seeking to organise the movement of further refugees from the Tyrol, returned to settle the disputes. During his two years' leadership (1533–35) he successfully established a fair system of communal production and sharing, his position strengthened by his inspired accusation that the wife of one leader, Schützingen, was a 'Sapphira'. A private stash of articles and four pounds of Bernese silver was found in Schützingen's apartment. See George Huntston Williams, *The Radical Revolution* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, ²1992), pp. 638–650.

³⁹ For a survey of Hutterite history see the highly informative article from the original *Mennonite Encyclopedia* ('Hutterian Brethren [Hutterische Brüder]'), now available online with enhanced bibliography at www.gameo.org ('Global Anabaptist Mennonite Encyclopedia Online').

⁴⁰ Translation Robert Friedman (ed.), *Brotherly Community, the highest Command of Love* (Rifton, NY: Plough Publishing House, 1978), pp. 59–62.

“It ought not to happen (as it did a number of times) that people come in a quick blaze of enthusiasm, wanting to take part, but their will proves to be insufficiently grounded and cannot carry them through. In the long run they find it hard to submit to the Orders that arise inevitably from the Spirit of Christ. Sooner or later their courage and zeal flag. They break their covenant. They leave the path. They quarrel and give trouble. The difficulties are greatest with those who fall away after having given in their property, originally with good intentions. And now they demand it back. They want it again for themselves.

“That is why we do not right away accept a final surrender of property from one who wants to begin a life of brotherhood with us. He is given enough time to learn what our convictions are and what message we proclaim, and to find out what our way of living and working together means for him. To begin with, we put aside what he brings with him into the community, either to be returned to him eventually or used for the common cause. If later on the community life no longer appeals to him, he can go his way. Then we are glad to give him back what had belonged to him, to the last penny. He is at liberty to go where he sees the best opportunities for himself.

“If after this time of testing he recognized the truth, if he has really experienced the truth and asks for baptism of his own free will, he becomes a part of community life. Whatever he has brought with him is now laid before him. Whether little or much, it is given back to him. Now he can hand it over to the Church, for that is as it should be. Now it is accepted. Now the poor and needy can benefit from it. It will be used wherever it is needed.

“But should it ever happen that he becomes unfaithful and in contradiction to his clear commitment demands to have his previous belongings back, nothing can be given back to him. After all, he did not hand it in so that it might later be given back to him! Before God and in all justice we owe him nothing. We treated him in the way we have just described. What a man gives up in the morning is no longer his in the afternoon. Therefore whenever a person is received into membership, all this is said to him. Certainly, as things are at the moment this is hardly necessary. People are so very poor that we have to give all those who come to us everything they need, from the very first day on.

“Much evil is said about us on this point. Although this just conduct is valid before God and required of all believers, many people (even among the Swiss Brethren) condemn it. The only arguments they can bring up are false ones. On the Day of the Lord, when His judgment comes, all lovers of property will have to recognize the truth. Then they will recognize wealth for the murderous weed that it is. Then they will see that it choked the living seed within them, so that they were unable to bear fruit in life.”

Ehrenpreis’ account of the independent generation of the device of provisional property-surrender during a probationary period, arising out of Hutterite difficulties with those who seceded from the *Bruderhof*, demonstrates practical motivations which in my view also led to the creation of the same process in the Qumran *Rule of the Community*. It is clearly practical experience which leads communities to devise this procedure. The comparative example of Ehrenpreis’ account suggests that the regulations for entry into the community in 1QS VI.13–24 were the fruit of a similar social experience and development. This section of the *Rule of the Community* was probably not simply penned out of the imagination of a thoughtful writer. It seems clear that the section is not merely a part of an ideal document; Philip Davies’ suggestion that the *Rule of the Community* is merely a utopian text, unrelated to the

practical life and social experience of real communities, is therefore incorrect,⁴¹ though the text may contain utopian features and reflect utopian intent.⁴²

The technique of provisional property-surrender apparently remains in place amongst the Hutterite communities of North America and Canada in the present day. An applicant for membership to a community is first asked to share the life of the community as a co-worker without giving in his possessions and without taking part in any meetings which take decisions concerning the whole community (cf. 1QS VI. 21(end)–23). Should the Hutterite co-worker, after some time, come to the decision to join the community completely, he asks for the novitiate. In the meantime the members of the community have the opportunity to get to know him better through the daily sharing of all aspects of life and work, which makes it increasingly difficult, as time goes by, for the applicant to conceal anything behind pretensions. If the circle of already baptised members unanimously recognise the genuineness of the applicant's calling and resolve, the novitiate is offered. This is not understood as a time of consideration, which should already have been done, but as a time of confirmation of the decision and more intensive preparation for baptism, the final step. The novice may attend the decision-making circle of the community without being burdened with decision-making. In the view of the community, such a time as a novice can only be experienced genuinely if the novice otherwise shares everything with the community (excluding his possessions), definitively. At baptism the novice is warned, if there remains uncertainty, to take away all possessions and leave the community in peace. The community is not interested in money, but in a free-willing heart.

The modern Hutterite practice of excluding the candidate member from the decision-making process is directly comparable with the rulings of the *Rule of the Community* from Qumran that only the full member of the community may participate in the processes of legal deliberation and judgment in the community. (1QS VI.21 (end)–23.) This practice is presumably ancient and arose naturally from the provisional status of the candidate for entry in both communities. From the perspective of their own reservation of baptism to the final stage of entry, it is interesting to note that modern Hutterite interpretation considers the possibility that the guilt of Ananias and Sapphira in Acts 5:1–11 was so great because they undertook to deceive the community only after their baptism, from which point total commitment in property was required.⁴³

⁴¹ Philip R. Davies, 'Communities in the Dead Sea Scrolls' *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 17 (1994), pp. 55–68, see esp. 66. For further arguments against Davies' contention, see Murphy, *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community*, pp. 144–145.

⁴² Cf. Doron Mendels, 'Hellenistic Utopia and the Essenes,' *Harvard Theological Review* 72 (1979), pp. 205–222; Lawrence H. Schiffman, 'Political Leadership and Organisation in the Dead Sea Scrolls Community', chapter 5 in his *Qumran and Jerusalem: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), pp. 98–111. This piece also appeared under the title 'Utopia and Reality: Political Leadership and Organization in the Dead Sea Scrolls Community' in S. M. Paul et al. (eds.) *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 413–427.

⁴³ This presentation of current Hutterite practice results from the present author's personal enquiries. While it attempts to be accurate, it cannot claim the representative status of a description based on analysis of a wide-ranging set of recorded interviews. Unfortunately, I know of no study of the Hutterites which engages with the precise details of the novitiate.

3.2 Comparative example: Shaker Community of Goods and the Shaker exterior position and Orders

The Shakers, or the “United Society of Believers in Christ’s Second Appearing”, or the “Millennial Church”, or “Alethians” began in a Quaker revival in England in 1747. During persecution a group of six men and two women led by mother Ann Lee to America, where they settled in the woods of Watervliet near Albany, New York. The pacifist, communitarian movement grew greatly through the preaching and healing activities of Mother Ann. The Senior Order practised full community of goods, dwelling together in ‘families’ of 30 to 90 adults, each family sharing a house together, without children. They emphasised confession of sin before admission, prized celibacy highly, and claimed to spend nothing on police, lawyers, poor-houses or prisons.⁴⁴ Shakers did, however, devise a careful process of progressive admission, which, I would suggest, was born of experience in admitting some members too rapidly in their early years and trouble from seceders who demanded compensation. The Shaker Covenant⁴⁵ is framed in cautious and thorough language, perhaps betraying legal knowledge within the movement. It declares:

“It is an established principle of faith in the Church, that all who are received as members thereof do freely and voluntarily, of their own choice, dedicate, devote and consecrate themselves, with all they possess, to the service of God forever.”

The following explanation regarding the outermost position in the Shaker community was given to William Alfred Hinds,⁴⁶ who visited Shaker communities in the 1870’s:

“The first, or Novitiate Class, are those who receive faith, and come into a degree of relation with the Society, but choose to live in their own families, and manage their own temporal concerns. Any who choose may live in this manner, and be owned as brethren and sisters in the gospel, so long as they live up to its requirements.

“Believers in this class are not controlled by the Society, either with regard to their property, children, or families; but act as freely in all these respects as the members of any other religious Society, and still enjoy all their spiritual privileges, and maintain their union with the Society; provided they do not violate the faith, and the moral and religious principles of the institution.” (Hinds, p. 91)

This outermost position of relation with the Shaker family could also serve as the first stage of the process of greater integration. Charles Nordhoff, *American Utopias* (1875; reprinted Stockbridge MA: Berkshire House Publishers, 1993), pp. 144–147, describes a would-be full joiner adopting this exterior position:

⁴⁴ The literature on the Shakers is vast. A collection of early documents and biographies is Frederick William Evans, *Shakers. Compendium of the Origin, History, Principles, Rules and Regulations, Government, and Doctrines of the United Society of Believers in Christ’s Second Appearing* (New Lebanon, NY, 1867).

⁴⁵ See William Alfred Hinds, *American Communities and Cooperative Colonies* (1878; reprinted New York: Corinth Books, 1961). pp. 171ff.

⁴⁶ William Alfred Hinds, *American Communities and Cooperative Colonies* (1878; reprinted New York: Corinth Books, 1961). The details concerning the Shaker classes and entrance procedure given in the following, sourced from Hinds and Nordhoff, are also found in Frederick William Evans, *Shakers. Compendium of the Origin, History, Principles, Rules and Regulations, Government, and Doctrines of the United Society of Believers in Christ’s Second Appearing* (New Lebanon, NY, 1867), pp. 42–50.

“New members are admitted with great caution. Usually a person who is moved to become a Shaker has made a visit to the Novitiate family of some society, remaining long enough to satisfy himself that membership would be agreeable to him. During this preliminary visit he lives separately from the family, but is admitted to their religious meetings, and is fully informed of the doctrines, practices and requirements of the Shaker people. If he then still desires admission, he is expected to set his affairs in order, so that he shall not leave any unfulfilled obligations behind him in the world.

From this near-external position an applicant might progress to the Junior Order. This was open only to those without families. Any surrender of property was made only on a provisional basis; property remained retrievable. Nordhoff noted the careful, provisional nature of any transfer of property at this stage:

“A candidate for admission is usually taken on trial for at least a year, in order that the society may be satisfied of his fitness; of course, he may leave at any time (pp. 144–5).

“In accordance with this rule, the neophyte brings with him his property; but as he is still on trial, and may prove unfit, or find himself uncomfortable, he is not allowed to give up his property unreservedly to the society; but only its use, agreeing that so long as he remains he will require neither wages for his labour nor interest for that which he brought in. On these terms he may remain as long as he proves his fitness.” (p. 147).

The interviewer William Alfred Hinds heard:

“The Second, or *Junior Class*, is composed of persons who, not having the charge of families, and being under no embarrassments to hinder them from uniting together in Community order, choose to enjoy the benefits of that situation. These (for mutual safety) enter into a contract to devote their services freely to support the interest of the Family of which they are members, so long as they continue in that order; stipulating at the same time to claim no pecuniary compensation for their services; and all the members of such families are mutually benefited by the united interest and labors of the whole Family, so long as they continue to support the order thereof; and they are amply provided for in health, sickness, and old age. These benefits are secured for them by contract.”

“Members of this class have the privilege, at their option, by contract, to give freely the improvement of any part or all of their property, to be used for the mutual benefit of the Family to which they belong. The property itself may be resumed at any time, according to the contract; but no interest can be claimed for the use thereof; nor can any member of such Family be employed therein for wages of any kind.” (Hinds, p. 92).

The community defends itself, by refusing to allow the members of the Junior Order to renounce property irrevocably to the community, against the danger of hasty donations, which might lead to dispute and claims against the community from those who had reflected insufficiently. The community insists that considerable time elapse before a candidate be allowed to surrender property irrevocably. We can assume the same motivations in the stipulation of IQS VI.19–20 that though the novice’s property is passed into the care of the community, it may not be spent on the community.

A member of the Shaker Junior Order might, after at least a year, apply for and be allowed entry to full membership in the Church Order or Senior Class. With this transition title to all the candidate’s property passed irrevocably to the Church. Nordhoff wrote:

“But when at last he is moved to enter the higher or Church order, he formally makes over to the society, forever, and without power of taking it back, all that he owns.” (p. 147)

Hinds heard:

“The third, or *Senior Class*, is composed of such persons as have had sufficient time and opportunity practically to prove the faith and manner of life practiced by the Society, and are thus prepared to enter fully, freely and voluntarily into a united and consecrated interest. These covenant and agree to dedicate and devote themselves and services, with all that they possess, to the service of God and the support of the gospel forever, solemnly promising never to bring debt nor damage, claim nor demand, against the Society, nor against any member thereof, for any property or service which they have thus devoted to the uses and purposes of the institution. This class constitutes what is called the *Church Order*.”

The Shaker Covenant, which each full member signed, carefully emphasises the irrevocable nature of the final surrender of property in its last section, entitled “Dedication and Release of Private Claim.”

“Whereas, in pursuance of the requirement of the Gospel, and in the full exercise of our faith, reason and understanding, we have freely and voluntarily sacrificed all self-interest, and consecrated and devoted our persons, services and property, as aforesaid, to the pious and benevolent purposes of the Gospel: Therefore, we do hereby solemnly and conscientiously, unitedly and individually for ourselves and our heirs, release and quitclaim to the Deacons, as acting Trustees of the Church for the time being, for the use and purposes aforesaid, all our private, personal right, title, interest, claim and demand of, in and to the estate, interest, property and appurtenances so consecrated, devoted and given up; and we hereby jointly and severally promise and declare in the presence of God and before witnesses, that we will never hereafter, neither directly nor indirectly, under any circumstances whatever, contrary to the stipulations of this Covenant, make nor require any account of any interest, property, labor nor service, nor any division thereof, which is, has been, or may be devoted by us, or any of us, to the uses and purposes aforesaid, nor bring any charge of debt or damage, nor hold any claim, nor demand whatever against the said Deacons or Trustees, nor against the Church or Society, nor against any member thereof, on account of any property or service given, rendered, devoted or consecrated to the aforesaid sacred and charitable purposes.” From: William Alfred Hinds, *American Communities* (1878; reprinted New York: Corinth Books, 1961), p. 175.

It is noteworthy that the administration and defence of community property involves statements regarding both any property brought into the community by the member and any claim which might arise because of the member’s work while within the community. Those who signed the Covenant renounced claims of both types. It is interesting to compare Shaker eagerness to specify renunciation of both property and work with the phrasing of the *Rule of the Community*, from Qumran. In this document the Overseer finally inscribes the member for both *hôn* (property) and *m^ela’kah*, variously translated as ‘work’ or ‘earnings’ (1QS VI.19). The cited comparative material from Shaker life may help us to understand the background reasons for the mention of ‘earnings’ or ‘work’ as well as ‘property’. The community expressly states its entitlement to the fruit of the member’s labour as well as his property assets, and hence that, should he earn wages for work done outside the community, these too belonged to the community and were to be handed to the Overseer. The specification of ‘work’ or ‘earnings’ as well as ‘property’ may also hint at the community’s contention that, should the member depart, he had no claim of compensation against the community for the value of his labour performed while within the community.

3.3 Comparative example: The Community of Goods of the Society of Separatists of Zoar, Ohio.

In the early nineteenth century, persecution of separatist Protestant groups in some German states and elsewhere in Europe resulted in the foundation of some seventeen

communistic settlements in the frontier Northeast and Midwest areas of the United States of America, few of which were successful.⁴⁷ A successful, longer-lasting commune was that of the Society of Separatists of Zoar, Tuscarawas County, Ohio.⁴⁸ This group, like most of the separatists, took its theology from the writings of the mystic Jacob Boehme (1575–1624) and pietists like Gerhard Terstegen (1697–1769). Led by one Joseph Bäumeler (later Bimeler) they had fled the south German state of Württemberg. There, on account of refusal to send their children to the schools controlled by the clergy, refusal to allow their young men to be forced into military service, and refusal to honour rulers and clerical potentates, they had suffered floggings, imprisonment and fines. Social changes and economic hardships also contributed to the wave of emigration: land reforms which had released serfs from centuries of bondage soon left them on small land lots, due to land division on inheritance, but still subject to burdensome fixed rents and labour duties owed to noble landlords. Domestic servants lost their traditional status within the household to become employees without security. Craftspeople came under pressure from the factory system. There was also huge population growth; between 1815 and 1845 the population of Germany rose from 25,000,000 to 34,500,000, with serious overpopulation in the south and west. In other words, the way of life of the traditional agrarian village was collapsing. There was severe land hunger. In 1816–17 a subsistence crisis due to the loss of the war economy and increasing competition from English factories led to widespread poverty and famine. Some espoused the cause of revolution, which would reach its zenith in 1848, while others turned to forms of religion which affirmed a strong communal inclination. The emigrant communalists were not radicals, but conservatives who devised a radical religious path to conserve traditional values. They sought to hold on to the centuries-old, quasi-communal village order which was passing away.⁴⁹ In other words, these emigrant religious groups took the path of ‘virtuoso religion’ — revolution by tradition.⁵⁰ They emphasised in Protestant fashion the communal possibilities of New Testament and Anabaptist Christianity, intensifying received religious tradition into new, securing social forms. They went to America to create ideal Christian villages.

Bäumeler’s separatists purchased and settled 5,600 acres of land, each farmer planning to pay off the loan on his own land. It soon transpired that older and poorer members would not be able to do this. In 1819 discussion issued in the proposal of a community of goods, aimed at the survival of the whole community economically and as a single community of faith. The group signed articles and prohibited further

⁴⁷ Cf. Yaacov Oved, *Two Hundred Years of American Communes* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1988), p. 69

⁴⁸ On the origins of the Zoar community see Eberhard Fritz, *Roots of Zoar, Ohio, in early 19th century Württemberg: The Separatist group of Rottenacker and its Circle*. Part one: *Communal Societies* 22 (2002) pp. 27–44; Part two: *Communal Societies* 23(2003) pp. 29–44; Charles Nordhoff, *The Communistic Societies of the United States* (1875), now published with new material as *American Utopias* (Stockbridge: Berkshire House Publishers, 1993), pp. 99–103; Yaacov Oved, *Two Hundred Years of American Communes* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1988), pp. 81–83, with further references.

⁴⁹ On these social changes see the summary of Diane L. Barthel, *Amana: From Pietist Sect to American Community* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1984), pp. 8–10 and her biographical essay, pp. 197–198.

⁵⁰ The formula ‘revolution by tradition’ was apparently coined by Michael Hill, *The Religious Order: A study of virtuoso religion and its legitimation in the nineteenth century Church of England* (London: Heinemann, 1973), see pp. 85–103.

marriages until c. 1830. Further members from Europe joined in 1832. In the 1870's William Alfred Hinds interviewed their then leader and school-teacher Jacob Ackermann, who furnished details of a complex constitution in which two classes of membership were distinguished, a "first class" which included fifty-four adults, and a "second class" of one hundred and twenty-six adults:

Hinds: "How are the two classes distinguished from each other?"

Ackermann: "The first class includes the probationary members and the children, and all who have not signed the Covenant. After the children become of age they cannot be received into the second class except on special application, and then after a year's delay."

Hinds: "What are the special privileges of the second or higher class?"

Ackermann: "The two classes fair alike in all respects, excepting that only the members of the second class can vote and hold office."

Hinds: "How does it happen that so many adults still remain in the first class?"

Ackermann: "Some are perfectly satisfied with their present position and don't care to enter the higher class. This may be due to the fact, that so long as a person remains in the first class he can withdraw any money he put into the common fund on joining the Community, and use it as he likes; but on joining the second class there is an entire surrender of all property rights."

Hinds: "In case a member of the second class secedes, is any part of the money he put in refunded?"

Ackermann: "No property is refunded; his bringing in much or little would not be regarded; but if he made application for something, it would be considered how he conducted [himself] and how valuable his services had been, and a gift made accordingly." (Hinds pp. 26-27).

Hinds also learned that new members from outside were still received, but that usually life alongside the community for more than year was required before the possibility of entering the lower, first class of membership was entertained:

Hinds: "Do you still receive new members?"

Ackermann: "We have accepted new members up to the present time, and I think will keep on doing so; but our doors are only open to applicants of good character."

Hinds: "What are your terms of admission?"

Ackermann: "We generally pay wages for a year or more to applicants, so that they may have time and opportunity to get acquainted with us and we with them. If the acquaintance proves mutually satisfactory, and they again apply for admission to the community, they are admitted as probationary members and sign the articles for the First Class. If during the next year they commend themselves they may make application for the second class, and if there is no good ground of rejection will be admitted; when they give up their property forever. Rich people seldom apply for membership, and we are glad of it. We would rather take poor people, half naked though they be, provided they have the right character." (Hinds p. 30)

Thus during the second year of what was commonly at least a two-year process, the candidate's property entered the common fund. During this year the candidate no longer received wages for his work, and received his food and other needs from the common stores. Only on transition to the second or higher class of

membership did the candidate's property enter the common fund irrevocably.⁵¹ The social interests of bettering mutual acquaintance and testing suitability determined the length of the process. The possibility that the candidate might successfully live without personal possessions was experimentally tested during the probationary year through the mechanism of provisional surrender of property. Again, the social and legal analogy to the "blocked account" mechanism of the *Rule of the Community* suggests that the rule discovered at Qumran legislated for this procedure because its writers desired to create a permanent and irrevocable community of goods. The distinction between a socially sensible, provisional surrender of property in a well-conceived, well-explained, progressive procedure and a complete final surrender at the conclusion of that procedure seems to be socially necessary to, or at least highly expedient for, successful voluntary combination for the community of goods.

In 1824 Zoar's founding covenant became its legal constitution, recognised by the state of Ohio, setting all the member's rights and the commune's business practices on an externally recognised legal footing. From the 1850's to the 1880's the community successfully defended a number of law-suits at some expense against seceders who sought compensation for their initial donations and labour within the society. In 1853 the Supreme Court of the United States gave the precedential decision "that a member on seceding from a Community bound together by such Covenant cannot enforce a division and distribution of its property."⁵² The Supreme Court of Ohio judged "that a member of a Community with such a Covenant has no interest in the common property which on his death descends to his heirs at law."⁵³ These law-suits and judgements demonstrate the necessity that community of goods be regulated in a precise and sophisticated manner so that the community may resist the inevitable demands of disgruntled seceders, which threaten the entire continuing enterprise of life in community of goods. I would suggest that the *Rule of the Community* from Qumran, which regulated Essene community over a period of several generations, is the first example of such a successfully drafted constitution, and bears the marks of similar jealous advances upon community resources.

4. The entrance procedure of 1QS VI.13–23 and the comparative example of provisional surrender of property in Pythagorean community of goods

In Hellenistic times Pythagoras of Samos (c. 570–495 BC) was reputed to have founded, in the sixth century BC, an esoteric property-sharing philosophical association, dedicated to the pursuit of wisdom, at Croton in Magna Græcia (the Greek colony in southern Italy). The Hellenistic portrayal of Pythagoras' group shows it holding political control of the colony, while submitted to a disciplined common

⁵¹ Details of the status of the candidate's property in the Zoar community are also given in Charles Nordhoff, *The Communistic Societies of the United States* (1875), now published with new material as *American Utopias* (Stockbridge: Berkshire House Publishers, 1993), pp. 105–106; cf. Edgar B. Nixon, 'The Zoar Society: Applicants for Membership', *Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* 45 (1936), pp. 341–350.

⁵² Jyotsna Sreenivasan, *Utopias in American History* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2008) pp. 389–390; the case is *Goesele vs. Bimeler*, online at www.churchstatelaw.com/cases/goeselevbimeler.asp

⁵³ Cf. Ohio, Supreme Court, *Reports of Cases Argued and Determined in the Supreme Court of Ohio*, Volume 13, pp. 144–158. See further in general Emilius O. Randall, *History of the Zoar Society* (Columbus: Press of Fred J. Heer, 1904); Susan Elaine Colpetzer, *The Society of Separatists at Zoar: A Study of a Communal Society Within a Regional Context, Focusing on the Years 1870–1898* (Ohio State University, 1985).

life under his autocratic leadership. These accounts describe a phased entry procedure including the provisional surrender of the probationer's property, which is the focus of our interest here. I drew attention to the similarity of this phased entry procedure with the Essene process mandated in IQS VI.13–23 in 1983⁵⁴ and made further comments on the comparison in two pieces published in 1995.⁵⁵

Some assessment of the historical value of the elaborate process described is pertinent to the purpose of the present piece. The Hellenistic portrayals of Pythagoras' economic arrangement and the influence of his group have been thought to betray the influence of Plato's thinking in his *Republic*, in which the ruling class of 'Guardians' share property in common.⁵⁶ It is clear that we are not dealing with a one-on-one correspondence when we compare the Hellenistic portrayals of Pythagoras' community with the *Republic*. While Plato's 'guardians', all males, held wives in common, this is never attributed to Pythagoras' community of disciples at Croton. Since the impact of Pythagorean ideas on Plato is well established, we equally have to consider the possibility that influences may have worked from Pythagoras and his later followers on Plato, as much at least as from Plato into the Hellenistic portrayals of Pythagoras' early community.

On the one hand, the sources on which our knowledge of Pythagoras' community are based are late, the *Lives* of Diogenes Laertius, Porphyry and Iamblichus; all date from the third century AD. However, these portrayals may have rested on well-informed earlier sources. Peter Garnsey, who accepts the historicity of early Pythagorean communal arrangements, points to Aristoxenos of Tarentum (fl. c. 335 BC). One fragment survives from each of four of his works on Pythagoras and Pythagoreanism, these being his *Life of Pythagoras*, *On Pythagoras and his pupils*, *On the Pythagorean life*, and *Pythagorean precepts* (or *negations*). Aristoxenos' father knew the Pythagorean Archytas, the leading politician of early fourth century Tarentum. Tarentum (modern-day Taranto), a coastal city of southern Italy, was founded by Dorian Greeks in 706 BC, and ruled over the Greek colonies of Magna Graecia. Archytas therefore certainly knew oral traditions about the Pythagorean communities of the region in the fifth century BC. Since Diogenes Laertius' *Life of Archytas* drew on Aristoxenus, it may be fair to assume he used other works of

⁵⁴ Brian J. Capper, 'The Interpretation of Acts 5.4', *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 19 (1983) pp. 117–131, see 126–127 and notes 25, 27–29.

⁵⁵ Brian J. Capper, 'Community of Goods in the Early Jerusalem Church,' in Hildegard Temporini & Wolfgang Haase (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, series II, volume 26, part 2 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995), pp. 1730–1774; 'The Palestinian Cultural Context of Earliest Christian Community of Goods,' in *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), ed. Richard J. Bauckham (Volume 4 of *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*), pp. 323–356.

⁵⁶ James A. Philip, *Pythagoras and Early Pythagoreanism* (Toronto:1966) pp. 25ff, 185ff. Philip's arguments were rejected by Holger Thesleff, 'The Pythagoreans in the Light and Shadows of Recent Research', in Sven S. Hartmann and C. M. Edsman, *Mysticism (Scripta Instituti Donneriani Aboensis* 5, Stockholm, 1970), pp. 77–90, see p. 80 n. 2. Scepticism concerning the community of property of an original brotherhood founded by Pythagoras is also expressed by Walter Burkert, *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism* (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press 1972) and 'Craft Versus Sect: The problem of Orphics and Pythagoreans', in Ben F. Meyer E. P. Sanders (eds.), in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, Vol. 3, *Self-Definition in the Graeco-Roman World* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1982), pp. 1–22. Burkert's skepticism was followed by Doyne Dawson, *Cities of the Gods: Communist Utopias in Greek Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), pp. 14–18 and 44 n. 10. Cf. also Leonid Zhmud, *Wissenschaft, Philosophie und Religion im frühen Pythagoreismus* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1997).

Aristoxenos in writing his *Life of Pythagoras*. Iamblichus once cites at length Aristoxenos' *On the Pythagorean Life* (Life 33). Garnsey follows Burkert in accepting that Aristoxenos had 'excellent information' about Pythagoras.⁵⁷

Garnsey gives credence to our earliest account of the community of property of Pythagoras' disciple group, which comes from the early third century BC Sicilian historian Timaios. Timaios was born in Tauromenion, a city of the Ionian Greek colony of northern Sicily, around 345 BC, though he fled around the turn of the century to Athens. Both Burkert and Garnsey lay weight on Timaios' origins in Magna Graecia. A fragment of Timaios recorded by a scholiast on Plato's *Phaedrus* tells us that Timaios wrote in his eighth book: 'So when the younger men came to him wanting to associate with him, he did not immediately agree, but said that they must also hold their property in common with whoever else might be admitted to membership.' Much later he comments: 'And it was because of them that it was first said in Italy: "The possessions of friends are common."' Garnsey takes the view that this account is 'severely truncated', and that it 'appears to allude to a phased entry procedure' which included a provisional surrender of property.⁵⁸

Iamblichus first describes (*Vit. Pyth.* 16 §70) something of the exact and disciplined way of life which Pythagoras required of his disciples. The standard is indeed high; it includes rejection of greed for possessions, discipline of speech, moderation in sleep and diet, a good-spirited sense of fellowship, zeal for learning, keenness of spirit, and a high morality. He then continues:

Since he therefore thus prepared his disciples for erudition [*paideia*, 'learning'], he did not immediately receive into the number of his associates those who came to him for that purpose, till he had made a trial of, and judiciously examined them. Hence in the first place he inquired after what manner they associated with their parents, and the rest of their relatives. In the next place he surveyed their unseasonable laughter, their silence, and their speaking when it was not proper; and farther still, what their desires were, with whom they associated, how they conversed with them, in what way they employed their leisure time in the day, and what were the subjects of their joy and grief. (*Vit. Pyth.* 17 §71)

According to Iamblichus, Pythagoras had specific, elevated standards for his élite association, and hence had to test the potential of outsiders who applied to join the association. The group's cherished identity was protected by an elaborate process of 'interviewing' and 'screening', to apply modern terms. Pythagoras' particular standards dictated what he had to establish in his enquiries, which were as far-reaching as the standards of the group were unusual and eccentric.

Iamblichus goes on to explain something rather more alien to the modern reader, the 'physiognomic' examination which applicants were made to undergo, an analysis of the form and motion of the body, including the mode of walking. This too, however, was for Pythagoras an indicator of the candidate's capacity for successful integration into the group, since he is said to have considered these characteristics

⁵⁷ Peter Garnsey, *Thinking about Property: From Antiquity to the Age of Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 20–21; Walter Burkert, 'Craft Versus Sect: The problem of Orphics and Pythagoreans', in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, in E. P. Sanders et al. (eds.) (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982) pp. 1–22, see p. 13.

⁵⁸ Timaeus fr. 13a Jacoby, Schol. In Plato, *Phaedr.* 279C, translated Kirk et al. (1983), p. 227, reference and translation of the first quotation above from Garnsey, *op. cit.*, p. 21 and n. 31.

‘manifest signs of the unapparent manners of the soul’ (*Vit. Pyth.* 17 §71 cf. §74). Iamblichus continues:

When he had thus made trial of someone, he suffered him to be neglected for three years, in the mean time observing how he was disposed with respect to stability, and a true love of learning, and if he was sufficiently prepared with reference to glory, so as to despise (popular) honour. (*Vit. Pyth.* 17 §71)

Success at the initial examination still did not result in immediate entry to the community. Since the character of the group’s common life was far removed from the ordinary way of life round about, first impressions could not give complete proof of the candidate’s capacity to permanently maintain Pythagoras’ rigorous standards. The ‘stability’ of the candidates is now observed, their application to learning and ability to fully identify themselves with the group. All these things, the candidates’ personal commitment to the community, could only be proved with time. Wherever Iamblichus’ description has arisen from, we can deduce that the process arises from the actual experience that a hasty decision on the part of candidate or community could lead to substantial problems later on because of the high degree of social integration intended. Hence a mechanism has been formed which protects both parties. I argued that the sophistication of the process points to actual social experience of establishing a community of possessions in a brief reference and description of the procedure in 1995.⁵⁹ Peter Garnsey agreed with my argument, finding my ‘comparison with the Qumran community of the Dead Sea Scrolls (and other Essene communities)’ effective.⁶⁰ Garnsey uses my argument to help deduce the fully property-sharing character of the earliest Pythagorean community, rather than merely to argue the existence at some stage in the Pythagorean tradition of fully property-sharing communities.

I must acknowledge that Garnsey’s knowledge of classical sources is vast compared with my own. For the purposes of the present piece it is, however, not necessary to commit to the view that Pythagoras’ earliest community practised community of property, which has learned detractors, as noted above.⁶¹ It is enough to deduce that the process shows that at some time prior to the third century accounts, some actual experience of establishing community of property issued in the kind of sophisticated process we find in Iamblichus’ account.

Where a group is of a religious type, such a process will establish if the candidate has the occasionally necessary capacity for unflinching dedication to the community and the ability to ride railing and harassment from parties outside. It is difficult to attribute this motivation to the original Pythagorean group. While Pythagoras’ society eventually faced considerable external opposition (the community house at Croton was eventually burnt and the community dispersed in a political

⁵⁹ ‘The Palestinian cultural context of earliest Christian community of goods’, in Richard J. Bauckham (ed.), *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), pp. 323–356, see p. 327.

⁶⁰ Peter Garnsey, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

⁶¹ Burkert, *op. cit.* (1972 and 1982), Dawson, *op. cit.* (1992), pp. 14–18, 44 n. 10, Zhmud, *op. cit.* (1997). Christopher Riedweg supports the view of an original full sharing of property amongst Pythagoras’ disciples. See his *Pythagoras: His Life, Teaching and Influence* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005).

uprising), their political power would have made such motivations superfluous. The original Pythagorean group was socially confident.

Though Iamblichus does not emphasise the fact, the first three years of his provisional association clearly served in its original context as a training period for the candidate, during which he modified his behaviour to the standards of the group sufficiently enough to make closer integration possible. The process also afforded candidates a chance to reflect on their plans to join the group, and reinforce their determination to join. Through this prolonged period of reflective contact, they gained a truer impression of the society they sought to join, providing the basis for a properly informed decision. Wherever the process which Iamblichus describes originated, it afforded a process of mutual acquaintance and assessment in which the group and candidate discovered, over a period of time, whether their proposed intimate and life-long association was likely to be successful. We can directly compare this first and prolonged phase of acquaintance with the postulancy of Christian monasticism, where the basic suitability of the candidate is established over a period of time, in modern times usually a year.⁶²

Up to this point, no surrender of assets to the community occurred, although perhaps the most distinctive feature of final membership is the group's common ownership of property. The paradox arises from the practical dimensions of the undertaking, from the high degree of social integration and adjustment required of a candidate entering such a close-knit group. This too is also true of the postulancy in Christian monasticism, during which no financial transactions take place. Pythagoras probably learnt from experience the same lesson, that, when money changes hands, tensions arise which can disrupt the process of acquaintance. Iamblichus does not explain that these 'postulants' would probably leave at any point during this first period of association with the community, if their resolve failed, yet this is implicit. The testing of the candidate's resolve can be read from the statement that Pythagoras 'suffered him to be neglected' (*hyperorasthai*, 'disdain, hold in contempt, take no notice of') for three years. We are not told what form this disdain took, but it seems to have represented a deliberate attempt to break the applicant's determination. Christian monasticism has also seen at times the postulancy as an attempt to expose the weak-willed by harsh treatment. Benedict prescribed that an applicant for the novitiate be left in the porch of the monastery for five days. If he is persistent, he may enter the novitiate.⁶³ Applicants of weak resolve depart, causing the abbot no further trouble.

Iamblichus continues with a description of the second and most interesting phase in the entrance procedure:

After this, he ordered those who came to him to observe a quinquennial silence, in order that he might experimentally know how they were affected as to continence of speech, the subjugation of the tongue being the most difficult of all victories; as those have unfolded to us who instituted the mysteries. During this (probationary) time, however, the property of each was disposed of in common, and was committed to the care of those appointed for this purpose, who were called 'politicians', 'economists' and 'legislators' (*politikoi, oikonomikoi, nomothetikoi*). And with respect to these (probationers), those

⁶² See section 5 below and generally the Roman Catholic *Codex Juris Canonici* 641–643, cf. *The Code of Canon Law in English translation* (Canon Law Society of Great Britain and Northern Ireland 1983), pp. 116–117, 119, 122.

⁶³ See section 5 below on the regulation of chapter 58 of Benedict's Rule, and also for John Cassian's provocative resistance to the applicant.

who appeared worthy to participate of his dogmas, from the judgment he had formed of them from their life and the modesty of their behaviour, after the quinquennial silence, then became 'esoterics' and both heard and saw Pythagoras within the veil. For prior to this they participated of his words by hearing alone, beyond the veil, without at all seeing him, giving for a long time an example of their peculiar manners. But if they were rejected, they received back the double of the wealth which they brought, and a tomb was raised for them as if they were dead by the 'hearers', for thus were all his disciples called. (*Vit. Pyth.* 17 §72)

This second period of testing was harsher than the first, although the long absolute silence may be an exaggeration; the candidates in this phase were only allowed to hear the doctrine of Pythagoras and the discussion of the learned circle of full members, without right of comment or contribution; the 'silence' may have involved no more than this.⁶⁴ The candidates' increased privileges come only with an increased commitment; they hand over their property to the group. If they fail their final examination at the end of the five years, however, they receive their property back with more besides. Here Iamblichus specifies that they received double back; in another passage he simply says that the candidate received his property back 'and more' (*kai pleiona* 30 §168), and at yet another point that the disciples 'drove him out of the auditory, loading him with a great quantity of gold and silver' (17 §74).

If the candidate's money was sealed up, then the additional sum of which Iamblichus writes may have been a sort of compensation for the earnings or interest the candidate might have received from his capital under other circumstances. Though forced to leave, he would then hopefully have no cause to complain that his attempt to join the community had caused him harm. Again, an initially strange-sounding procedure has its basis in the practical considerations which arise when an attempt is made to realise community of property and highly integrated social life in practice.

Although we have little information to go on, it seems that the community had common premises, and that at this point the candidate left his own home for good and took up residence, in the 'auditory' (*homakeion*). Iamblichus writes that 'the property' of the candidate (*ta hyparchonta*) was 'made common' (*ekoinounto*) when he entered the five-year period, adding the qualification that by 'property' he means 'landed property' (*toutestin hai ousiai*, *Vit. Pyth.* 71 §72). The verb *ekoinounto* here interestingly cannot mean a communalising of property including absolute right of property, but only the right of administration of property. The candidate's removal to the community premises was probably a sensible point for him to sell his real estate. This was well in advance of final acceptance into the community. Since the candidate who left received his money back and more, his funds cannot have been considered to belong to the community in any final or irreversible sense, though under the care of the relevant officers in the community. The tradition which specifies that the funds were sealed has precisely in mind that they were kept on trust, on the candidate's behalf.

There was probably good practical sense in this process of provisional surrender of property. The intended life in full community of property with Pythagoras' disciples meant a radical change from the candidate's former way of life. The period during which he experienced the practical implications of living without

⁶⁴ Cf. K. von Fritz in A. F. von Pauly and G. Wissowa (eds.), *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Vol. 24.1 (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1921), p. 220.

personal resources, without making any permanent commitment, must have served to show him precisely what his future life would be like, if he finally remained. He was able to delay, however, the final and difficult decision irreversibly to hand over his property to the community. The candidate would, therefore, by his provisional surrender of property in advance of full membership, be prepared for the common ownership of property which full membership entailed. Although Iamblichus does not make mention of the fact, we can fairly assume that any candidate who found this restriction of his personal life too great would leave during the five-year period, also receiving his funds back and any compensation considered necessary. It is those candidates who were rejected by the community who went on right to the end of the process, only then to be sent away with their property and more.

It is implicit in the details given about the return of the candidates' property, that if they went on into full membership at the end of the five-year period, their funds were irreversibly made over to the community. Once a full member had lived for a time in community of goods with the group, it would be difficult to fairly determine what he should receive back, if he later decided to leave. Any number of practical problems would complicate the issue, not the least being that sufficient funds might not always be available fully to reimburse him. The candidate was prepared so carefully for the common life because full entry was an irreversible decision. Christian monasticism again offers a very close analogy to this provisional surrender of property. Following the postulancy, the candidate enters the novitiate. At this point, the point of 'simple profession' (as opposed to 'perpetual profession'), he often surrenders his property to the care of the order, though he receives it again if he decides not to continue with his application to join the order, or is not permitted to continue.⁶⁵ Of course, each group has its own respective standards and expectations of the candidate, but the basic process is the same, and the same kind of practical necessities are at work in each case.

It may appear illegitimate in an historical study to draw such parallels between the ancient Pythagoreans and Christian monasticism. However, the point of the comparison is not to seek any historical connection, but to demonstrate that similar social circumstances tend to produce similar regulating structures precisely where no historical link may be assumed. In the case of instances of property-sharing this legitimate exercise in 'comparative historical sociology' is particularly productive. Groups which live in community of property necessarily require a high degree of conformity from their members, and hence a process of testing and assimilation is necessary. The similarity between the entrance procedures in these two instances of community of goods with no direct historical connection serves to demonstrate the necessity of a provisional membership phase wherever community of goods is to be instituted in practice without coercive or unfair treatment of applicants. Provisional phases of membership are a 'social necessity' wherever community of goods is to be undertaken with any hope of the relaxed social relations necessary for the permanence of the institution.

The disposal of private property to the group, indeed the yielding of the very right to private property to the group, is an especially large and life-changing step, which is best tested for a time, experimentally, on a provisional basis. The applicant

⁶⁵ See further below, section 5.

may thus avoid being forced to accept the consequences of a rash decision; the group spares itself the practical problems of later having to deal with members who had not fully thought out the consequences of common ownership.

5. The entrance procedure of IQS VI.13–23 and some comparative contemporary examples of provisional surrender of property in Christian Monasticism

The universal prolongation of entry procedures in Christian monasticism suggests that in general religious groups which practice voluntary community of goods will seek to hinder and delay the entry of the applicant's full membership because of the extreme difficulty of communal life itself and the enormous changes in behaviour and attitudes which must be perfected by the applicant if successful social integration is to be achieved.⁶⁶ It is well known that ancient Christian monasticism attempted to deter those who would be monks, to test their resolve. In Pachomian monasteries the would-be monk had to learn by heart the Lord's Prayer and Psalms as he was able as a test of resolve and suitability.⁶⁷ Cassian made the applicant lie outside the gates of the monastery for ten days or more, continually taunted by the monks. Persistence proved the necessary humility, patience and resolve to begin the process of becoming a monk.⁶⁸ St. Benedict decreed:

'Let easy admission not be given to the one who newly cometh to change his life; but, as the Apostle saith, "Try the spirits, whether they be of God." (1 Jn 4:1) If, therefore, the newcomer keepeth on knocking, and after four or five days it is seen that he patiently beareth the harsh treatment offered him and the difficulty of admission, and that he persevereth in his request, let admission be granted him, and let him live for a few days in the apartment of the guests.'⁶⁹

Prolonged entrance procedures beyond initial resistance to the applicant serve similar purposes enabling social integration — they continue to test resolve and suitability, allow careful explanation of the severe restrictions of common life, and educate the applicant, giving both applicant and community greater assurance that joining as a full member is desirable and will be successful.

Christian monasticism has given rise to rules which employed the procedure of provisional surrender of property in the last phase of probationary membership, an aspect of the perdurance of entry processes. A period of temporary 'simple profession' during which the probationer was denied the administration of his own property, was for a long time the necessary precursor to perpetual 'solemn profession' in western monasticism.⁷⁰ In this section I cursorily glance at some procedures in recent western Christian monasticism. There are far too many examples to survey. The examples I give show the continuing usefulness, to the present day, of

⁶⁶ Cf. from a sociological viewpoint Michael Hill, *The Religious Order* (London: Heinemann, 1973), pp. 53–55, who describes the tests as designed to demonstrate 'proof of special merit'. I observe that the issue extends beyond simple moral conformity, and may include malleability in many areas of character and behaviour.

⁶⁷ See the *Rule of Pachomius*, in editions often part I or precept 47.

⁶⁸ John Cassian, *The Institutes and the Conferences* (Oxford, 1894), p. 219.

⁶⁹ Boniface Verheyen (transl.), *The Holy Rule of St Benedict* (Atchison, Kansas: St. Benedict's Monastery, 1949), chapter 58, beginning.

⁷⁰ Cf. A. Vermeersch, art. 'Religious Life', *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York: Robert Appleton/Encyclopedia Press, 1907–1914), Vol. XII, pp. 748–762.

progressive entrance procedures, and the beneficial value of the probationer's experience of loss of the personal administration of his property prior to fully renouncing his property, for the successful practice of community of goods.

I add here the caveat that it is possible that there was an historical connection between Essene practice and the early Syrian asceticism of the late second century AD, from which developed Syrian monasticism. Matthew Black and John C.L. Gibson considered the possibility of a direct line of connection between the Qumran scrolls and the early church of Edessa.⁷¹ The similarities continue to be noted, though a direct connection is difficult to prove. There appears to be a connection between the *qeyama* ('Covenant') of early Syrian asceticism and Essene celibacy.⁷² The *benai qeyama*, who in early Syrian Christianity have sometimes been thought to be the baptized laity, in a context where baptism was the sole prerogative of ascetics,⁷³ and later to have become a type of monastic order within the wider Christian congregation, invite comparison with the 'Council of the Community' and 'sons of the Covenant'⁷⁴ of the Qumran scrolls.⁷⁵ A connection is also possible between the Syriac *ichidaya* ('solitary', 'monk' = Greek *monachos*)⁷⁶ and Hebrew (*ha-*)*yachadh* (the 'Unity'), the technical term for the Community in the Dead Sea Scrolls, rather than simply Hebrew *yachîdh* ('solitary'). Ultimately a direct historical connection may have existed between the communities for which IQS legislated and the beginnings of Christian monasticism, especially if this began in Syria (rather than, on the alternative view, in Egypt, with Anthony and Pachomius). In this case, the comparative social evidence of Christian monastic groups would not have quite the force of the completely unconnected examples of the probationer's separation from the administration of his own goods in the examples of Christian sectarian community of goods discussed above. Nonetheless, comparative social argument arising from the frequency of the advanced candidate monk's loss of the administration of his property seems still to bear considerable force — though it be borrowed, wisdom remains wisdom.

A form by which western religious orders may distinguish between the provisional status of the probationary monk or nun's property is the distinction between "simple profession for X years" and "perpetual solemn profession". The last

⁷¹ Matthew Black, 'The Tradition of Hasidean-Essene Asceticism, its origin and influence', in *Aspects du Judéo-Christianisme* (Colloque de Strasbourg 23–25 Avril 1964 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1965), pp. 19–32; John C. L. Gibson, 'From Qumran to Edessa or the Aramaic Speaking Church before and after 70 A.D.', *The Annual of the Leeds University Oriental Society* V, 1963–1965 (Tübingen, 1966).

⁷² Cf. especially Robert Murray, 'The Exhortation to Candidates for Ascetical Vows at Baptism in the Ancient Syriac Church', *New Testament Studies* 21 (1974–1975), pp. 59–80; Jodi Magness, *Debating Qumran: Collected Essays on its Archaeology* (Louvain: Peeters, 2005), pp. 84–85; Arthur Vööbus, *A History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient*, Vol. I (Louvain: Peeters, 1968), pp. 4–29.

⁷³ The view of Arthur Vööbus, 'Celibacy as a Requirement for Admission to Baptism in the Early Syrian Church', *Papers of the Estonian Theological Society in Exile* 1 (Stockholm, 1951), has been greatly modified. See George Nedungatt, 'The Covenanters of the Early Syriac-Speaking Church', *OCP* 49 (1973), pp. 191–215, 419–444; Robert Murray, *op. cit.*

⁷⁴ 'Sons of the covenant', 1QM 17.8; 'the sons of your covenant', 4Q501, line 2; 'sons of your covenant', 4Q503 fragments 7–9, line 3.

⁷⁵ Cf. L. W. Barnard, 'The Origins and Emergence of the Church of Edessa During the First Two Centuries A.D.', *Vigiliae Christianae* 22 (1968), pp. 161–175, see especially pp. 163–164.

⁷⁶ Cf. G. Qispel, 'The Discussion of Judaic Christianity', *Vigiliae Christianae* 22 (1968), pp. 81–93.

phase of the candidate's probation used always to begin with the taking of "simple vows". The distinction between temporary "simple vows" and perpetual "solemn vows" in religious institutes is old, and is found in the 1917 *Code of Canon Law* of the Roman Catholic Church.⁷⁷ Uniformity of terminology now appears to have reduced since technical changes regarding the solubility of vows in the 1917 code, meaning that solemn vows may be taken on entry to the last probationary phase. Since the new code of 1983 each institute "identifies in its proper law the obligations and rights resulting from profession. In some institutes the obligations and rights are equivalent to those formerly legislated for solemn vows, e.g. renouncing the capacity to own property. In the proper law of other institutes the obligations and rights of profession are equivalent to those formerly identified with simple vows, e.g. retaining the capacity to own property but renouncing its independent use."⁷⁸ Here we find a legal distinction parallel to that distinguishing the status of full member's property over against that of the probationer in the last phase of his probation in 1QS VI.19–20.

The phase during which the probationer in Christian monasticism no longer administers his own property may feature as the last probationary period in a long process of integration into a fully property-sharing community — a period enduring markedly longer than the processes noted for some Christian sects above. I illustrate this first through the example of the present-day Austrian foundations of Augustinian canons, whose Constitution is conveniently available online.⁷⁹ A postulancy not exceeding two years may be applied in these 'stifts' before the clerical novitiate in these foundations. The novitiate lasts at least twelve months and must not exceed two years when absences are allowed. The successful novice proceeds to the period of 'simple profession', which lasts three years, concerning which he vows (or promises) a provisional and limited 'poverty'. This 'poverty' concerns his rights to administer his property and does not require transfer of any aspect of his property rights to the community at all: 'Before taking temporary vows the novice must hand over the administration of his property to a person of his own choice and must make arrangements for its use for the period of profession. He keeps the right of ownership.' (43). The community expresses no interest that any of its officers administer the candidates's property, though such a choice seems not to be excluded. Thereafter the candidate may progress to 'perpetual solemn vows', through which it appears that property is ideally given to the community. Since the changes in canon law in the 1917 code, no indispensable religious vows are recognised. The description 'perpetual' is therefore qualified, since the episcopal jurisdiction of the Catholic Church in Rome can release even those perpetually professed.

⁷⁷ Cf. A. Vermeersch, art. 'Novice' in *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York: Robert Appleton/Encyclopedia Press, 1907–1914), Vol. XI, pp. 144–148: "By canon law, the novice retains full and entire liberty to leave his order and incurs no pecuniary responsibility by the mere fact of leaving it. Vows of devotion do not change the juridical condition of the novice... [if he leaves] The order is obliged to restore to him his personal property and anything he may have brought with him. As the order is not bound to the novice by any contract, it may dismiss him."

⁷⁸ John P. Beal, James A. Coriden and Thomas J. Green, *New Commentary on the Code of Canon Law* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1982), p. 821

⁷⁹ See the *Constitution of the Austrian Congregation* 20–68, online at: <http://www.augustiniancanons.org/documents/Austrian%20Constitution.htm>

The complete process of admission may take as long as six years. During the postulancy (if applied) and during the novitiate no transfer of the administration of personal property takes place. The simply professed no longer administer their own property, but do not renounce the right of ownership. It is only traditional that at perpetual profession the probationer's property will become part of the community of goods amongst the canons. The probationer may gift his property elsewhere.⁸⁰

The well known Christian author Thomas Merton was a Trappist monk, i.e. a member of the Order of Cistercians of the Strict Observance, a cloistered order following the *Rule of St. Benedict*. Merton gave a useful technical explanation of how the church law of property applied to temporary simple profession, which is of interest for the present discussion. There is a distinction between two types of *dominium* or 'ownership', *dominium radicale* and *dominium utile*. *Dominium radicale* is direct or radical ownership. This means that one has possession of the thing in itself, but only that—one does not have the right to dispose of it. So, for example, a minor who has inherited property may own it but have no right to dispose of it until maturity. *Dominium utile* is the 'useful' ownership which gives one rights to the benefits and fruits of the thing owned, for example the right to cultivate fruits from leased land. When a person has both radical dominion and useful dominion, he is said to have *perfect dominion*.

Merton explains that three concepts apply for understanding useful dominion: 1) *Usus* is the right of use. This is how a thing might be used and used up. 2) *Usufruct* is the right to dominion over the fruits of a thing. Where an object remains substantially intact, but yields products — fruits — one may have dominion over the fruits but not the object itself. For example, one may have right to use land to cultivate crops without owning the land outright. One may have rights to dwell in a house one does not own. 3) *Administration* is the right to conserve and provide for property and to carry out all the acts necessary to take care of this.⁸¹

This conceptuality can serve remarkably well for understanding the distinction made regarding the status of the probationers' property in 1QS:20–23. The probationer in this phase of entry might be said to retain *dominium radicale* over his property, but loses the *administration* aspect of *dominium utile*. In my view the 'earnings' of the candidate in 1QS VI.19–20 are his daily wages from labour when this is done away from the community's own premises and land for payment. We can tell from the *Rule of the Community's* requirement that a priest must be present wherever there are ten men of the Council of Community (VI.3–4) that 1QS applied in the context of many small communities of fully property-sharing Essenes. We know from Josephus and Philo that there were distributed through Judaea numerous communities of fully property-sharing Essene males.⁸² We know from Philo that these

⁸⁰ 'Before taking perpetual vows personal property must finally be disposed of. The current will is also to be reviewed by the candidate and the superior. It is in keeping with the Augustinian ideal of common conventual property that his personal property be brought into the community' (62).

⁸¹ Thomas Merton *The Life of the Vows: Initiation into the Monastic Tradition* 6, ed. Patrick F. O'Connell (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2012).

⁸² Josephus numbers the celibate Essene males at over four thousand ('...they hold their possessions in common...the men [*andres*] who practise this way of life number over four thousand. They do not bring wives into the community...' *Ant.* 18.1.5 §§20–21, cf. Philo, *Quod omn.* §75) and states that they dwell 'in no one town (*polis*), but settle in large numbers in every one' (*B.J.* 2.8.4 §124). Philo

men pooled their wages, earned outside their communities in the local economy, each evening.⁸³ Hence it would be incorrect to find, as might assist the view of Murphy noted at the beginning of this piece, a reference to usufruct from deposited capital in the references to ‘earnings’ in IQS VI.19–20.⁸⁴ Earnings are, rather, daily wages earned by labour outside the community. Key to understanding the term ‘earnings’ correctly is that IQS is not a rule used only in Essene communities where there may have been communal production (e.g. the Qumran community), but was used widely by communities distributed in villages and towns across ancient Judaea, whose members often worked for others.⁸⁵

I draw attention to the fascinating parallel that current Benedictine monasticism can currently define five stages of social integration. A typical pattern is:⁸⁶

- 1) general acquaintance (especially through visits and short stays)
- 2) postulancy (6 months)
- 3) novitiate (2 years)
- 4) simple profession (3 years)
- 5) solemn profession

Overall this process lasts typically nearly six years. These five phases precisely parallel the phases of social integration deduced from the *Rule of the Community* in section 3 above.

The Latin Orthodox Benedictine Fathers provide a further interesting example for comparison in that there are yet more stages of progression and periods for proof of suitability. A tabulation of the stages of integration is available online.⁸⁷ I exclude the informal prior social position of general acquaintance and here count the six formal grades. These distinguish between: 1) candidates, who are normally involved in some work of the monastery, and therefore not merely visitors; 2) postulants; 3) novices; 4) ryassophores (literally ‘robe wearers’); 5) stavrophores (literally ‘cross bearers’), also known as ‘little schema’ or ‘lesser schema’ monks. ‘This stage is

explicitly links these celibate male Essenes to Judaea. They dwell ‘in many towns of Judaea, and in many villages in large and numerous societies’ (*Hypothetica*, 11.1).

⁸³ Philo writes: ‘Each member of the group, when he has received the day’s wages (*ton misthon labontes*) for these different occupations, gives it to the person who has been elected as treasurer. As soon as he receives this money, the treasurer immediately buys what is necessary and provides food in abundance as well as whatever else human life requires. Thus having each day a common life and a common table they are content with the same conditions, lovers of frugality who shun expensive luxury as a disease of both body and soul’ (*Hypothetica*, 11.10–11).

⁸⁴ Murphy, op. cit., pp. 189, 193, 370–371 and 399. Cf. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994), p. 110.

⁸⁵ Philo reports typical rural occupations, such as working the soil, shepherding, bee-keeping and crafts, *Hypothetica*, 11:4–9.

⁸⁶ <http://www.benediktinerinnen-koeln.de/Englishside/novitiate.htm>

⁸⁷ <http://www.irishorthodoxchristianchurch.org/the-monastery/constitution-and-the-statutes>

permanent and cannot be revoked'; and 6) the rare 'angelic schema' or 'great schema' monk, exceptional in ascetic practice and largely devoted to prayer; this grade is sometimes referred at as 'the angelic habit'.

With commitment to the fourth grade of formal social integration into the religious life the would-be monk's property rights begin to adjust: 'A Ryassophore monk retains his monies and possessions until solemn profession, although he is not free to use them during the Ryassophore stage.' (D.v). As in 1QS, there follows immediately after the stage in which the probationer loses the right to administer his property *though not ownership* of his property the irrevocable state of complete renunciation of property. The life of permanent renunciation of the stavromore is reminiscent of the full member of the *yachadh* in 1QS; the 'angelic' status of the Great Schema monk is reminiscent of the presence of angels at the worship of the congregation in 1QSa II.8–9 and 1QM VII.6.⁸⁸ The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice attest the synchronicity between human worship and the worship of the angels, underlining the importance of the heavenly connection mediated by the angels who were understood to be present at Essene worship. The emphasis on the angelic character of the orthodox monk down through history is well known.⁸⁹ Despite the difficulties of proving an historical connection between early Syrian monasticism and particular Essenes who lived according to a version of 1QS in the first century AD, and who perhaps had been drawn into the early church of Syro-Palestine, and early Syrian monasticism, and therefore perhaps the beginnings of Christian monasticism, the suggestion remains.

6. Conclusions

It is clear from the above discussion that the 'revisionist' case that denies full community of property to the full members of the *yachadh* of 1QS, the 'Council of the Community', can be opposed with confidence, despite its prevalence and sometimes weighty support. Detailed study of relevant texts in 1QS does not support the revisionist case. Moreover, as comparative examples show, where a period of detachment of the probationer from the administration of his own property is found, historically, this is always in association with the goal of entrance into communities which practice full renunciation of property and community of goods.

I add in closing a final observation regarding the view of Eyal Regev that the perdurance of entrance procedures, since it relates to creation of separation between the renouncer of property and the world, is necessarily an indicator of 'introversionist sectarianism'. Regev writes 'The similarities of the admission procedures of the *yahad*, the Essenes, and the Shakers, Amish and Hutterites show that gradual admission is typical of introversionist sects.' He goes on to contrast 'the openness of the Damascus Covenant... in accepting member without a thorough examination or period of probation', which he views as 'quite exceptional' amongst introversionist sects.⁹⁰ Here I believe he has misarranged the evidence by assuming that gradual admission is *only* typical of introversionist sects. Since gradual admission is also

⁸⁸ Also CD ms. A XV:15–17 and parallels in 4QD mss.

⁸⁹ See the study of Otto Betz, 'Isangelie', *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, Vol. 18 (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1998), pp. 945–976.

⁹⁰ Eyal Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran*, pp. 272–2733.

typical of *religious orders*, the parallel of gradual admission between these Christian sects and the Essenes does not prove that the Essenes — whichever grouping is in view — were introversionist sectarians. The absence of gradual admission and a probationary period in the *Damascus Rule* may indicate that this grouping has been too readily classified as an introversionist sect, and may simply have been one popular, generally well-regarded and accepted religious grouping within a range of approaches available to Judaeans around the turn of the eras, rather than a socially separated group. In the case of IQS, the parallel of gradual admission may mean, rather, that this is the rule of a *religious order*, an unusual but again respected religious option in the eyes of most Jews of Judaea.

Significant separation from the ‘world’ is a feature not only of introversionist sectarianism, where total separation is sought, but also of religious orders, whose separation is substantial but ultimately only partial. The ‘religious virtuosi’ of religious orders are known to occupy a liminal social position, accepting an authority from outside their religious order, and retaining a limited connection with the wider community of non-virtuosi, over whom they may exert disproportionate influence,⁹¹ because of the high honour paid to their extreme expression of religious values common to all in wider society. Sociological analysis has shown that acknowledgement of external authority from the wider community of faith is the only feature which clearly distinguishes the religious order *from* the sect, and that religious order and sect share many social features.⁹² Michael Hill calls the religious order, because of this combination of association and separation from the wider community, a ‘sect within the church’.⁹³

Of the above comparative examples of extended entrance procedures, the Hutterites, Shakers, and Society of Separatists of Zoar, Ohio, are clearly to be understood as Christian *sects*. But since religious orders too have extended, complex admission processes, the gradual admission procedure of fully property-sharing Essene males⁹⁴ may point as easily to an accepted social position as religious order within a wider religious communion. This may have constituted in the first instance a much larger, non-renouncing community of associated marrying Essene communities, conceivably a major or even dominant proportion of the Judaeans rural population.⁹⁵ Especially during the reigns of Herod the Great and his son Archelaus, when the Essenes enjoyed royal patronage,⁹⁶ favoured national status surely enhanced their standing amongst the wider Temple-worshiping Jewish community, making Essenism

⁹¹ Cf. Brian J. Capper, ‘John, Qumran and Virtuoso Religion.’ In *John and Qumran: Sixty Years of Discovery and Dialogue*, ed. Tom Thatcher and Mary L. Coloe (Leiden: Brill, 2011), pp. 93–116, see pp. 112–113.

⁹² Michael Hill, *The Religious Order: A Study of the Religious Order and its Legitimation in Nineteenth Century England* (London: Heinemann, 1973), 12, 61–71; Ilana F. Silber, *Virtuosity, Charisma, and Social Order: A Comparative Sociological Study of Monasticism in Theravada Buddhism and Medieval Catholicism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 40; Brian J. Capper, ‘John, Qumran and Virtuoso Religion’, pp. 96–100.

⁹³ Michael Hill, *The Religious Order*, p. 12.

⁹⁴ IQS VI.13–23; Josephus, *Jewish War* 2.8.7 §§137–142.

⁹⁵ Cf. the *Damascus Rule* [CD] and Josephus, *Jewish War* 2.8.13 §§160–162.

⁹⁶ Josephus, *Antiquities*, 15.10.4–5 §§372–379 (Herod); *Jewish War*, 2.7.3 §113 and *Antiquities*, 17.8.3 §§345–348 (Archelaus); cf. Brian J. Capper, “‘With the Oldest Monks...’ Light from Essene History on the Career of the Beloved Disciple?’, *Journal of Theological Studies* 49 (1998), pp. 1–55, see 28–29.

their movement attractive to prospective affiliates, expanding the membership of the movement's outer circles especially. The inner Essene order of 1QS, especially in this era, may have functioned simply as a religious order respected by most Temple-worshipping Jews.⁹⁷

The carefully constructed, extended entrance procedure of 1QS, with its sophisticated device of provisional property surrender in the probationer's final year, before full participation in the male Essene order's community of goods, may constitute evidence that the assemblies of fully property-sharing Essene males of the *yachadh* together formed not an introversionist sect (*pace* Regev), but a religious order within the wider Jewish community, especially during the reigns of Herod the Great and his son Archelaus. At other times these fully property-sharing groups may have formed a distinctive and probably leading echelon of a reform movement, or of a movement properly defined as sectarian. It is also possible that different groupings of Essenes functioned variously as 'sect' or 'religious order' simultaneously, since the Essene movement may have experienced internal divisions and embraced differences of social approach.⁹⁸

⁹⁷ Cf. Brian J. Capper, 'John, Qumran and Virtuoso Religion', pp. 100–103.

⁹⁸ Cf. John J. Collins' view of the Essene movement embracing a disperse, multiple set of groups embracing a common ethos, but having no defining common centre; see his 'Forms of Community in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in S. M. Paul et al. (eds.), *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 97–111; "'The Yahad" and the Qumran Community"' in Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu (eds.), *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), pp. 81–96; *Beyond the Qumran Community: the sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012).