

Re: "Debating Qumran: Collected Essays on Its Archaeology" by Jodi Magness

## Re: "Debating Qumran: Collected Essays on Its Archaeology" by Jodi Magness

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2007-10/msg01043.html>

---

- *From:* Jack Linthicum <[jacklinthicum@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jacklinthicum@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Fri, 26 Oct 2007 13:45:16 -0700
- 

On Oct 26, 3:56 pm, David <[pchristain...@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:pchristain...@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Oct 26, 2:50 pm, Jack Linthicum <[jacklinthi...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jacklinthi...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Oct 26, 2:36 pm, David <[pchristain...@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:pchristain...@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

...

How does the chronology of the settlement differ as between Dr. Magness and Dr. Thiering?

Hint: Both cannot possibly be right; one of them is wrong – the other is right.

One question: Doesn't Dr. Magness refute Dr. Thiering?

<http://www.archaeological.org/webinfo.php?page=10408>

Answer – NO!

Please see –

Madelyn Yribarren – review <http://www.arts.ualberta.ca/JHS/reviews/review181.htm>

"Magness' conclusions rest more on the actual archaeological evidence than the evidence of texts like the Hebrew Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Magness notes that de Vaux used information from the Damascus Document to place the beginning of the occupation at nearly four hundred years after the Babylonian invasion of Jerusalem (586 BCE). Then she adds

Re: "Debating Qumran: Collected Essays on Its Archaeology" by Jodi Magness

sixty years to account for the life and death of the Teacher of Righteousness, which places the beginning occupation at 135 BCE. This coincides with de Vaux's initial date for Period 1a at 130 BCE. Magness suggests that the archaeological evidence indicates that Qumran was not occupied until later. She cites the lack of pottery found at the site from the 2nd Century BCE and interprets some of the coins found at the site differently than de Vaux. De Vaux found a number of coins that dated to the reign of Alexander Janneus, and from this he concluded that the occupation level Period 1b should date to the period of the reign of Alexander Janneus. However, in antiquity coins remained in circulation many years after production. Magness thus maintains that Qumran was not inhabited by the sectarian community until around 100–50 BCE (p. 65)."

Two hundred years

CONTRA Magness on 100–50 BCE

[http://groups.yahoo.com/group/qumran\\_origin/message/2830](http://groups.yahoo.com/group/qumran_origin/message/2830)

"In 141– 140 BC, at the time Simon Maccabeus established the Hasmonean dynasty of high priests, the Hasidim–Essenes were forced out of Jerusalem as a result of their continuing political activism.

They record the event and its date in their Testament of Levi, 17,10. They went to Qumran, their 'desolate country', a location suited to their astronomical studies. It may have belonged to the Davids since the time the round well was built there in the Iron Age."

Re: [qumran\_origin] The Revolutionary Thiering Dating Scheme for Gospel Period History

CONTRA Magness and De Vaux because of incorrect translation in CD 1 relating to Teacher of Righteousness

[http://groups.yahoo.com/group/qumran\\_origin/message/189](http://groups.yahoo.com/group/qumran_origin/message/189)

"Then I pointed out that the famous passage on the 390 years in CD 1, which gives a date for the Teacher, is correctly translated 'the 390 years for his giving them...' and it is incorrect to translate ' 390 years after he

Re: "Debating Qumran: Collected Essays on Its Archaeology" by Jodi Magness

gave them...' The Babylonian names are pseudonyms for Romans, as in 1 Peter 5:13 and Rev 18, consistently with the assumptions of the pesharim. The 390 years are drawn from Ezek 4:5 and used as a prophecy of the length of the Roman occupation, not past history. The 'Period of Wrath' when the 390 years began is AD 6, when the Roman occupation began. The word 'wrath' (charon) always refers to the Romans. Thus the Teacher, coming 20 years after the Period of Wrath, came in AD 26. He died, according to CD 20, about 40 years before a date that is best interpreted as AD 70, that is, he died about AD 30. These dates support all the other parallels indicating that the Teacher was John the Baptist."

In addition,

Excerpts of a Review on Dr. Magness's book  
by Magen Broshi and Hanan Eshel, Jerusalem, Bar Ilan University

More good news [http://groups.yahoo.com/group/qumran\\_origin/message/5479](http://groups.yahoo.com/group/qumran_origin/message/5479)

Funny, she seems to

The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls (Paperback)  
by Jodi Magness (Author)

No Fringe Theories Allowed, November 2, 2002

By Virgil Brown (White Oak, Texas USA) – See all my reviews  
(REAL NAME)

This review is from: The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea  
Scrolls (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature)  
(Hardcover)

Jodi Magness points out in the introduction to her book that there are two reasons why fringe theories about the Dead Sea Scrolls are numerous. The second is that "we tend to side with the underdogs." The first reason is that controversy sells. Magness shows why the available archaeological evidence supports the basic conclusions of Roland de Vaux. The scrolls and the Qumran settlement are related. The scrolls were owned by a sectarian group. The settlement is not a villa rustica. Etc. Yet Magness does not rubber stamp the work of de Vaux. For example she sets forth her own chronology of the settlement.

This book is not for people who subscribe to fringe theories. There are no Christian writings found among the scrolls. Nor are the scrolls

Re: "Debating Qumran: Collected Essays on Its Archaeology" by Jodi Magness

Re: "Debating Qumran: Collected Essays on Its Archaeology" by Jodi Magness

a depository of the Temple either in 62 BCE or 68 CE. There used to be a sect known as the Essenes who lived at Khirbet Qumran...

These guys?

The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance For Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity (Paperback)  
by James Vanderkam (Author), Peter Flint (Author)

From Library Journal

VanderKam (Univ. of Notre Dame; The Dead Sea Scrolls Today) and Flint (codirector, Dead Sea Scrolls Inst., Trinity Western Univ., B.C.) have produced a richly informative and insightful book. The content is not all that unusual among recent books on the Scrolls, but the sober, thorough, and balanced presentation sets it apart. The book begins with an examination of the discovery and dating of the Scrolls, which includes the results of new technology. The authors discuss the text and canon of the Hebrew Bible in addition to the Apocrypha and New Testament in relation to the Scrolls. This is followed by a review of the nonbiblical Scrolls and their message. They also evaluate some earlier books on the Scrolls that make outlandish, unfounded claims concerning what they purportedly reveal about Jesus and early Christianity, then present some well-documented ways the Scrolls do offer important background material for understanding Jesus' teachings. The final chapter closes with a review of the controversies surrounding the Scrolls. Each chapter contains helpful sidebars and ends with a useful "Select Bibliography" for further research. Highly recommended as a clear, scholarly, and balanced presentation that helps the reader grasp both the significance of the Scrolls and their value as background material for our understanding of the Bible.  
David Bourquin, California State Univ., San Bernardino