

COMPANION TO THE QUMRAN SCROLLS

THE WAR TEXTS

1 QM and Related Manuscripts

T&T CLARK BIBLICAL STUDIES

JEAN DUHAIME



THE WAR TEXTS

Companion to the Qumran Scrolls, 6

Other volumes in the Companion to the Qumran Scrolls series:

The Damascus Text by Charlotte Hempel

The Temple Scroll and Related Texts by Sidnie White Crawford

Pesharim by Timothy H. Lim

The Exegetical Texts by Jonathan G. Campbell

The Purity Texts by Hannah Harrington

THE WAR TEXTS

1QM and Related Manuscripts

Jean Duhaime



T & T CLARK INTERNATIONAL
A Continuum imprint
LONDON • NEW YORK

Published by T&T Clark International, a Continuum imprint
The Tower Building, 11 York Road, London SE1 7NX
15 East 26th Street, Suite 1703, New York, NY 10010

www.tandtclark.com

Copyright © Jean Duhaime, 2004

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the **British Library**

Typeset by Data Standards Ltd, Frome, Somerset BA11 1RE

EISBN 9780567045270

To Bernard and Jean-Daniel
my 'Sons of Light'

Contents

List of Tables	ix
Preface	xi
Abbreviations	xii
Editions, Translations and Bibliographies	1
1. Introduction	4
1.1. Discovery, Identification and Official Edition of the War Texts	4
1.2. The Study of the War Texts	9
2. The Manuscripts of the War Texts and their Contents	12
2.1. 1QM and 1Q33	13
2.2. Copies of a Similar Recension	20
2.3. Copies of Other Recensions	23
2.4. The Lost End of the Rule of the War?	31
2.5. A 'Self-Glorification Hymn'	35
2.6. Summary	40
3. The Composition and Genre of 1QM	45
3.1. The Problem	45
3.2. Internal Evidence in 1QM	45
3.3. Evidence from Cave 4	50
3.4. The Literary Genre of 1QM	53
3.5. Summary	60
4. The Date of 1QM	64
4.1. Dating 1QM	64
4.2. <i>Terminus a quo</i> and <i>terminus ad quem</i>	65
4.3. Relationship with the Book of Daniel	65
4.4. Historical References in 1QM 1–2	72
4.5. The Kittim as the Main Enemy	77
4.6. The Sequence of the War	81
4.7. Military Equipment and Tactics	83
4.8. Relationship with Other Qumran Texts	95
4.9. Summary and Assessment	97

5. The War Texts and the Hebrew Bible	103
5.1. Overview	103
5.2. A Prayer of Biblical Inspiration: 1QM 11.1–12	104
5.3. Summary	113
Cumulative Bibliography	117
Index of References	132
Index of Authors	139

List of Tables

Table 1. The War Texts according to their date and type	41
Table 2. Parallels between 1QM and similar recensions	42
Table 3. Parallels and similarities between 1QM and other recensions or compositions	43
Table 4. The sequence of the war in 1QM 7.1–9.9; 14.2–18 and 1QM 15–19	82
Table 5. Hellenistic and Roman parallels to the military data found in 1QM according to Yadin	86
Table 6. Pre- and post-Marius parallels to the military data of the War Texts according to Gmirkin	92

Preface

I had my initial contact with the Qumran War Texts in the middle of the 1970s, when, as a graduate student, I was trying to uncover the origin and development of dualism in the Qumran scrolls. Thirty years later, I am still fascinated by the powerful religious imagination at work in these texts which envision the final battle between the forces of light and darkness, resulting in the triumph of truth and justice. This dream is not only the utopia of a small group of sectarians of the past, but also the expectation of most of our contemporaries, as may be seen in movies like *Star Wars*, to name but one.

My gratitude goes to colleagues and friends who have supported my work during all these years. Guy Couturier, a former student of Roland de Vaux and my mentor at the Université de Montréal, first aroused my interest in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, professor at the École Biblique et Archéologique Française de Jérusalem, helped me to find my way in the complex field of Qumran research. John J. Collins, Florentino García Martínez, Lawrence H. Schiffman, Guy Stiebel and others have contributed, through numerous conversations and exchanges of papers, to my understanding of one or another aspect of these writings. Philip Davies deserves special thanks for his trust in inviting me to write this book and being patient enough to wait for its completion, as well as for his suggestions for improving its style; more than anyone, he shared with me his passion for the War Texts and his insightful thoughts. My warmest words, however, are for my wife Paule-Renée, through whom I have been blessed for the last three decades with the unfailing love of a spouse and, more recently, with the competence of a first-class assistant.

A grant from the Faculté de théologie of my home university made possible the initial phase of research for this book, during which Mike Arcieri meticulously tracked down the bibliographic material on the War Texts from the last ten years. Most chapters were written in the peaceful setting of the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies during the fall of 2001, at a time when an unprecedented attack against America brought the rhetoric of holy war to the fore and resulted in a worldwide campaign against terrorism. While I am typing the last lines, this struggle is still going on, apparently for many more years. . .

Abbreviations

- ABD* D.N. Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (6 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1992)
- ActOr* *Acta Orientalia*
- ANRW* H. Temporini and W. Haase (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1972–)
- ANTI* Arbeiten zum Neuen Testament und Judentum
- ATANT* Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
- BETL* Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
- Bib* *Biblica*
- BibOr* *Biblica et orientalia*
- BJRL* *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*
- BN* *Biblische Notizen*
- BRGK* *Berichte der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission [des deutschen Archäologischen Instituts]*
- BZ* *Biblische Zeitschrift*
- BZAW* Beihefte zur *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
- CBQ* *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
- CBQMS* *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Monograph Series
- CP* *Classical Philology*
- DBSup* L. Pirot and A. Clamer (eds.), *Dictionnaire de la Bible: Supplément* (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1928–)
- DJD* Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
- DSD* *Dead Sea Discoveries*
- EncDSS* L.H. Schiffman and J. VanderKam (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2 vols.; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000)
- EncJud* C. Roth and G. Wigoder (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (16 vols.; Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1972)
- EstBib* *Estudios Bíblicos*
- ETL* *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses*
- HSS* Harvard Semitic Studies
- HT* *History Today*

HUCM	Monographs of the Hebrew Union College
<i>IEJ</i>	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
JSPSup	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i> , Supplement Series
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
<i>Neot</i>	<i>Neotestamentica</i>
<i>NJB</i>	<i>New Jerusalem Bible</i>
<i>NJBC</i>	R.E. Brown <i>et al.</i> (eds.), <i>The New Jerome Biblical Commentary</i> (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1990)
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NRTb</i>	<i>Nouvelle revue théologique</i>
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>PEQ</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
RechBibl	Recherches bibliques
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumrân</i>
<i>RGG</i> ³	K. Gallig (ed.), <i>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i> (7 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr–Paul Siebeck, 3rd edn, 1957–65)
<i>RSR</i>	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBM	Stuttgarter biblische Monographien
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
ScrHier	Scripta Hierosolymitana
<i>ScEs</i>	<i>Science et esprit</i>
SDSSRL	Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature
<i>Sem</i>	<i>Semitica</i>
SSN	Studia semitica neerlandica
<i>ST</i>	<i>Studia theologica</i>
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
<i>TDNT</i>	G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (eds.), <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> (trans. G.W. Bromiley; 10 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
<i>TLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
<i>TRu</i>	<i>Theologische Rundschau</i>
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>

VTSup	<i>Vetus Testamentum, Supplements</i>
WZ	<i>Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

Editions, Translations and Bibliographies

Official Editions of 1QM and Related Texts

- Baillet, Maurice 1982 *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)* (DJD, 7; Oxford: Clarendon): 12–72, pl. V–XXVI [4Q491–497].
- Barthélemy, Dominique, and Josef T. Milik 1955 *Qumran Cave I* (DJD, 1; Oxford: Clarendon): 135–36, pl. XXXI [1Q33, additionnal frgs. of 1QM].
- Chazon, Esther, *et al.* 1999 *Qumran Cave 4 XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (DJD, 29; Oxford: Clarendon): 421–35, pl. XXVIII [4Q471b, 471c].
- García Martínez, Florentino, *et al.* 1998 *Qumran Cave 11.II* (DJD, 23; Oxford: Clarendon): 243–51, pl. XXVIII [11Q14].
- Pfann, Stephen J., *et al.* 2000 *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI* (DJD, 36; Oxford: Clarendon): 199–205 [4Q471b], 228–46, pl. XII–XIII [4Q285], 439–49, pl. XXX–XXXI [4Q471–471a].
- Sukenik, Eleazar L. 1955 *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press [Hebrew, 1954]): 1–19, pl. 16–34 and 47 [1QM].

Other Editions, Tools and Translations

- Abegg, Martin 1993 ‘The War Scroll from Cave 1 and 4: A Critical Edition’ (PhD diss., Hebrew Union College).
- Alexander, Philip S. 1999–2000 ‘A Reconstruction and Reading of 4Q285 (*4QSefer ha-Milhamah*)’, *RevQ* 19: 333–48.
- Bardtke, Hans 1955 ‘Die Kriegerrolle von Qumran übersetzt’, *TLZ* 80: 401–20.
- Carmignac, Jean 1958a ‘Concordance hébraïque de la Règle de la Guerre’, *RevQ* 1: 7–49.
- 1958b *La Règle de la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils des Ténèbres: Texte restauré, traduit et commenté* (Paris: Letouzey & Ané).
- 1961 ‘La Règle de la Guerre’, in J. Carmignac and P. Guilbert, *Les textes de Qumrân, I* (Autour de la Bible; Paris: Letouzey & Ané): 81–125.
- Delcor, Mathias 1955 ‘La guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres ou le “Manuel du parfait combattant”’, *NRT* 77: 372–99.
- Duhaime, Jean 1995 ‘War Scroll’, in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls, II. Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*. (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press): 80–203.
- Dupont-Sommer, André 1961 *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (trans. G. Vermes; Oxford: Basil Blackwell): 164–95.

- Eisenman, Robert H., and James M. Robinson 1991 *Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls, I–II* (Washington, DC: Biblical Archeology Society).
- Eisenman, Robert H., and Michael Wise 1992 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (Shaftesbury: Element Books): 24–29, pl. 2 [4Q285].
- Eshel, Esther, and Hanan Eshel 1992 '4Q471 1 and Ma'amadot in the War Scroll', in J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (eds.), *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March 1991* (STDJ, 11; Leiden: Brill): II, 611–20.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar 2000 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill): I, 112–44; II, 640–43, 950–53, 970–91, 1208–11.
- Gaster, Theodor H. 1976 *The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday): 399–423, 452–57.
- Habermann, Abraham M. 1959 *Megilloth Midbar Yehuda: The Scrolls from the Judean Desert* (Jerusalem: Machbaroth Lisefrut): 89–108.
- Hunzinger, Claus-H. 1957 'Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milhamah aus Höhle 4 von Qumrân', *ZAW* 69: 131–51 [4Q491].
- Ibba, Giovanni 1998 *Il 'Rottolo della Guerra': Edizione critica* (Turin: Silvio Samorani).
- Jongeling, Bastiaan 1962 *Le rouleau de la guerre des manuscrits de Qumrân* (SSN, 4; Assen: Van Gorcum).
- Kuhn, Karl G. 1960 *Kondordanz zu den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Lim, Timothy L., in consultation with Philip S. Alexander 1997 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library, 1* (Leiden: Brill).
- Lohse, Eduard, 1971 *Die Texte aus Qumran hebräisch und deutsch* (Munich: Kosel Verlag): 177–225, 294–95.
- Luukkonen, Osmo, and Johan Westerlund 1997 'Sotakäärö (1QM)', in R. Sollam (ed.), *Qumranin kirjasto: Valikoima teoksia* (Helsinki: Helsinki University Press): 107–42.
- Maier, Johann 1960 *Die Texte von Totem Meer* (Munich: E. Reinhardt): I, 123–48; II, 111–36.
- 1995–96 *Die Texte von Totem Meer* (Munich: E. Reinhardt): I, 125–56, 364; II, 242–44, 538–41, 554–70.
- Moraldi, Luigi 1986 [1971] *I Manoscritti di Qumran* (Classici della Religione; Turin: Union Tipographico): 271–326.
- Ploeg, J.P.M. van der 1955 'La règle de la guerre: Traduction et notes', *VT* 5: 373–420.
- 1959b. *Le rouleau de la Guerre traduit et annoté* (STDJ, 2; Leiden: Brill).
- Richter, Hans-Peter 1988 *A Preliminary Concordance to the Hebrew and Aramaic Fragments from Qumran Cave II–X Including Especially the Unpublished Material from Cave 4* (printed from a card index prepared by J.A. Fitzmyer, W.G. Oxtoby and J. Teixidor. Privately printed).
- Sukenik, Eleazar L. 1948 *Megilloth Genuzoth I* (Jerusalem: Bialik Foundation) [1QM 8; 14–15].
- 1950 *Megilloth Genuzoth II* (Jerusalem: Bialik Foundation) [1QM 12].
- Tov, Emmanuel (ed.) 1999 *The Dead Sea Scroll Electronic Reference Library, 2* (Leiden: Brill).
- Tov, Emmanuel (ed.), with the collaboration of Stephen J. Pfann 1993 *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill).

- Vermes, Geza 1998 *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (New York: Penguin): 161–89.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion, and Martin G. Abegg (eds.). , 1991–92 *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave 4* (3 vols.; Washington, DC: Biblical Archeology Society): II, 223–27.
- Wise, Michael O., Martin Abegg and Edward Cook 1996 *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco): 150–72, 291–94, 403–405.
- Woude, Adam S. van der 1968 'Ein neuer Segenspruch aus Qumran (11QBer)', in S. Wagner (ed.), *Bibel und Qumran: Beiträge zur Erforschung der Beziehungen zwischen Bibel- und Qumranwissenschaft. Hans Barakke zum 22.9.1966* (Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft): 253–58 [11Q14].
- Yadin, Yigael 1962 *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (Oxford: Oxford University Press [Hebrew, 1955]).

Bibliographies and Bibliographical Overviews

- Bardtke, Hans 1972 'Literaturbericht über Qumran VI. Teil I. Die Kriegerrolle 1QM', *TRu* 37: 97–120.
- Burchard, Christoph 1957–65 *Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer* (BZAW, 76, 89; 2 vols.; Berlin: Töpelmann).
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1990b *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study* (Atlanta; Scholars Press).
- García-Martínez, Florentino 1988 'Estudios Qumranicos 1975–1985: Panorama Critico (III)', *EstBib* 46: 325–74.
- Garcia Martinez, Florentino, and Donald W. Parry 1996 *A Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1970–1995* (STDJ, 19; Leiden: Brill).
- Jongeling, Bastiaan 1971 *A Classified Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1958–1969* (STDJ, 5; Leiden: Brill).
- LaSor, William S. 1958 *A Classified Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls 1948–1957* (Pasadena, CA: Fuller Theological Seminary).
- Orion Center 1995– <<http://orion.msc.huji.ac.il>> [online bibliography updated weekly].
- Pinnick, Avital 2001 *The Orion Center Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls (1995–2000)* (STDJ, 41; Leiden: Brill).
- Woude, Adam S. van der 1992 'Fünfzehn Jahre Qumran forschung (1974–1988), III', *TLZ* 57: 12–16.
- Yzhar, Michael 1967 *Bibliography of Hebrew Publications on the Dead Sea Scrolls 1948–1964*. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

1.1. Discovery, Identification and Official Edition of the War Texts

War Texts is the name given to a small group of Dead Sea Scrolls which depict the preparation for, and the various phases of, the eschatological battle (Hebrew *milhamah*) between two opposite camps, the ‘Sons of Light’ and the ‘Sons of Darkness’. The longest of these texts was found in a cave near Qumran (Cave 1) and is known as 1QMilhamah (in short 1QM). It provided precious clues for identifying various fragments of similar works discovered afterward in Caves 4 and 11. The editing of these manuscripts was a long process that has been completed only recently. Numerous questions were raised during these years about the origin and meaning of these texts. This chapter briefly surveys this history, from the initial discovery to the official edition (or *editio princeps*) of the War Texts.

1.1.1. 1QM

According to early reports, the first manuscripts known today as the Dead Sea Scrolls, were found early in the summer of 1947 by Mohammed edh-Dhib and Ahmed Mohammed, two shepherds of the Bedouin Ta’âmireh tribe, in a cave located on the north-west shore of the Dead Sea, about half a kilometre from Khirbet—that is, the ruins of—Qumran (Barthélemy and Milik 1955: 5; Sukenik 1955: 13). By the end of November, Eleazar Lipa Sukenik, professor at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, was offered some of these manuscripts; he managed to purchase three of them from a Bethlehem dealer on behalf of the university’s Museum of Antiquities. The best-preserved scroll contains a description of a war between the opposite camps of the ‘Sons of Light’ and the ‘Sons of Darkness’, a topic which prompted the title given by Sukenik for this document, also known as the War Scroll. The other two texts were a long

collection of Thanksgiving Hymns (1QHodayot) and a badly damaged copy of the book of the prophet Isaiah (1QIsaiah^b).¹

In 1948, Sukenik wrote for the Bialik Foundation a preliminary report on the three manuscripts in the possession of the Hebrew University. This report contains the first description and photographs of the Milhamah scroll from Qumran Cave 1 (1948: 17–26; pl. V-IX), along with a partial transcription of its cols. 8 and 14–15. An additional excerpt, a hymn found in col. 12, was disclosed in a second report two years later (Sukenik 1950: 51–52 and pl. XI). Sukenik was preparing an exhaustive edition of all three scrolls when he died in 1952. The university appointed a committee to deal with the publication. The task was entrusted to N. Avigad, who completed an edition of the texts alone, without annotations, on the basis of the material left by Sukenik. The Hebrew original was released in 1954, followed by an English version in 1955. It consists essentially of an introduction based on the preliminary reports and a set of plates of the texts with their transcription.²

In January 1949, on the basis of information provided by the Bedouin, a small contingent of the Arab Legion of Jordan positively identified the cave from where the manuscripts had been taken. The cave was excavated soon after by Roland de Vaux, Director of the École Biblique et Archéologique Française in Jerusalem, and G. Lankester Harding, Director of the Department of Antiquities of the Kingdom of Jordan, from 15 February to 5 March 1949 (Barthélemy and Milik 1955: 6). Among the fragments found by the excavators of Qumran Cave 1, two were identified as belonging to the Milhamah manuscript bought by Sukenik, hence providing a confirmation of its origin. The Bedouin would have let them fall when they removed the scroll from the cave. These fragments, labelled 1Q33 frgs. 1 and 2, were published in the first volume of the series *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, the official edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Barthélemy and Milik 1955: 135, pl. XXXI).

1. A few additional scrolls were also shown to Sukenik in the beginning of 1948, but it was impossible for him to complete the transaction at that time. After all sorts of incidents, they were finally purchased by his son, Yigael Yadin, in 1954, on behalf of the State of Israel.

2. The 19 columns of 1QM and ten additional fragments are reproduced on pl. 16–34 and 47, with their accompanying transcription. The War Text is presented on pp. 35–36 of the introduction; photographs of it before and after unrolling are shown on figs. 11–13, and 26–27. The photographs of 1QM were also reproduced in the *Dead Sea Scrolls* on microfiche (in Tov, ed. 1993), as parts of the collection of texts from the Judaean Desert.

1.1.2 The War Texts from Cave 4

Cave 4 was also discovered by the Bedouin, in September 1952 (de Vaux 1953; de Vaux and Milik 1977: 1–29). Two lots of manuscript fragments were offered for sale in Jerusalem and in Bethlehem on 20 September, leading the authorities to the identification of the cave, dug in a protruding part of the marl terrace, at a short distance from Khirbet Qumran. It was excavated by a joint team from the Department of Antiquities of Jordan, the Palestine Archaeological Museum and the École Biblique from 22 to 29 September (de Vaux and Milik 1977: 9–14). The cave was in two parts (4a and 4b) and had been used for habitation; the fragments and other artefacts were found mostly in the first, larger part, where they had probably been hidden just before the destruction of the nearby buildings by the Romans in 68 CE. A thousand fragments from more or less a hundred different manuscripts were still *in situ*, a large amount of which showed a correspondence with the fragments bought from the Bedouin before and after the excavations. A total of around 15,000 fragments, belonging to nearly 600 different manuscripts were collected in Cave 4 either by the Bedouin or by the excavators. About ten of these, assigned by de Vaux to different members of a small international team of editors, were identified as War Texts in one way or another, and were published as such at various times during the following decades.

4Q491–496, M^{a-f} and 4Q497 War Scroll-Like Text A

Six of these War Texts (4Q491–495 and 497) were among the fragmentary manuscripts assembled in part by Josef Milik before they were entrusted to Claus-Hunno Hunzinger for editing. In 1957, Hunzinger published an excerpt from 4Q491 M^a and compared it with the parallel text found in 1QM 14. Maurice Baillet, another member of the international team, had been asked to examine a group of fragments written on papyrus; he found another War Text among them (4Q496, M^f) and briefly reported on it soon after (Baillet 1964). In 1971, when it became evident that Hunzinger would not complete his assignment, all the manuscripts of the War Texts were definitively transferred to Baillet who provided a short description of them during the next year (Baillet 1972). The official edition of the War Texts from Cave 4 was published in volume 7 of DJD, presented by Baillet in the Colloquium Biblicum held at Leuven in 1976 (Baillet 1978) and finally released in 1982 (Baillet 1982: 12–72). 4Q491–496, which have parallels with 1QM, were labelled 4QM^{a-f}, while 4Q497, which is probably a

different but related composition received the name 'War Scroll-like Text A'.³

Because the War Texts edited by Baillet were much more damaged than the Cave 1 manuscript, their reconstruction was a very difficult task and Baillet did not expect it to be definitive. In a few cases, the original arrangement of the texts could not be established completely; it is not even certain that all the fragments put together as parts of a single manuscript really belonged to it. 4Q491 M^a is a good example. When assembled, the 13 pieces identified as frgs. 1–3 of this manuscript provide a column of text of an exceptional length, and the arrangement seems therefore suspicious, though not impossible. Another fragment, frg. 11, is made up of 17 different pieces arranged in two columns, the join of which Baillet considered probable at best. The first column of the reconstructed text contains a strange 'Self-Glorification Hymn' unparalleled in 1QM. Since its publication, the question of the exact nature of this fragment and of its relationship to the War Texts has often been raised (e.g. Smith 1990), even more when copies of this poetic composition were identified among fragments of various manuscripts of Hymns (1QHodayot^a 26.6–17; 4Q427 Hodayot^a frg. 7; 4Q471b = 4Q431 Hodayot^c frg. 1). After a thorough examination of the fragments of 4Q491 M^a in his doctoral dissertation, Martin G. Abegg (1993) has concluded that they rather belong to three different manuscripts: only the first two are considered as War Texts, whereas the third one, consisting of the 'Self-Glorification Hymn' found in frg. 11, col. 1 and in the related frg. 12, is said to be a separate composition.⁴

4Q471 War Scroll-Like Text B

Among the texts assigned to him, John Strugnell noticed fragments which apparently came from a single manuscript of a War Text, 4Q471. The manuscript was later reassigned to Esther Eshel who, together with Hanan Eshel, presented it and discussed one fragment at a conference held in Madrid in 1991 (E. Eshel and H. Eshel 1992). After a closer examination of all the fragments, Esther Eshel identified a few of them as belonging to other manuscripts. In the official publication, she edited the fragments in two different volumes. Only frgs. 1–3 were finally considered parts of the manuscript 4Q471 War Scroll-like Text B, published in DJD 36 (in Pfann *et al.* 2000: 439–45, pl. XXX). Fragment 6 was also edited in the same volume, but separately, under number 4Q471—a 'Polemical Text'

3. Milik (1972: 138–42) had already disclosed the text of 4Q495 Milhamah^c frg. 2, without noticing Baillet, apparently (see Baillet 1982: 55).

4. This problem will receive more attention in the next chapter.

(in Pfann 2000: 446–49, pl. XXXI). Fragments 7–10, containing a text similar to the ‘Self-Glorification Hymn’ found in 4Q491 (Milhama^a frg. 11 i), appeared under this title in DJD 29 with the number 4Q471b (in Chazon *et al.* 1999: 421–32, pl. XXVIII), followed by frgs. 4–5 now labelled 4Q471c ‘Prayer concerning God and Israel’ (in Chazon *et al.* 1999: 433–35, pl. XXVIII). In the same DJD volume, Eileen Schuller (in Chazon *et al.* 1999: 199–205) has offered an alternative edition of the ‘Self-Glorification Hymn’ found in 4Q471b, arguing that it belonged in fact to a manuscript of Hymns, 4Q431 Hodayot^c frg. 1.

4Q285 Sefer ha-Milhamah

In an article on the angels Melchizedek and Melchiresha^c, Milik (1972: 143) mentioned in passing that one of his manuscripts from Cave 4 was almost certainly another copy of the War Scroll edited by Sukenik. The fragments preserved in 4Q285 apparently belonged to the lost end of 1QM. Milik also noticed similarities between parts of his manuscript and a fragment from Cave 11 edited in preliminary form by Adam S. van der Woude (1968; see below).

By the end of the 1980s, Milik’s text was still unpublished, as were the majority of manuscripts from Cave 4, still lying in the hands of their editors. Pressure was growing, however, both in academic circles and in the media, to make them available as soon as possible. In this context, photographs of unpublished manuscripts were transmitted by an undisclosed source to Robert H. Eisenman, a professor at the California State University. Eisenman made the news with the spectacular announcement that he had identified a fragment predicting the death of a Messiah (Wilford 1991). The fragment in question was part of 4Q285 (frg. 5). It was soon published in an unauthorized *Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls* released by Eisenman and James M. Robinson (1991: pl. 795). The next year, Eisenman re-edited the fragment with a translation and commentary under the title ‘The Messianic Leader’ (Eisenman and Wise 1992 : 24–29, pl. 2). His interpretation was immediately questioned by various scholars, among them Geza Vermes (1992), on the basis of a different reading of the text.

In the meantime, at the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, Ben-Zion Wacholder and Martin G. Abegg had managed to obtain a copy of a concordance of the Qumran scrolls, listing all words in their context; it had been elaborated between 1957 and 1960, on the basis of the work done thus far by the editors, and was circulating in a limited edition from 1988 (Richter 1988). From the concordance, they reconstructed many unpublished texts, among which was 4Q285, and started to release them in fascicules (Wacholder and Abegg 1991–92: II, 223–27). As result of the

mounting pressure, photographs of all the manuscripts, including the now famous 4Q285, were made available in a microfiche edition (Tov ed. 1993). The international team was also rearranged and expanded in order to speed up the official edition. 4Q285 was reassigned to Geza Vermes and Philip S. Alexander who prepared it for inclusion in DJD 36 (Pfann *et al.* 2000: 228–46, pl. XII–XIII). They suggested the name *Sefer ha-Milhamah*, ‘Book of the War’, for this text, thereby indicating that this document is somehow related to 1QM.

1.1.3. 11Q14 *Sefer ha-Milhamah*

Cave 11 was the last cave found by Bedouin in the Qumran area, apparently in January 1956. They collected most of the manuscripts from the cave, leaving but a few fragments for the archaeologist who followed them a month later (de Vaux 1956). In 1959, many of these manuscripts were offered for acquisition to the Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen (KNAW) who purchased them, after negotiations, in 1961–1962. Their edition was entrusted to Professors J.P.M. van der Ploeg and Adam S. van der Woude. Since the manuscript of 11Q14 contained a long blessing, van der Woude labelled it 11QBerakhot when he published a preliminary edition of it, in 1968, under the title ‘Ein neuer Segenspruch aus Qumran (11QBer)’.

When the full content of 4Q285 was made available in the microfiche edition, it seemed clear that Milik’s remark was correct and that there was in fact a relationship between this text and 11Q14: the latter could well be another copy of a War Text. The title of the manuscript was changed accordingly to 11QSefer ha-Milhamah (‘Book of the War’). Its official publication was prepared under the editorial responsibility of Florentino García Martínez for DJD 23, published in 1998 (García Martínez *et al.* 1998: 243–51, pl. XXVIII).

1.2. The Study of the War Texts

The official editions of the War Texts leave us, then, with a total of a dozen or so: 1QM and 1Q33; 4Q285 *Sefer ha-Milhamah*; 4Q471 War Scroll-like Text B (distinct from 4Q471a Polemical Text; 4Q471b Self-Glorification Hymn and 471c ‘Prayer concerning God and Israel’); 4Q491 M^a (probably to be divided into three different manuscripts); 4Q492–496 M^{b-f}; 4Q497 ‘War Scroll-like Text A’; and 11Q14 *Sefer ha-Milhamah*. These official editions provide a lot of excellent material: a physical description of the manuscripts and an introduction to their characteristics, a set of photographs, and, in the

DJD series, annotated transcriptions and translations of the texts.⁵ They are, however, neither the first, nor the last word on the War Texts. Many War Texts have received preliminary editions still worth consulting. All sorts of questions have also been discussed before or after their publication. These have to do with the reconstruction of the texts themselves, but also with various aspects of their interpretation.

These debates are summarized in the following chapters. In the next pages (Chapter 2), the different scrolls are described, with the details of their contents and their relationships to one another. Chapter 3 is a survey of the studies of unity and genre of 1QM. Chapter 4 discusses the arguments for dating this composition in the Hellenistic or in the Roman period, and Chapter 5 provides an example of the use of the Hebrew Bible in the War Texts.

Further Reading on the Discoveries of Qumran

- Baillet, Maurice, *et al.* 1956 'Le travail d'édition de fragments manuscrits de Qumrân', *RB* 63: 47–67.
- Broshi, Magen, and Devorah Dimant 2000 'Qumran', *EncDSS* 2: 733–46.
- Collins, John J. 1992 'Dead Sea Scrolls', *ABD* 2: 85–101.
- Davies, Philip R. 1982 *Qumran* (Cities of the Biblical World; Guildford: Lutterworth Press).
- Magness, Jodi 2002 *The Archeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
- Milik, Josef T. 1959 *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (SBT, 26; London: SCM Press).
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome 1986 'The Judean Desert', in R.A. Kraft and G.W.E. Nickelsburg (eds.), *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters* (Atlanta: Scholars Press): 119–56.
- 1992 'Qumran, Khirbet', *ABD* 5: 590–94.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. 1994 *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia and Jerusalem: Jewish Publication Society).
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. (ed.) 1990 *Archeology and History of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (JSPSup, 8; Sheffield: JSOT Press).
- Tournay, Raymond J. 1949 'Les anciens manuscrits hébreux récemment découverts', *RB* 56: 204–33.
- VanderKam, James C. 1994 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
- VanderKam, James C., and Peter Flint 2003 *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco).

5. Sukenik's edition of 1QMilhamah has only a transcription, for reasons explained above.

- Vaux, Roland de 1949a 'Post-scriptum: La cachette des manuscrits hébreux', *RB* 56: 234–37.
- 1949b 'La grotte des manuscrits hébreux', *RB* 56: 586–609.
- 1953 'Fouilles au Khirbet Qumrân: Rapport préliminaire', *RB* 60: 83–106, pl. II-VII.
- 1956 'Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân: Rapport préliminaire sur les 3^e, 4^e, et 5^e campagnes', *RB* 63: 533–77, pl. III-XIII.
- 1973 *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Schweich Lectures 1959* (London : Oxford University Press [French 1961]).

The edition of a scroll from the Dead Sea usually includes the best possible photographs of it, accompanied by a description of both the physical aspects and the contents of the manuscript. The physical description consists of information about the material on which the text is written, the number of preserved sheets or fragments, their measurements, state of conservation, and the palaeography. Most of the Qumran War Texts are written on animal skins, but a few of them were copied on papyrus; both materials can be dated with relative accuracy by carbon-14 analysis. Ancient Jewish scribes usually scored horizontal lines on the scrolls and hung the letters beneath them; vertical lines were drawn to delineate margins on both sides of each column. An average sheep or goat skin could accommodate four columns of variable size; larger scrolls were made by sewing skins together. The Qumran scrolls have often been damaged and have survived only in fragmentary form. Sometimes direct joins between fragments are possible; in other cases, the identification of similar damage patterns can help to reconstruct the relative position of fragments of a scroll. Reeds and vegetable ink, usually black, were the common writing tools. The calligraphy of the scrolls did not vary much from one scribe to another, but tended to change over the years. Through comparative analysis, Qumran experts can differentiate between manuscripts from various periods (Hellenistic, Hasmonaean, Herodian), and between early, middle and late forms of the script of a period.

As they have come to us, the War Texts, like other Dead Sea Scrolls, mostly do not have titles. Their identification rests basically on a study of their contents, and is sometimes open to debate. In the best cases, an outline of a text can be derived from a careful examination of the paragraphing devices used by the scribes, such as spacing, indentation and various kinds of marginal marks. In this chapter, the physical character-

istics of each of the War Texts are summarized and their contents outlined, on the basis of the scribe's indications where possible.¹ The relationships of the manuscripts to one another are also considered. Since 1QM is the best-preserved War Text, it is discussed first; then the texts from Cave 4 published by Baillet, both those that are copies of a similar recension to 1QM, and also those which apparently belong to different ones. Finally, two particular groups of texts are examined: the two copies of the *Sefer ha-Milhamah* preserved in Cave 4 (4Q285) and in Cave 11 (11Q14), and the 'Self-Glorification Hymn' found in 4Q491c and its parallels.

2.1. 1QM and 1Q33

The text of 1QM has been copied on what Sukenik (1955: 35–36) described as a fine, well-prepared leather scroll.² Its largest part consists of four buff-coloured sheets sewn together, for a total measurement of 2.9 m by 16 cm. A fifth, detached sheet is partly represented in one large piece (9 x 13 cm) and a few additional smaller ones. Ten fragments have detached from the body of the scroll purchased by Sukenik (frgs. 1–10) and two others, found during the excavation of Cave 1, were identified by Milik (1Q33 frgs. 1–2). The beginning of the scroll is discernible in the exceptionally wide margin (5 cm) at the right of the first column; but the end has vanished.

Substantial parts of 19 columns are visible, as well as a few letters from a twentieth. Columns are between 10 and 15 cm wide, separated by a margin of about 2 cm; in each of them, the upper margin (c. 3 cm) and 14 to 19 lines of text can be read, the lower part being lost. Sukenik estimated that only 3 or 4 lines were missing from the best-preserved columns which therefore would have had a total of 21 or 22 lines. The space between the lines is about 7 mm and the letters around 2 mm high; depending on how wide the columns are, the number of letters or spaces varies between 60 and 90 for a line. Lacunae in the text may sometimes be filled by extant fragments, parallel texts from Cave 4, or on the basis of the contents of the line. 1QM had been copied by 'an expert scribe writing a beautiful and accurate hand', in Sukenik's words (1955: 35); corrections have been

1. In addition to those found in the official editions, photographs of most of the manuscripts mentioned in this chapter are also available in the microfiche edition (Tov ed. 1993) or in electronic format (Tov ed. 1999).

2. The transcription and the plates of 1QM are found in Sukenik 1955: 1–19, pl. 16–34 and 47.

made carefully and, with the exception of *waw* and *yod*, letters are clearly distinguished. Sukenik did not specify a precise dating for the composition or the copying of the scroll. Later palaeographical observations by Cross (1961: 138) and Birnbaum (1971: I, 150–54) led them to classify the script of 1QM as ‘early formal Herodian’ and to conclude that this text had been copied during the second half of the first century BCE.

The first column of 1QM introduces the work. In an apocalyptic tone, it foretells an attack to be launched by ‘the Sons of Light’ against ‘the lot [= party] of the Sons of Darkness’, as well as other phases of the war between them. The following columns fall into three parts:

- I. An organizational and tactical part, dealing with various aspects of the technical preparation and direction of the troops (1.end–9.bottom);
- II. Prayers to be recited during the times of war (9.end–14.bottom);
- III. The sequence of the battle itself, with special emphasis on the speeches delivered by the priests at various points (14.end–20.?).

In each part, subjects are separated by a blank left at the end of a line or even by an empty line. A few of these divisions have been lost at the end of cols. 1, 3, 9, 12 and 14. The following detailed outline is based on these indications (see Duhaime 1995: 80):

INTRODUCTION (1.1-bottom)

The introduction, which offers a general view of the outbreak of the war and its first phases, anticipates the great tribulation and everlasting redemption to come through supernatural help.

1.1a: Title?

If there ever was a title to this text, it should have been found in the first line of col. 1. At the beginning of this line, two letters are still visible before a short lacuna of 16 mm and the word ‘the war’. On the basis of the available space, one possible reconstruction of the lost title, among others, would be: ‘For the Ins[tructor, rule of] the war’ (*lm[šky]l srk] hmlhmb*).³

1.1b-7: The beginning of the war

The war begins with an attack launched by the Sons of Light (faithful ones from Levi, Judah and Benjamin), against a coalition led by the archangel Belial (Edom, Moab, Ammon, Philistia, the Kittim of Asshur, and violators of the covenant). Then a furious assault by ‘[the king?] of the

3. Suggested by Milik (1955: 598) and others. In his recent critical edition, Ibba (1998: 51, 63) leaves the question open.

Kittim in Egypt' is expected. God's people will be saved, the Sons of Darkness will be destroyed, and the dominion of the Kittim will come to an end.

1.8-15: The day of the Kittim's fall

The second section concentrates on the day 'appointed long ago' by God for the destruction of the forces of darkness. Heavenly hosts will fight a fierce conflict alongside human beings. During this unparalleled tribulation, the opponents will win three 'lots' (encounters) each. The issue of the battle will be decided on the seventh encounter, when God's mighty hand will redeem his people, and give them victory.

1.16-bottom: The seventh lot (?)

This badly damaged section mentions '... holy ones' appearing 'in help ... for the destruction of the Sons of Darkness'. It may have added details about the seventh lot, in which the angels and God himself or his 'hand' play an active role in annihilating evil.

I. ORGANIZATION AND TACTICS (1.end-9.bottom)

This organizational part of the text provides rules for the mobilization of the troops, lists details for the preparation and labelling of various signalling instruments, and explains the proper ways to form and equip the troops, to direct them on the battlefield and to change their disposition during the operations.

1.end-2.14: Mobilization and assignment of the troops

This section now envisions the whole war lasting 40 years: 35 years of service and 5 sabbatical years (or years of remission) during which no battle is fought. The beginning of the extant text details the assignment of the chiefs of the congregation to Temple worship during the first sabbatical year. Similar instructions for the first 6 years of service were presumably provided beforehand. During the remaining 33 years, troops shall be mobilized 'year after year', except during the sabbatical years. The war shall unfold according to a specific calendar: the whole congregation takes part during years one to six; then separate campaigns are conducted against specific enemies, listed in detail for the next 9 years (Aram Naharaim, etc.), and in more general terms for the last two decades (Sons of Ham and Sons of Japhet, respectively). An empty line follows.

2.16-3.11: Rule for the trumpets

The (damaged) heading of the section introduces the list of trumpets for summoning different groups to perform their task during the various

phases of their service. Each category of trumpets is engraved with a particular inscription which either puts the group in relation to God ('Princes of God', 3.3) or states what God effectuates through it at this precise moment of the battle ('Mysteries of God to ruin wickedness', 3.9).

3.13–4.17: Rule for the standards

The different groups involved in the operations are to be identified by standards inscribed with religious phrases specifying who they are and in which operation they are engaged. The first list gives the divisions of the congregation from the whole people down to the small units of ten men (3.13–bottom). The second details the four standards of the Levitical clans (3.end–4.5): the name of the last one, Merari, is still preserved (4.1), but the other three are lost (Gershon, Kohath and probably the priests, sons of Aaron). The third and fourth enumerations link each phase of the battle with its own slogan, written both on the standards of the Levites (4.6–8) and on those of the whole congregation (4.9–14). The length of the standards is set according to the importance of each group (4.15–17). The slogans are a means of encouraging the troops by stressing that they are the chosen of God and his hosts. They are often made of mnemonic puns: the inscription for the thousand ('elep) begins with 'wrath of God' ('ap 'el, 4.1), etc.

4.18–5.2: Inscription for the Prince of the Congregation

A new section provided the same kind of indications for other pieces of equipment. The only parts remaining of it are the inscriptions to be put either on the shield (*mgn*) or on the sceptre (*mt*) of the prince, acting as the secular leader of the congregation.

5.3–7.7: Rule for the fighting battalions

The rule for the various groups of fighting battalions sets basic specifications about their number, array and equipment. A heavy frontal formation is made of seven rows of a thousand men, equipped with long shields, spears and swords (5.3–14). The light infantry has two lines equipped with bows or slings (their description is lost), three with javelins, one with spears and shields, and the last with swords and shields (5.16–6.6). Six thousand horsemen, divided into three groups, are to assist the skirmishers, to surround the 'camps' (i.e. whole bodies of troops), and to be attached to each line to keep 'the rule'. The section concludes with instructions about the ages qualifying for various appointments, the people unfit for battle and therefore excluded, and the proper way to maintain the purity of the camps, 'for the holy angels are together with their hosts' (6.19–7.7).

7.9–9.9: How the priests are to direct the battle

Dressed in special war garments, seven priests are to direct the movements of different bodies of troops and to conduct each phase of the operations, as if they were rituals, by blowing modulated signals in their trumpets. At specific moments, seven Levites will also blow 'a great war alarm to melt the enemy's heart' (7.9–15a). When the skirmishers have accomplished their tasks (7.15b–9.2), the whole army launches a general pursuit (9.3–7a). The priests, however, are prohibited to approach unclean blood (9.7b–9).

9.10-bottom: Rule to modify the formation of the fighting battalions

This damaged section consists of indications about a few types of tactical manoeuvres, namely the 'folding of hands', the 'bow', the 'wings', and especially the four 'towers'. These towers were made of 300 men equipped with long shields, inscribed with the name of the patron angel of the unit (Michael, Gabriel, Sariel or Raphael); they provided cover to the troops advancing behind them and marching out through their two lateral 'gates' (Yadin 1962: 183–97, 237–40). Details about the setting-up of an ambush are lost.

II. WAR PRAYERS (9.end–14.bottom)

The second part of 1QM consists of a series of prayers to be recited before, during and after the battle.

9.end–12.bottom: Prayer at the camp

The opening lines of col. 10 are part of a prayer which must have been introduced at the end of col. 9. This prayer was to be recited at the camp (mentioned in 10.1), when the troops were preparing for battle. The first section recalls the instructions of Moses to the successive generations of Israel: when drawing near for battle, they must turn to God, who shall fight the enemies for them (9.end–11.12). The power of God is unparalleled, as demonstrated through the creation of the heavens and the earth, as well as through victories over seemingly strong foes, namely the Pharaoh of Egypt and Goliath of Gath. Moreover, the coming battle has been foretold by the prophets: their oracles, predicting the destruction of Israel's enemies like Moab, Edom, the seven nations of vanity, and Asshur, are reinterpreted as referring to the coming victory. A second section stresses that enemies from all lands shall be delivered to the hands of the poor and the humble ones by God and his hosts of angels, doing battle from heaven and bringing the rebels of the earth to judgement (11.3–12.5). The prayer ends with a pressing invitation to God, the glorious king, to arise and triumph over his enemies; then Zion and the cities of

Judah shall joyfully celebrate his victory and share his dominion over the nations (12.7–16). The last part of the prayer, from which only a few words are preserved, mentions ‘mighty ones of war’, Jerusalem, and heavens (12.17-bottom).

12.end–14.1: Prayers on the battlefield

These prayers are probably part of the immediate preparation for the engagement, on the ‘day of battle’ (13.14). The introductory rubric, which began in the lost part of col. 12, prescribes that priests (probably headed by the chief priest), Levites and elders speak out ‘from their position’ (12.end–13.2a). The following lines provide words for blessing God and his faithful (13.2b-3) and for cursing Belial and his spirits (13.4–6); the two groups are to one another as light is to darkness. The blessing is developed in a hymn to the ‘God of our fathers’, who established his covenant with them long ago and has always kept it alive through a remnant. Those cast in the ‘truthful lot’ are to be rescued from Belial by the angelic commander of light appointed long ago to do so (13.7–13a). On this day of battle, the mighty hand of God will strike again ‘to bring low darkness and to make light powerful’ (13.13b-16). From the next section(s), only a few words remain, recalling ‘his outburst against the idols of Egypt’ (13.17–14.1).

14.2-bottom: Prayers after the victory

The morning following their victory, after having washed themselves clean ‘from the blood of the guilty corpses’ of the slain, the members of the community go back on the field to praise God (14.2–4a). As promised, the God of Israel has kept his covenant by giving strength to the stumbling and to the weak, turning the perfect of way into powerful instruments to destroy an assembly of wicked nations. Belial’s dominion of hatred has failed to overcome the faithful. The mighty deeds of God are part of his mysterious plan to raise up to him human beings, whereas he brings low divine beings (14.4b-15). The last, incomplete part of this prayer urges the God of gods to rise up for the completion of the punishment of the Sons of Darkness (14.16-bottom).

III. THE WAR AGAINST THE KITTIM (14.end–20.?)

The last columns of 1QM describe the sequence of the war against the Kittim and the army of Belial. A first engagement takes place, followed by the intervention of the reserve, a final engagement and a pursuit. Other events, probably culminating with the celebration of victory, must have completed the scenario.

14.end–15.3: Introduction

The beginning of the introduction is lost at the end of col. 14. The first lines of col. 15 specify that the war shall oppose Israel, the lot of God promised to everlasting redemption, to ‘all the nations’, that is, the army of Belial gathered with the king of the Kittim, doomed to destruction. The stage is set for the battle when the former establish their camp against the latter.

15.4–16.9: First engagement

The chief priest conducts the operations, assisted by the other priests, the Levites and the ‘men of the rule (*serek*)’. He reads the prayer for the time of war and arrays the line (15.4–6a). Then, as they stand in front of the camp of the Kittim, a priest appointed for this task is to strengthen the troops with a rousing speech (15.6b–7a): there is no reason to be afraid of this wicked congregation, whose might is vanishing smoke (15.7b–12a); this is a battle of the God of Israel, who has raised his hand against the nations, and will do mightily for his people (15.12b–16.1). Following the signals given by the priests with the appropriate trumpets, the skirmishers engage in various moves against the Kittim, whom they slay while the Levites blow horns (16.3–9).

16.11–17.bottom: Engagement of the reserve

When the Sons of Darkness subject the first line of skirmishers to severe casualties, according to the mysterious plan of God, the priests give the signal for them to withdraw and to be replaced by reserve troops, to whom the chief priest delivers an exhortation (16.11–14): putting the heart of his people to the test, God is showing his holiness through the slain; he did the same in earlier days, discriminating between Nadab and Abihu, whose blood was shed, and Eleazar and Ithamar, with whom he engaged in a lasting covenant (16.15–17.3). The ‘sons of his covenant’ are now urged to stand strong ‘in the midst of God’s crucible’: with the help of the majestic angel Michael, they will prevail and have dominion over all flesh, as he will over divine beings (17.4–9). The reserve engages in the battle, also directed by the sound of trumpets and horns (17.10–15). This encounter is followed by a third ‘lot’, that is, phase of the battle, but its description is almost completely lost (17.16–bottom).

17.end–19.8: Final engagement and pursuit

In the final engagement, perhaps the seventh ‘lot’, God raises his hand to crush ‘all the multitude of Belial’, including Asshur, the sons of Japhet and the Kittim (17.end–18.3a). As the priests blow the trumpets of memorial, all forces prepare for the annihilation (*herem*) of the Kittim (18.3b–5a).

Before this, the priests, Levites and officers bless the God of gods for keeping his covenant and saving his people through wonders (18.5b-8). In a following prayer, God is praised for having appointed long ago this unprecedented day for a battle of his own which brings everlasting redemption to 'us' and final destruction to the enemy. As the pursuit takes place, the glorious King is urged (in a section parallel to 12.7-16) to seize his plunder and let his sword 'devour flesh'. The prayer concludes with an invitation for Zion to rejoice and with the anticipation of Israel's reign for ever (18.10-19.8).

19.9-20.?: After the war

After a night of rest in the camp, the troops gather for a morning prayer on the battlefield, at the very place where '[the mi]ghty men of the Kittim, the multitude of Asshur, and the army of all the nations' have been slain by God. The text of this prayer is found at the bottom of col. 19 (now lost) and perhaps in the first lines of col. 20, probably followed by a description of the return to Jerusalem for a triumphal celebration of victory.

2.2. Copies of a Similar Recension

2.2.1. 4Q492 M^b

Three brownish fragments belong to this manuscript (Baillet 1982: 45-49, pl. VII). The leather was cut through when the lines were scored; as a result, the skin has flaked in many places. The largest fragment (frg. 1) is about 11 cm wide and 11 cm high, preserving remnants of 13 lines, including the right margin of lines 1-4 and 6-8. The second is only 4 cm wide and 3.5 cm high; it has part of an upper margin and a few words from two lines. The third is 1.5 cm wide and 6 cm high; it is probably the upper left part of a sheet (Baillet 1982: 49) of which the upper and the right margins are still visible, along with the last letter of two lines and a blank space between them. The line spacing is about 9 mm, the letters are about 3 mm high, and there is room for around 75 letters or spaces on a line. The Herodian script is contemporary to that of 1QM 'if not from the same scribe' (Baillet 1982: 45), hence a dating in the last part of the first century BCE.

Fragment 1 contains a text parallel to 1QM 19, with minor variations. Lines 1-8a are similar to the prayer found in 1QM 19.1-8 (see also 1QM 12.7-16), but with a more damaged text: significant preserved words refer to God as the 'glorious' king, urged to 'seize' his plunder, to let his 'sword' devour flesh, and to fill his 'palaces' with gold. Two spaces, not found in 1QM, delineate the last parts of this prayer, which extend an invitation to

Zion to rejoice (lines 5b-7a) and to the 'daughter of my people' to celebrate (lines 7b-8a), while anticipating the 'reign' of Israel. Like the parallel text in 1QM, the second part of the fragment (lines 8b-13) provides instructions for the victorious troops to gather to the camp for the night and to return to the battlefield on the next morning to praise 'the God of Israel'; the last line refers to him as the 'Most High', an expression which was possibly found in the bottom of 1QM 19. In their extant parts, the two texts of 1QM 19 and 4QM^b are quite similar. On the basis of a rather extensive reconstruction of the latter text, Baillet (1982: 47-49) suggested that at least in three instances (lines 1, 7 and 12 of 4QM^b), it was shorter than 1QM (see E. Eshel and H. Eshel 2000: 352-56).

Fragment 2 was perhaps part of the prayer introduced at the end of frg. 1, since it mentions 'his [m]ight over all [the na]tions' (line 1 cf. 1QM 16.1), and, if Baillet's reconstruction is adopted (1982: 49), the '[ho]rn' (line 2), that is, the strength of either victorious Israel or the defeated nations. Too little is preserved from frg. 3 to make sense of it.

2.2.2. 4Q494 M^d

This manuscript consists of only one dark brown fragment, 6 cm wide and 4 cm high (Baillet 1982: 53-54, pl. VIII). Even if there is no ruling, the line spacing of 7 mm is quite regular, as are the letters, about 3 mm high. Six partial lines of text are preserved, five of them beginning at the right margin; they originally contained around 80 letters or spaces each. The Herodian script, similar to the first hand of the Habakkuk peshet from Cave 1, suggests a dating of the manuscript in the beginning of the first century CE.

The text of lines 4-6 corresponds to the beginning of 1QM 2, with minor variants; a text similar to that of lines 1-3 might have stood at the end of 1QM 1: it provides a few additional words from the instructions for the assignment of the chiefs of the tribes, the fathers of the congregation, the priests, and the Levites to the service of the Temple during the first year of remission. From what is left in lines 5-6, Baillet (1982: 54) infers that 4QM^d was slightly different from 1QM at this point.

2.2.3. 4Q495 M^c

This manuscript is represented by two buff-coloured fragments of irregular form (Baillet 1982: 54-56, pl. VIII). The scoring of margins and lines is still visible, with a line spacing of 7 mm and letters about 3 mm high. Fragment 1 has the shape of a small triangle, 1.8 cm wide by 1.5 cm high and preserves remnants of only three words on two lines of text. On

frg. 2, about 4 cm in its widest part and 3.5 cm in its highest one, the right margin and a few words from four different lines are still visible; based on the similar text found in 1QM, one may estimate that each line contained around 65 letters or spaces. The Herodian script of this manuscript is contemporary with that of 1QM (last part of the first century BCE).

The words 'Israel', 'covenant' and probably 'learned' (*wm[lmdy]*) in frg. 1 have a single match in 1QM, a prayer found in 10.9–10, in which God is given thanks for Israel's unique status among the nations as 'the holy people of the covenant, learned in the statute'. The text of frg. 2 is parallel to 1QM 13.9–12, a hymnic section in which God's name is blessed for having provided Israel with the help of the commander of light against Belial and his angels of destruction. The two texts have slight variations, however: 4QM^c frg. 2 line 1 for instance reads '(you) God have *created* us for you' (*brtnw* from the root *br*) whereas 1QM 13.9, broken at this point, had perhaps 'you have *chosen* us' (*brwtnw* from the root *brr*—so Baillet 1982: 56).

2.2.4. 4Q496 M^f

This War Text is found on the back of a complex papyrus manuscript, made up of more than 300 fragments, which also contains psalms and prayers for feasts (4Q505, 506, 509). The War material is represented on 123 separate fragments, impregnated with grey dust and rather badly preserved; a few of them are quite large (e.g. frg. 3 is 4.5 cm wide and 6 cm high), whereas others are very small (frg. 119 is 6 mm by 5 mm) (Baillet 1982: 56–68, pl. X, XII, XIV, XVI, XVII bottom, XXIV bottom). The black ink of the text has disappeared in many places where fibres have detached. The manuscript had column divisions, still visible in the first sheets. The line spacing is around 8 mm, and the average letters are 3 mm high. No complete line can be reconstructed. The manuscript is written in a pre-Herodian script, perhaps a few years before the middle of the first century BCE (Baillet 1982: 58).

Baillet succeeded in matching the contents of this manuscript with those of 1QM, but in many cases, no identification was possible, since only a few words, letters, or even ink spots remain. Fragments 1–14, 16 and 75 have parallels in 1QM, but since the papyrus was written on both sides, and the frg. numbers refer to both, the sequences follow a reverse order for each column on one side. Fragments 3 and 2+1, which together make col. 1, correspond to the introduction of 1QM. Fragment 3 contains an interesting mention of '[Is]rael' (line 4) which fills a gap in 1QM (1.5) and makes clear that one aim of the attack launched by the king of the Kittim is to cut off the power of Israel. Besides that, the blanks left between the sections in 1QM 1.7 and 15 do not appear in the

corresponding parts of 4QM^f, an indication that a different system of division was used for this manuscript.

Fragments 7, 6+5, 4 (col. 2) and 13+75+14 (first part of col. 3) contain instructions for the mobilization and assignment of the troops that have parallels in 1QM 1.end–2.14. The text of frgs. 13+75+14 line 4 confirms that the ten last years of the forty years' war are to be fought against the 'Sons of Japhet' (cf. 1QM 2.14). Fragments 9+8 (bottom of col. 3) and 12+11+10 line 1 (first part of col. 4) contain remnants of the Rule for the trumpets, with minor variants and a few blank spaces not found in 1QM (2.end–3.11). A marginal tick between lines 1 and 2 in frg. 10 indicates a new section, the Rule for the standards (cf. 1QM 3.13–4.17), to which belongs also frg. 16 (col. 5). Fragment 10 has two supralinear corrections (lines 3 and 4), mentioning twice the 'Prince' (of the congregation), absent from this part of 1QM: the largest standard is related to him and his name is written on it.

The other fragments (15, 17–74, 76–123) contain only a few words at best, of no particular significance. On the basis of what is left, Baillet sometimes cleverly suggested links with 1QM, while acknowledging that no clear relationship can be firmly established.

When the text of 4QM^f overlaps with 1QM, they are quite similar, except for small variations in arrangement and contents. In a few but significant cases, the fragments from 4QM^f supplement the text of 1QM. The double mention of the Prince (frg. 10), even if it may be a secondary addition, is an indication that he was given a more prominent place than can be inferred from the surviving text of 1QM. This question is an important one, since the Prince of the Congregation plays a leading role in the events described in the *Sefer ha-Milhamah* (4Q285 and 11Q14, on which see below).

2.3. Copies of Other Recensions

2.3.1. 4Q471 War Scroll-like Text B

This leather manuscript, to which ten fragments were initially thought to belong, is now composed of only three, the others having been reclassified (E. Eshel and H. Eshel in Pfann *et al.* 2000: 439–45, pl. XXX). Fragments 1 and 2 are about 5 cm wide by 7.5 cm high, whereas frg. 3 is only 1.5 cm wide by 3 cm high. The left margin is still visible on a few lines of frg. 1. Remnants of respectively nine, eleven and four lines are preserved. The line spacing is about 7 mm and the average letters 3 mm high; the lines have room for only around 45 letters or spaces. The Herodian script suggests a date in the second half of the first century BCE.

Lines 1–2 of frg. 1 have only a few words, without any significant context; they deal perhaps with people to be selected (?) ‘each man from his brothers the sons of [...]’. From line 3 onward, the text overlaps with 1QM 2.1–10, with variations.⁴ The topic is the appointment of priests and Levites for Temple service. In line 7, the text mentions presumably soldiers to be ‘sw[ord-]trained’ for combat and continues with a reference to the ‘[w]ar of [their] divisions’. Among the significant differences between 4Q471 frg. 1 and 1QM 2, the editors note that, on the basis of their reconstruction, 4Q471 has no mention of the chief priest and his deputy; it says nothing either about ‘their chiefs of divisions’ who are ‘to attend daily’ (cf. 1QM 2.3), probably a reference to their mandatory presence at the *tamid*,⁵ a requirement also found in Pharisaic halakhah. Since the section about the soldiers is also more elaborated in 1QM, it seems reasonable to conclude that this fragment is part of a War Text ‘shorter and probably earlier than 1QM 2’ and the similar text found in 4Q494 M^d (E. Eshel and H. Eshel in Pfann *et al.* 2000: 439).

Fragment 2 is thought to have contained parts of speeches similar to those found in 1QM. It has no complete sentence, and the meaning of what is left cannot be determined with certainty. The first lines (1–4) refer to a group related to a ‘covenant’ whose testimonies are kept, and to ‘armies’ whose members are handled (by God or by their leaders?) with ‘slow ang[er]’, their hearts being discouraged from ‘dee[ds]’ of some sort. In contrast, ‘[ser]vants of darkness’ seem to be urged (by Belial?) to behave according to ‘the guiltiness of his lot’ and ‘to choose the evil’ rather than the good (lines 5–7). The latter group will encounter God’s hatred and ‘the fury of his vengeance’ (lines 8–11). The words, ‘dominati[on]’ and ‘lo[t]’ are all that remains from frg. 3, along with a few isolated letters; they could have belonged to a similar speech also.

2.3.2. 4Q491 M^a

When Hunzinger (1957) first reported on 4Q491 M^a, he mentioned 70 fragments of this manuscript; he later made a few additional direct joins and left Baillet with 62 pieces. The latter reduced this number to 37 in the official publication (Baillet 1982: 12–44, pl. V–VI). One of the largest fragments is about 8 cm wide by 6.5 cm high (frg. 2, made of seven different pieces), whereas one of the smallest is 7 mm by 6 mm (frg. 7). The original light beige colour has turned darker, but the black ink is still easily readable. Lines and margins have been ruled with a dry reed and are almost invisible; the line spacing is surprisingly short, around 4 mm, and

4. Abegg (1994b) has challenged this identification, however.

5. The *tamid* is the public sacrifice offered every day in the Temple.

letters such as *aleph* and *he* are barely 2 mm high, an indication that this manuscript was for private use (so Baillet 1982: 12). The margins are still extant here and there, but no complete column is preserved. The reconstruction of frgs. 1–3 amounts to an exceptionally wide column, with lines of around 130 letters or spaces, twice the width of frgs. 8–10 col. 1. On the basis of its Herodian script, Baillet estimated that 4QM^a was copied in the second half of the first century BCE.

Given the poor state of the scroll, Baillet could not determine the original arrangement of the manuscript. He arranged frgs. 1–16 according to the sequence of similar material in 1QM; then he put together pieces of regulations (frgs. 17–22), excerpts of hymns, prayers and speeches (frgs. 23–25), and passages with undetermined contents (frgs. 26–37). As mentioned above, Abegg has challenged this arrangement and argued that, even if they are from the same period, the fragments of 4Q491 M^a belong in fact to three different manuscripts.⁶ His demonstration is based on physical, palaeographic, orthographic and literary evidence. According to their physical appearance, one group of these fragments (hereafter 4Q491a M^{a/a}) has been copied more ‘roughly’ than the others and has a constant line height of 3.7 mm; the more ‘elegant’ fragments fall into two different groups, with respective line heights of 4.0–4.1 mm (4Q491b M^{a/b}) and 4.3 mm (4Q491c M^{a/c}). Abegg assigns to the first manuscript frgs. 8–10, 11 col. 2, 13–15, 18, 22, 24–28, 31–33 and 35; the second manuscript is said to consist of frgs. 1–3, 4, 5–6, 7, 16, 17, 19–21 and 23; the third manuscript would be made of frg. 11 col. 1 and frg. 12; the classification of frgs. 29, 30, 34, 36 and 37 remains ‘undetermined’. The script of 4Q491a is slightly different from that of 4Q491b and 4Q491c (these two being attributed to the same hand), especially in the writing of the letters *aleph*, *kaph*, *men*, *nun* and *shin*. The orthography of the first manuscript also displays inconsistency in the use of shorter and longer forms of pronominal suffixes, whereas the others have only the longer forms. The relationship of three manuscripts to 1QM, finally, is very different, at least for a few critical fragments: in frg. 11 col. 2, belonging to 4Q491a, most of the text is parallel to 1QM, the non-parallel portions representing a more detailed account of the final battle against the Kittim; in contrast, the text of frgs. 1–3, attributed to 4Q491b, ‘echoes material that is scattered throughout 1QM’, but has no exact parallel to it; the remnants of 4Q491c, frg. 11 col. 1 and frg. 12, are a copy of a ‘Self-Glorification Hymn’ which ‘shows no contextual connection at all with 1QM’ and is in

6. Abegg 1993. The present summary is largely based on Abegg 1997 and on complementary information kindly provided by the author in a private communication.

fact 'an independent hymnic work' (Abegg 1997: 70). The cumulative evidence that Abegg adduces makes his view quite convincing; his rearrangement of the fragments is adopted in the following summary of the first two manuscripts, in order to provide material for its assessment. The third will be presented in the last section of this chapter, along with the other copies of the 'Self-Glorification Hymn'.

4Q491a M^{a/a}

(= 4Q491 frgs. 8–10, 11 col. 2, 13–15, 18, 22, 24–28, 31–33 and 35)

Fragments 8–10 are a complex ensemble of 13 different pieces from which two incomplete columns of text are reconstructed; the upper margins are missing, but the others are still partly visible. The first column (17 lines) is a prayer after victory parallel to the one found in 1QM 14.3–18.⁷ The 'Go[d of] I[srael]' is blessed for having 'gathered an assembly of na[tions] for a destruction' through the 'weak' of his people, to whom he has 'taught war'. He has shown his mercy during 'the dominion of Beli[al]' and he is now urged to rise up and to have 'the Sons of Darkness' scattered in front of him and perhaps definitively eliminated in 'the places of darkness and ruin'. The text of this prayer is sometimes shorter in 4QM^{a/a}, namely in line 6 where it does not have the reference to God as the one 'who keeps the covenant for our fathers and with all our generations' found in 1QM 14.8–9. Both texts are reasonably close, however, and each can be carefully used in turn to fill lacunae in the other. 4QM^{a/a} frgs. 8–10 col. 1.16–17 also provide the last words of the prayer and the beginning of the following instructions, a part now lost at the end of 1QM 14.

The bottom part of col. 2 is preserved on 11 lines (numbered 7–17). Its topic is a battle against the Kittim. When, among the skirmishers already engaged, the 'slain of the crucible' start falling, a new line is summoned and the former is recalled. In an appropriate speech, the 'priest appointed for the battle' shall 'strengthen the hands' of the new combatants by persuading them that they take part in an act of 'vengeance' against wickedness, whereby a supernatural power, perhaps the divine sword, is to devour 'among gods and men . . . as far as Sheol'. This column presents similarities, rather than parallels, to sections of 1QM, especially 15.2–7 and 16.8–16.

Fragment 11 has been assembled by Baillet (1982: 26–29) from 17 scattered pieces, providing parts of two columns of text, the join of which he considered as probable at best. On the basis of the observations summarized above, Abegg concluded that the 'Self-Glorification Hymn' found in col. 1 belongs in fact to a different manuscript (4Q491c) and

7. See Baillet 1982: 20–25; Hunzinger 1957.

that only col. 2 is part of the War Text attested by 4Q491a. The 24 fragmentary lines of the latter contain the description of a war against the Kittim. The priests and the Levites conduct a first battle with their trumpets and rams' horns; when the troops suffer casualties, another line is called to replace them. In his exhortation to the 'reserve', the chief priest stresses that they are to be tested in 'the crucible' and that they have to 'stand in the breach', without fear, until the God of Israel provides victory. The text of this column corresponds roughly to 1QM 16.3–17.14; but there are important differences between them (Duhaime 1987: 46–51).

Fragment 13 preserves remnants of nine lines. Fortified by a speech promising that, with divine help, the small among them 'shall pursue a thousa[nd]', several troops engage in what is probably one of the last phases of the battle, directed by trumpets of the priests and the horns of the Levites. The 'whole people' then join their voice, presumably for a song of praise. Baillet suggested that this exhortation might have been addressed to the third line of troops; a similar text would have stood in the lost part of 1QM 17.

Fragments 14 and 15 are probably part of the same section of text. Fragment 15 has 12 lines; Baillet tentatively located the six lines of frg. 14 to the right of frg. 15, lines 5 to 10, with the same numbers.⁸ The reconstructed text preserves the end of a prayer (or a speech?) in which a group, perhaps the people mentioned at the end of frg. 13, declares its readiness 'to engage'. Then a priest delivers an exhortation in which he refers to God stretching his hand 'over all the nations' and bringing salvation to his people, with whom 'divine beings' join forces. The forecast of the ultimate destruction of the enemies, including Belial (?) and his spirits, provides an additional reason to stand strong and brave in front of them. If there were such an exhortation in 1QM, it would have been in the missing end of 1QM 17.

Among other fragments, a few have to do with the duties of priests or Levites on the battlefield. Fragment 18 preserves remains of ten words scattered in six lines; after a reference to blowing (trumpets or horns) to direct a phase of the battle, there is the beginning of a speech which recalls the victory against Pharaoh at the 'Red S[ea]'. Fragment 22 has just a few letters of a single word on each of its three lines, also relating to people directing the course of action by blowing their instruments. Fragments 24 and 25 are remnants of prayers: the first (five lines) mentions the 'dominion of all divine bein[g]s' and praise in their company, whereas the second (three lines) refers to '[Is]rael', 'God' and the 'wicked'. Fragments

8. An alternative location of frg. 15 could be to the right of frg. 13, in its upper part (Baillet 1982: 38). But this seems less likely.

26–28, 31–33 and 35 are insignificant pieces containing no more than a few letters or words.

4Q491b M^{a/b}

(= 4Q491 frgs. 1–3, 4, 5–6, 7, 16, 17, 19–21, and 23)

Fragments 1–3 are made up of 13 pieces. Their assembling results in exceptionally long lines, but their contents seem consistent to Baillet, except for that of frg. 3, the placement of which he considered as ‘incertain’ (1982: 14). The first lines are apparently the end of a speech (lines 1–4a), followed by instructions for the ‘princes’ of the congregation (lines 4b–5): after a mention of God’s judgement against Korah and his congregation (cf. Num. 16.1–17.5), they refer to the supernatural support granted by the ‘commander of his angels’ and by the ‘the hand of God’ for an ‘everlasting destruction’ (presumably of the enemies). The next lines consist of regulations dealing with various organizational and tactical topics. First are addressed questions about the purity of the camps (lines 6–8), the selection of men ‘for the daily duty’, and the exclusion of unclean ones from combat since ‘holy angels (are) togeth[er] within their lines’ (lines 9–10). Then indications are given about the formation of the lines ‘for the battle on that day’, the setting of an ambush, and the gathering of the troops afterwards (lines 11–15a). The sequence of the engagement of three different lines is also explained (lines 15b–17a), as well as the way the Levites, the ‘m[en of the ru]le (*serek*)’ and the priests direct it, the latter being also provided with instructions about their war garments (lines 17b–18). A formal conclusion apparently summed up the whole (lines 19–20). Most of these topics are also discussed in 1QM, but in different places and with significant variations.⁹

Fragment 4 consists of only a few words from four lines of text, which prescribe that one must be at least 20 years old to be appointed to some unknown task, probably a military one, since the ‘enemy’ is mentioned.

Fragments 5–6 have been associated, assuming an interval between them (15 mm), on the basis of text found in 1QM 12.1. They preserve a few words of a single line of the hymn celebrating God for ‘the host of [a]n[gel]s’ who praise his ‘tru[th]’ in the heavens, and for ‘the elect ones’ (of the holy people).

The little frg. 7 bears the remnant of a *mem* on one line and the words ‘and to recount’ (*wlspr*) on the next. Baillet tentatively suggested linking it with the praise of God in 1QM 13.8–9 and reconstructing the same verb

9. Baillet refers to 1QM 2.1–6; 5.16–17; 7.3–7, 10–12; 9.1–18; 16.3–14; 17.10–15. See also Duhaime 1990; García-Martínez 1988: 351–54.

at the beginning of line 9, so as to read: '... and to re[count] your truthful works and the judgments of your wonderful might'.

Fragment 16 preserves portions of five lines; their content probably refers to events which are to take place after the victory: the division of the booty between the fighters 'and between the whole congregation' (as in Num. 31.27), and the gathering of 'all Israel' in Jerusalem for a final celebration. In 1QM, the return, for which a specific trumpet had to be prepared (1QM 3.11), was perhaps described in the missing end of the scroll.

Four various fragments contain excerpts of regulations. Fragment 17 (eight lines) displays bits of instructions about an action to be performed; it includes the earliest known reference to the title 'Book of Psalms' (*spr hthlym*), unfortunately without a clear context, and alludes eventually to the opposite fates of one group to be exterminated 'in a des[tructive] fire' and another to be saved as 'a remna[nt]'. Fragment 19 (four lines) mentions an 'offering' and a 'memorial'. Fragment 20 (five lines) has to do with the 'num[bered men]' of 'Israel', and possibly with requirements about their age. Fragment 21 (three lines) simply mentions 'the war' and 'the priests'. In addition to these, frg. 23 (five lines) preserves a few words of a hymn praising God for having raised human beings to him '[from d]ust' and given strength to 'the fallen' perhaps as a result of his 'forgiveness'.

Unclassified Fragments of 4Q491a M^a
(= 4Q491 frgs. 29, 30, 34, 36, 37)

A few fragments of 4Q491a M^a escape classification. According to Abegg, not enough material is left on the tiny frgs. 29, 30, 34 to determine from which manuscript they came. As for frgs. 36 and 37, Baillet (1982: 44) acknowledged already that they may be from a manuscript other than 4QM^a. The only significant words of this group are found in frg. 36 which reads: 'and there shall be a tribula[tion]'.

Abegg's division of the frgs. of 4Q491a M^a into three hypothetical manuscripts represents a valuable attempt to clarify the relationship of the first two of them to the Cave 1 text and to put the strange 'Self-Glorification Hymn' of the third into a different context. On the basis of physical as well as literary arguments, the first two manuscripts 4Q491a M^{a/a} and 4Q491b M^{a/b} appear as two different recensions of the War Scroll as found in 1QM. Abegg suggests that the first one is closer to the text of 1QM, mostly on the basis of his study of the contents of frgs. 8–10 col. 2, which parallels 1QM 14.3–18 with minor variants; but other frgs. from 4Q491a M^{a/a}, namely frgs. 8–10 col. 2 and frg. 11 col. 2, reveal much more important differences. The statement that the second

manuscript (4Q491b M^{a/b}) has no parallel with 1QM, but material similar to it, is especially true for frgs. 1–3; Baillet, however, considered it plausible that frgs. 5–6 and 7, as scanty as they are, could match respectively the texts of 1QM 12.1 and 13.8–9. Hence, the problem of the relationship between these two reconstructed manuscripts and 1QM remains a complex one. Each document is original indeed in its attitude towards the text or tradition witnessed by 1QM; but the variations of the first document are as important as those of the second, and, even if they are separated, both manuscripts can safely be put in the category of copies of ‘other recensions’ of the War Scroll found in Cave 1.

2.3.3. 4Q493 M^c

4Q493 M^c is made of two pieces of greyish leather joined to form a single fragment 12 cm wide and 9 cm high at its largest extent (Baillet 1982: 49–53, pl. VIII.). A column of 14 lines, with 50–55 letters or spaces on each, has been preserved, with all its margins still partly visible. Lines were apparently not ruled and they have an irregular spacing, varying between 5 and 6 mm, with average letters around 2.5 mm high. A few lines are almost complete, but the black ink of the text has faded, especially on the left side and at the bottom of the fragment, which makes the reading more difficult in these places. Since its script is slightly earlier than the Herodian period, the date suggested for this manuscript is the first half of the first century BCE, which makes it the oldest War Text found at Qumran.

The first 12 lines give indications for the conduct of the battle. The priests blow various trumpets to signal the successive phases of a first engagement: the trumpets of memorial to let the skirmishers go out, the ‘the trumpets of battle’ to engage combat, and the ‘trump[ets] of withdr[aw]al’ to ‘enter the gates’. Keeping away from the slain and from the lines of the skirmishers in order to avoid profaning ‘the oil of their priesthood’, they shall stand aside, perhaps near war machines (‘the catapult and the ballista?’). When a second line engages, the Levites blow different trumpets as well, namely the ‘trumpets of the alarm’. The last two lines, which mention the ‘trumpet[s] of sabbaths’ but also ‘burnt offerings’ and ‘holocausts’, suggest a different context: they probably belong to a series of instructions about inscriptions to be made on cultic trumpets. Many of the trumpets found here are unknown in 1QM, in which only the priests use them, whereas the Levites blow horns. Baillet (1982: 50) formulated the hypothesis that this text may be from the same recension as 4QM^a, an opinion that cannot be validated, for the lack of significant overlaps between the two documents; moreover, as explained above, 4QM^a may contain material from more than one single manuscript.

2.3.4. 4Q497 War Scroll-like Text A

The 54 fragments of this text appear on the back of poorly preserved pieces of a papyrus containing hymns or prayers (4Q499, in Baillet 1982: 69–72, pl. XXVI). It is not certain that all fragments belong to the same document; one of the largest ones (frg. 1) is 1.7 cm wide and 5.5 cm high, whereas one of the smallest (frg. 45) is only 7 mm wide and 5 mm high. Only a few letters of an average size of 3 mm have survived on each line, and a maximum of five or six lines, spaced by around 8 mm, for the best fragments. The text was copied by the middle of the first century BCE.

Even on the largest fragments, only a few words, at best, can still be read. They sometimes point to parallels with 1QM, as in the following cases: '[. . . stub]bornness of heart [. . .]' and 'covenant' (frg. 1; cf. 1QM 14.7–8); 'bring' and 'dust' (frg. 2; cf. 1QM 12.14); '[you will do bat]tle against them' (frg. 4; cf. 1QM 11.17); 'you have established [a cove]nant with [our] fa[thers]' (frg. 47; cf. 1QM 13.7). But when such possible parallels occur, either the other traces do not match the text of the possible parallel, or not enough is left to make the connection certain. Baillet (1982: 69) suggested that the text may also be related to 4Q285 *Sefer ha-Milhamah*.

2.4. The Lost End of the Rule of the War?

2.4.1. 4Q285 *Sefer ha-Milhamah*

The last manuscript of Cave 4 identified as a War Text is 4Q285.¹⁰ This *Sefer ha-Milhamah* is made of 20 pieces of fine brown skin that have been assembled into ten fragments tentatively arranged according to their appearance, damage patterns, contents and similarities with the parallel text from Cave 11 (11Q14; see below). The smallest (frg. 5) is 5 mm wide and 8 mm high, whereas one of the largest (frg. 4) is 8 cm wide and 8.5 cm high. The manuscript was apparently not ruled, and its line spacing is uneven, but usually around 8 mm. The average letters are 2.5 mm high. Fragments 6–7 have smaller line spacings and letters than the others, but, according to the editors, this may be due to shrinkage of the leather. The largest fragments preserve parts of ten or eleven lines of 50–55 letters or spaces each; the upper and lower margins are sometimes visible, but no side margins have survived. The reconstructed arrangement suggests that

10. Vermes and Alexander in Pfann *et al.* 2000: 228–48, pl. XII–XIII. Alexander 1999–2000 provides observations supplementing the edition of the text in DJD 36, among which is a concordance correlating the new numbering of the fragments with those of former translations and studies (pp. 333–34).

the fragments came from six columns of 13 lines of text. The early Herodian script is similar to that of 1QM and points to a dating towards the end of the first century BCE.

Fragment 1 may be an excerpt of a prayer, as the phrase 'for the sake of your name' implies. It contains the names of the archangel 'Michael', followed by 'G[abriel]' and perhaps also Sarial and Raphael, since these four are to be inscribed on the 'shields of the tower', according to 1QM 9.15–16. God was probably asked to send them to protect his faithful troops during the battle.

Fragment 2 has only a few letters. Fragment 3, similar in texture and colour, mentions 'Levit[e]s', 'trum[pets]' and 'rams' horns'. It probably had to do with the signals that the Levites (along with the priests?) are to provide with these instruments during the various phases of the engagement. The Kittim also appear in this fragment, associated with a verb that could be either 'despise' (*bzh*) or 'despoil' (*bzz*).

Fragment 4 describes the final victory over the Kittim, when 'wickedness will be smitten'. It quotes a passage of the Scriptures which has been identified as Ezek. 39.3–4, forecasting the fall of Gog 'on the mountains of I[srael]'. As the enemy flees, the 'Prince of the Congregation' leads the pursuit 'towards the [Great] Sea'. After the return 'to the dry land', a prisoner, probably the king of the Kittim, is brought 'before the Prince [of the Congregation]'.

Only a few letters remain on the two lines of frg. 5, presumably detached from frg. 6 which has five additional lines containing a total of eight words. It apparently described the movements of a group (Israel, the Congregation?) and perhaps its rest during the 'night' following victory.

The much-discussed frg. 7 (formerly frg. 5) begins with a quotation from Isa. 10.34–11.1 which predicts the 'fall' of [Lebanon] and the coming forth of 'a shoot from the stump of Jesse', also called 'the Branch of David'. This messianic 'Prince of the Congregation', eventually guided by the High Priest, will try the opposing leader (the king of the Kittim) and 'put him to death', at least judicially, that is, by pronouncing sentence against him, if not physically. Then 'a priest' will issue commands, probably to dispose properly of the '[s]lain [of] the Kittim' and to cleanse the land when the war is over.

Fragment 8 is made up of four separate pieces assembled on the assumption that they contain a text parallel to 11Q14 frg. 1 col. 2, which is better preserved. It contains a blessing pronounced over '[I]srael', presumably by the High Priest, when the final victory has brought peace. It opens with two general formulae taken from the priestly blessing of Num. 6.24–25. These are followed by a more specific series, also of biblical inspiration, listing various gifts that God is expected to spread over

Israel when he opens '[his] good [treasury whi]ch is in heaven'; they consist mainly of dew and rain fertilizing the land, so that it may produce abundant food and drink. Another series details diseases or afflictions which may have caused stumbling in the congregation in the past, but which will cease or be prevented in the blessed land, and even more in the holy congregation in communion with God and his angels.

The small frg. 9 has just a few words, the last of which are either 'and Tor[ah]' (*wtwr[h]*) or 'in yo[ur] midst' (*mtwk[h]*), and its ending may possibly be found on the first line of frg. 10; the latter has a total of ten partial lines, followed either by a *vacat* or a bottom margin. The general context seems to be the purification of the land after victory. This could imply the expulsion of evildoers 'from the midst of the community', the collection of the booty by '[one who fors]akes property [and] gain',¹¹ and the proper disposal in graves of the corpses of 'the[ir] slain', perhaps those of the Sons of Light who fell in combat for reasons known only to God. The last lines allude to the return of '[those who re]pent from sin': they are eventually treated with 'mercy' (by God?) and reintegrated in the renovated 'Is[r]ael'.

As mentioned above, Milik (1972: 143) has suggested that 4Q285 is a copy of a Rule of the War similar to 1QM, and provides parts of its missing end. The final editors of the manuscript agree that '4Q285 seems to relate to phases of the eschatological war later than those described in 1QM and 4QM' (Vermes and Alexander in Pfann *et al.* 2000: 231). But they are reluctant to establish a close connection between these texts, especially with 1QM, which mentions the Prince of the Congregation only in passing (1QM 5.1–2) and does not anticipate for him the leading role that he plays in 4Q285.¹² On the basis of a similar argument, Jonathan Norton (2003: 10–27) considers that the Sefer ha-Milhamah could be 'a messianic reworking' of the Rule of the War, rather than its lost conclusion. Alexander (1999–2000: 348) also expresses the view that this War Text may be a somewhat different work, 'more an apocalyptic description of what would happen' in the final battle than a set of rules to be followed during it (see also Alexander 2003: 29–30).

2.4.2. 11Q14 Sefer ha-Milhamah

The second copy of the Sefer ha-Milhamah, found in Cave 11 (11Q14), consists of nine pieces, belonging to four fragments, of light tan leather, numbered 1a-f, 2, 3 and 4 (García Martínez 1998: 243–51, pl. XXVIII).

11. As suggested by Nitzan 1993: 84–85 on the basis of 1QM 7.2.

12. The Prince (of the Congregation) also appears in 4Q496 M^f frg. 10 (see above).

The largest piece is frg. 1a (13 cm wide and 12 cm high); the smallest is frg. 4 (9 mm wide and 13 mm high). As arranged, frgs. 1a-f preserve the remnants of two columns of text; only a few letters from col. 1 remain, but 15 almost complete lines of col. 2 can be read, with the number of letters and spaces varying between 35 and 50. Margins are still visible at the left of cols. 1 and 2, as well as at the bottom. The space between lines is around 8 mm and the average letter height is 3.5 mm. The script shares similarities both with the 'developed' and the 'late' Herodian formal script, dated in the first half of the first century CE.

The first column of frg. 1 consists of four pieces: the right-hand side of frg. 1a, joined to 1b-1c, and, at a distance, to 1d.¹³ It contains traces of letters at the end of seven non-consecutive lines. A 'very probable, but minimal' overlap with 4Q285 frg. 7 has led to a partial reconstruction of the text (García Martínez 1998: 246). A few words of the quotation from Isa. 10.34-11.1 can be identified, namely the important mention of the 'sh[oo]t' emerging from the stump of Jesse, the '[bu]d of [David]', interpreted as the Prince of the Congregation trying and putting to death the king of the Kittim, at the end of the eschatological war. Fragment 1d also preserves the word 'slain', probably matching the phrase '[the sl]ai[n] of the Kittim' found at the end of 4Q285 frg. 7.

The second column is much more substantial. Most of its text is provided by frg. 1a; the end of the first line has survived on frg. 1b; a few additional letters come from frgs. 1e and 1f. Like 4Q285 frg. 8, it contains a blessing of Israel after the final victory; but the text found here, although almost identical, is better preserved and contains many details which have been lost in the copy from Cave 4. The blessing is formally introduced by 'and he (the High Priest?) shall bless them in the name of [the God of I]srael, and he shall begin to speak [...]'. 'God Most High' and 'his holy angels' are blessed at the end of the opening sentence. The following blessing elaborates on the 'showers of blessing' that God is expected to send from heaven to fertilize the land which, as a result, will provide 'grain, wine and oil in abundance'. In this idyllic country, there will be no more miscarriage, sickness or plague; grain will remain wholesome and wild beasts will be absent; the congregation will be spared from '[stum]bling'. As the officiant states in conclusion, the ground for these blessings is that 'God is with you' along with his angels, 'and his holy name is invoked over you'.

The placement of frgs. 2 to 4 is uncertain. Fragment 2 has only three partial lines and perhaps the top margin of a column. Two complete words are preserved, as well as a few letters of five others, which have been

13. A close scrutiny of the relationship between frgs. 1a, 1b and 1c has led Jonathan Norton (2003: 4-10) to suggest a slightly different arrangement.

reconstructed on the basis of similarities with the Hebrew text of Sir. 50.26 and 1QM 12.10: the first line is read as an allusion to 'a stup[id] nation', the second as an appeal to God to get up as a '[he]ro' to 'take the Phil[istine] prisoner'. The editors conjectured that the Edomites and the Samaritans were perhaps also listed here, as they are in Sir. 50.26, instead of the Kittim found repeatedly in 1QM (García Martínez 1998: 244). Nothing significant remains on frgs. 3 and 4.

From the study of their overlapping parts, it has been assumed that 11Q14 was an almost identical copy of the *Sefer ha-Milhamah* of 4Q285, except perhaps for minor variants.¹⁴ As was the case for 4Q285, and for the same reasons, one cannot demonstrate that the elements found in 11Q14 once stood in the final part of 1QM; they could also have belonged to a different edition of the same composition, if not to a completely different War Text.

2.5. A 'Self-Glorification Hymn'

2.5.1. The Text of 4Q491c M^{a/c}

(= 4Q491 frg. 11 col. 1 and frg. 12)

The first column of frg. 11, as assembled by Baillet, is about 10 cm wide by 7 cm high.¹⁵ Since col. 1 lacks the part corresponding to lines 1 to 7 of col. 2, tentatively connected with it, the text of col. 1 was numbered from lines 8 to 24. In the parts of a hymn preserved in lines 8–19, the 'holy ones', it is said, 'shall be glad' because of God's action, for he has planned, in 'his mysterious prudence', to turn 'the council of the poor to an everlasting congregation'. Then the text becomes more personal: someone speaking as an 'I' claims twice to be reckoned among divine beings and mentions 'a powerful throne in the congregation of divine beings', on which no one but him, apparently, is worthy to sit, perhaps for a judgement. He also states that none can compare with him in glory or prevail against him. After a blank there are, in lines 20–24, remnants of a joyful praise: 'the righteous ones' are invited to rejoice (?) 'in the holy dwelling' and 'to play' for God, probably because of his decision 'to raise the horn' (of the poor?) and to 'make his hand known with power'.

The small frg. 12 (1.5 cm wide by 1.7 cm high) is said to have belonged probably to the same column, but its location cannot be determined. On

14. García Martínez 1998: 244. This conclusion has been challenged by William John Lyons in two articles (1996; 1999); Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (2000) has subsequently discussed and rejected Lyons's arguments.

15. Baillet 1982: 26–30, pl. VI. See above, 2.3.2, pp. 24–26.

plate VII of the official edition, it simply appears in the upper left corner of the column. There are scanty remains of six lines referring to 'his (God's?) habitation', and again to a being expressing in the first person ('and I') his association with 'splendour'.

Baillet's label for col. 1 of frg. 11 is 'Canticle of Michael and canticle of the righteous ones' and for frg. 12 simply 'Canticle of Michael', even if the archangel's name never appears in the text itself. The identification of Michael as the one 'reckoned with the divine beings' and sitting on 'a powerful throne' in their congregation was apparently based on the link between cols. 1 and 2 of 4QM^a frg. 11, and on the similarities that the content of the latter shares with a speech found in 1QM 17. In this address, the chief priest states that the 'the authority of Michael' will be set 'in everlasting light' and exalted 'over the divine beings' (1QM 17.6–7). But Abegg's separation of the two columns of frg. 11 and his demonstration that they do not come from the same manuscript do not allow for such reasoning. Even before Abegg's work, the identification of the speaker with Michael had been contested by Morton Smith (1990: 181–88), who interpreted the song as uttered by a human being, perhaps the author of the Hodayot, claiming to have been taken up into the heavens; this question is still open to debate.

2.5.2. Other Copies of the 'Self-Glorification Hymn'

Copies of this poetic composition were identified among fragments of three different manuscripts of Hymns from Cave 1 (1QHodayot^a) and Cave 4 (4Q427 Hodayot^a and 4Q431 Hodayot^c). Where the three manuscripts overlap, there are enough similarities between them to suggest that they are copies of the same recension which, however, is different from the one found in 4Q491c M^{a/c}.

1QHodayot^a 26.6–17

The Thanksgiving Scroll from Cave 1 (1QHodayot^a, in short 1QH^a) was one of the scrolls edited by Sukenik (Sukenik 1955: 37–39, pl. 35–58). It was copied during the Herodian period (second half of the first century BCE) and came in two separate parts. The first part was made up of three disconnected sheets preserving a total of 12 columns of text ranging from 35 to 41 lines (cols. 1–12), written by two different scribes. The second part consisted of 'a crumpled mass of about seventy detached frgs. of leather of assorted sizes' (Sukenik 1955: 37). Sukenik was able to reconstruct five additional fragmentary columns from large fragments copied by the first scribe (cols. 13–17) and a sixth by the second scribe (col. 18); Sukenik sorted the remaining fragments according to their handwriting and size and arranged them on three separate plates.

It was later demonstrated independently by Harmut Stegemann and Émile Puech that the original arrangement of the scroll was different from the one reconstructed by Sukenik; they suggested a more accurate order which is adopted in most modern translations and studies of 1QH^a.¹⁶ Scholars have also been able to find the location of many fragments appearing on the last plates of Sukenik's edition and to put them into their proper place in the scroll. Among these, frgs. 56 col. 2, 46 col. 2 and 55 col. 2 have been assembled to form the beginning of 11 lines in the first part of col. 26 (lines 6–17);¹⁷ the restored column (with reconstructed lines of 50–60 letters or spaces) contains a few words identified as remnants of another recension of the 'Self-Glorification Hymn' (lines 6–9a), followed by an invitation to 'rejoice' and to 'exalt' and bless God (lines 9b–17). Michael O. Wise (2000) has also argued that the bottom of col. 25, partly reconstructed from the association of frgs. 8, 7 col. 1 and 47, preserved the heading of this text.¹⁸ It is introduced as 'a musical psal[m]' to be used by 'the *Maskil*', that is, the local leader, and his community, in a liturgical context. Wise understands this as an indication that the canticle was sung by a group in which each individual member could claim for himself what the text states.

4Q427 Hodayot^a frg. 7

A copy of the same text is found in frg. 7 col. 1 of the first manuscript from Cave 4 (4Q427 Hodayot^a or H^a).¹⁹ This frg. is the largest of the scroll, out of 22; it measures up to 16 cm wide and 17 cm high and contains two columns of text, estimated at 23 lines each, with 50–55 letters per line. The line spacing varies in the manuscript; in frg. 7, it is about 5.5 cm and the average letters are from 2 to 2.5 cm. On the basis of

16. See Puech 1988b; Stegemann 1963, 1990, 2000. The column and line numbers of the Sukenik edition are often also indicated, however, since they are essential for anyone who wishes to consult the plates. Puech and Stegemann are preparing a new critical edition of 1QHodayot^a. In the following paragraphs, the column and line numbers follow the new order, as found in García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000: I, 146–203.

17. These frgs. of various forms are found on Sukenik's pl. 58 and have the following approximate size: frg. 46 is 3.5 cm wide and 5 cm high, frg. 55 is 6 cm wide and 1.5 cm high, frg. 56 is 3 cm wide and 3 cm high. The line spacing is about 7 cm and the average letters are about 3 cm high.

18. Frg. 7 (6.5 cm wide and 9 cm high) and frg. 8 (4 cm wide and 11 cm high) are found on Sukenik's pl. 55, whereas frg. 47 (3.5 cm wide and 3.5 cm high) appears on pl. 58.

19. The manuscript has been prepared for publication by E. Schuller (integrating material by J. Strugnell and H. Stegemann) in Chazon *et al.* 1999: 77–123, pl. IV–VI and foldout pl. I.

its script, the manuscript has been dated in the first half of the first century BCE.

Fragment 7 corresponds to cols. 3 and 4 of the reconstructed manuscript. It continues a prayer which began probably at the end of col. 2 (line 18) of the manuscript and ended somewhere in the first three lines of its col. 5. The text of frg. 7 col. 1.6–13a corresponds to a recension of the ‘Self-Glorification Hymn’ which overlaps that attested in 1QH^a, but has more preserved material. The speaker presents himself as one of exceptional ‘teaching’, who is a ‘companion to the holy ones’, the ‘divine beings’ among whom he has his ‘place’, even if he remains unmatched by them.

As in 1QH^a the hymn is followed by an invitation to ‘beloved ones’ to sing praise to God in ‘the [holy] habitation’ and to ‘bless the one who does majestic deeds and makes known the power of his hand’ (lines 13b–21a). The text also celebrates God ‘who judges with destructive wrath’ to punish the wicked, but acts with ‘loving kindness, righteousness, and with great mercies’ towards the faithful (lines 21b–23). In col. 2, the end of iniquity and affliction is expected, giving way to light, peace and other eschatological benefits (lines 2–7a). The hymn continues with three additional calls to proclaim the greatness of the God who ‘casts down the haughty spirit’ and ‘lifts up the poor from the dust’ and makes him stand (?) ‘with the divine beings’ (lines 7b–11), who acts with righteousness, mercy and forgiveness (lines 12–22a), and who has established the heavens and the earth by his might (lines 22b–23). The speaker of the ‘Self-Glorification Hymn’, in this wider context, ‘is to be understood in relationship to the “I” voice we hear speaking in the other psalms, particularly the other Hymns of the Community’ (Schuller in Chazon *et al.* 1999: 102).

4Q471b frags. 1a-d = 4Q431 Hodayot^e frg. 1

As identified by Esther Eshel (in Chazon *et al.* 1999: 421–32, pl. XXVIII), the manuscript 4Q471b is a text made of four separate pieces which, on the basis of their contents and of the parallel in other manuscripts, can be matched to reconstruct an additional copy of the ‘Self-Glorification Hymn’. They are labelled either frags. 1–4 or, more accurately, frags. 1a–d. Fragment 1a is the largest, measuring 7 cm wide and 6 cm high; it preserves eight lines, estimated at around 45 letters or spaces each, and a wide right margin (2.7 cm). Fragment 1b is 3 cm wide and 1.7 cm high, with three lines of text. Fragment 1c is 1.3 cm wide and 0.5 cm high and has only three letters, whereas frg. 1d is 1.2 cm wide high and 0.7 cm high and has four letters. On frags. 1a and 1b, the line spacing is about 7 cm; the average letters are 3 cm. The script is Herodian and suggests a dating in the second half of the first century BCE.

According to Eshel's reconstruction, the composite fragment preserves remnants of ten lines of text. In line 1, one finds the statement that '[I am] recko[ned with the divine beings]', followed by a series of rhetorical questions and claims by the speaker about his unique worth, his unparalleled teaching and his status of 'beloved of the King'. The last line consists of fragment 1d which preserves traces of the call to beloved ones to 'sing' their praise to God.

The handwriting of 4Q471b frgs. 1a-d is the same as that of a fragment assigned to the fifth Hodayot manuscript from Cave 4, 4Q431 Hodayot^e (or H^e), which had been entrusted to Eileen Schuller for publication; since this fragment contains a text similar to the one following the 'Self-Glorification Hymn' in 4Q427 H^a frg. 7 (see above), Harmut Stegemann has suggested that both texts are sections of the same hymn. Having re-examined frgs. 1a-d of 4Q471b with Stegemann, Schuller proposed her own reconstruction and an alternative edition of them, labelling them frg. 1 of 4Q431 H^e.²⁰ She made a physical join between frgs. 1a and 1b. Fragment 1c, placed on the first line by Eshel, was tentatively aligned at a distance with line 3 of frg. 1a, near the left margin of the column; but its location being only tentative, it was not integrated into the transcription. In both editions, frg. 1d is placed below frg. 1a, as the last part of the ensemble. According to Schuller's calculations, frgs. 1 and 2 correspond to the middle part of the first two columns of a scroll. The nine lines of frg. 1, as reconstructed by her, would offer a text almost identical to the one preserved in 4Q427 H^a frg. 7 col. 1.

Taken together, these three manuscripts witness to the same recension of the 'Self-Glorification Hymn' and of the following praise of God, which shares common features with the other recension of the text found in 4Q491c M^{a/c}, in spite of important differences. In both recensions, the speaker expresses himself as 'I' and formulates bold claims about his unparalleled status, his teaching and his place among heavenly beings. But only in the Milhamah form of the hymn does the speaker state that he has sat, apparently on a throne among the divine beings, perhaps to perform a judgement based on the exclusive teaching that he has received. The rhetorical question 'who is like me among the divine beings?' is unique to the Hodayot version, which presents many variations in its use of common terms; it also seems to develop the themes in a more elaborate way, especially in the following praise. These observations have led scholars to suggest that the Milhamah recension could be an earlier one and that its speaker could be a distinctive individual such as the Teacher of

20. Schuller in Chazon *et al.* 1999: 199–208. The second frg. of this manuscript (4Q431 frg. 2) is found on pl. XII.

Righteousness or the eschatological High Priest; however, the connection of this recension with the War Texts remains uncertain. The Hodayot recension could mirror the ‘routinization’ of the experience and claims of a ‘charismatic’ leader for the benefit of his followers who would have made use of this hymn in a different context.²¹ In any case, the very existence of two different recensions implies that this ‘Self-Glorification Hymn’ has gone through a process of redaction to suit various purposes in different contexts.

2.6. Summary

The War Texts found in the library of Qumran are rich and diversified. Their state of conservation varies from fairly good to excellent, except for the texts copied on papyrus which are badly damaged and not easily readable (4Q496 M^e and 4Q497 War Scroll-like Text A). The quantity of material that they preserve is very different from one to another. With 19 almost complete columns of text and a few additional fragments, 1QM remains the most comprehensive copy of a War Text; others extend from just one or two fragments (4Q494 M^d, 4Q495 M^e) to over a hundred (4Q496 M^f) of variable size, preserving in the best cases remnants of a few columns of text (as in 4Q491a M^{a/a} or 11Q14).

These manuscripts represent copies of various works, which have been described in relation to 1QM either (a) as copies of a similar recension (4Q492 M^b, 4Q494 M^d, 4Q495 M^e, 4Q496 M^f), or (b) as copies of different recensions (4Q471 War Scroll-like Text B, 4Q491a M^{a/a}, 4Q491b M^{a/b}, 4Q493 M^c, 4Q497 War Scroll-like Text A), or (c) as copies of a separate work: the *Sefer ha-Milhamah* related to the ‘war cycle’ (4Q285, 11Q14), or an independent hymnic composition (4Q491c M^{a/c} and other copies of the ‘Self-Glorification Hymn’ 1QH^a 26.6–17, 4Q427 H^a frg. 7 col. 1, 4Q471b frgs. 1a-d = 4Q431 H^c frg. 1). All have been copied during either the first century BCE or the first years of the first century CE. Table 1 lists the manuscripts according to their date and type.

21. See especially Collins 1995a, 1995b; Collins and Dimant 1994–95; E. Eshel 1999; Fletcher-Louis 2002; Knohl 2000; Wise 1999, 2000. For references to other opinions, see Schuller in Chazon *et al.* 1999: 102 n. 37. A recent discussion of these views is found in García-Martínez 2002: arguing that 4Q491c belongs to the War Texts and is to be read as a victory hymn after the final battle, he maintains that Baillet’s original attribution of the hymn to the Archangel Michael ‘makes more sense than all other attributions proposed’ (p. 336), whereas the speaker of the hymn, in the context of the Hodayot, ‘can only be the voice of the Teacher of Righteousness’ (p. 339).

Table 1. The War Texts according to their date and type

Type	1QM	Similar recension	Other recensions	Sefer ha-Milhamah	'Self-Glorification Hymn'
Date					
First half of the first century BCE		4Q496 M ^f	4Q493 M ^c 4Q497		4Q427 H ^a
Second half of the first century BCE	1QM	4Q492 M ^b 4Q495 M ^c	4Q471 4Q491a M ^{a/a} 4Q491b M ^{a/b}	4Q285	1QH ^a 4Q471b = 431 4Q491c M ^{a/c}
First half of the first century CE		4Q494 M ^d		11Q14	

From this evidence, it seems that various types of War Texts were circulating simultaneously.

The main topic of 1QM is the eschatological war to be fought by the Sons of Light, the faithful remnant of Israel, against their enemies; led by their religious and secular leaders, they are to be an instrument of God and his heavenly hosts to bring an end to wickedness and to establish Israel's domination for ever. The text embodies various contents: an apocalyptic overview of the war (col. 1), instructions to prepare the war and to direct the troops (cols. 1.end–9.bottom), a collection of prayers and hymns (cols. 9.end–14.bottom), and a description of the ultimate military engagements after speeches of encouragement (cols. 14.end–20.?).

The material found in similar recensions belongs to all parts of the text and supplements it more than once. It even provides occasionally elements which have been lost in the missing parts of 1QM, as well as a few significant variants to the extant text, such as the corrections mentioning the 'prince' in the Rule for the standards (4Q496 M^f frg. 10). Table 2 lists the main parallels to 1QM in these manuscripts.

Other parallels or similarities with 1QM have also been identified among manuscripts that are copies of different recensions of the War Text or belong to related but different compositions. The most significant are listed in Table 3.

These fragments are less reliable as a source for reconstructing the damaged or missing parts of 1QM, since the variations between the texts are often important. But they provide other kinds of significant information. A few fragments illuminate the redactional history of the War Text by illustrating how parts of it have been reworked in one way or another (compare 4Q471 frg. 1 and 1QM 2.1–10, 4Q491a M^{a/a} frgs. 8–10 and 1QM 14; etc.). Others offer hints of what might have stood in the missing parts of 1QM (e.g. 4Q491a M^{a/a} frgs. 8–10 col. 1.16–17, frg. 13

Table 2. Parallels between 1QM and similar recensions

Similar recensions 1QM	4Q492 M ^b	4Q494 M ^d	4Q495 M ^e	4Q496 M ^f
1.4-9				frg. 3
1.11-bottom				frgs. 2+1
1.end-2.3		frg. 1		
2.5-6				frg. 7
2.9-10				frg. 4 (?)
2.9-12				frgs. 6+5
2.13-14				frgs. 13+75+14
2.17				frg. 9 (?)
2.end-3.2				frg. 8
3.6-7				frg. 12
3.9-11				frg. 11
3.11-15				frg. 10
3.end-4.2				frg. 16
4.6-7				frg. 35
9.5-9				frg. 15
9.9-10			frg. 1	
12.8-16	frg. 1 1-8			
13.9-12			frg. 2	
19.1-14	frg. 1 1-13			
19.6-7				frg. 97 (?)

and frgs. 14-15), or add relevant details such as additional types of trumpets or war machines (4Q493 M^c). Fragment 16 of 4Q491b M^{a/b} probably refers to the collection of booty and the gathering in Jerusalem after victory, events similar to those which were presumably described at the lost end of 1QM.

The two copies of the *Sefer ha-Milhamah* (4Q285 and 11Q14) are also particularly noteworthy in their description of the final victory over the Kittim, including the capture, trial and execution of their king by the Prince of the Congregation, and the blessing of the eschatological community in the purified land. Even if it cannot be proven that they correspond to the missing end of 1QM, they illustrate how the ultimate outcome of the eschatological war was envisioned in certain circles.

The 'Self-Glorification Hymn' found in 4Q491c M^{a/c} (frg. 11 col. 1 and frg. 12) reports the exceptional claim of a speaker to have been exalted among divine beings, eventually sitting on a throne for a judgement. The identity of the speaker and even the connection of the hymn with the War Texts have been discussed since its publication by Baillet. The discovery of three copies of a similar text in manuscripts of Hymns (1QH^a 26.6-17,

Table 3. Parallels and similarities between IQM and other recensions or compositions

Other recensions or compositions IQM	4Q471	4Q491a M ^{a/a}	4Q491 M ^{a/b}	4Q493 M ^c	4Q497
2.1-10	frg. 1 3-9				
5.16-17			frgs. 1-3 11-12		
6.bottom			frg. 4 (?)		
7.3-7			frgs. 1-3 6-10		
7.10-12			frgs. 1-3 18		
9.7-9				frg. 1 4-6	
9.17-bottom			frgs. 1-3 12-13		
11.17					frg. 4
12.1			frgs. 5-6		
12.14					frg. 2
13.7					frg. 47
13.8-9			frg. 7		
14.3-bottom		frgs. 8-10 col. 1			
14.7-8					frg. 1
15.2-7		frgs. 8-10 col. 2.7-14			
16.3-8		frg. 13 3-6			
16.3-17.14		frg. 11 col. 2			
16.8-16		frg. 10 col. 2.7-14			
17.10-13		frg. 13 3-7			

4Q427 H^a frg. 7 and 4Q471b frgs. 1a-d = 4Q431 H^c frg. 1) demonstrates that, at least in this alternative recension, it was used in a context having nothing to do with the war traditions, probably by a community of disciples who appropriated for themselves the claim once made by or in the name of their leader, rather than by an archangel.

The different War Texts found at Qumran are particularly interesting as witnesses to traditions which have been used and reworked over and over in a priestly milieu during the first century BCE and the first years of the first century CE. Their edition and study have raised many questions and prompted a vast amount of scholarly research. In the following chapters, we turn to a selective review of the main issues discussed since Sukenik's edition of the first of these texts.

Further Reading on the Contents of the War Texts

- Abegg, Martin 1994a 'Messianic Hope and 4Q285: A Reassessment', *JBL* 113: 81-91.
 — 1994b '4Q471: A Case of Mistaken Identity?', in J.C. Reeves and J. Kampen (eds.), *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (Leiden: Brill): 136-47.

- 1997 'Who Ascended to Heaven and Returned to Tell the Tale?', in C.A. Evans and P. Flint (eds.), *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SDSSRL, 1; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans): 61–73.
- Alexander, Philip S. 1999–2000 'A Reconstruction and Reading of 4Q285 (4QSefer ha-Milhamah)', *RevQ* 19: 333–48.
- Collins, John J. 1995a *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday):
- 1995b 'A Throne in Heavens: Apotheosis in Pre-Christian Judaism', in J.J. Collins and M. Fishbane (eds.), *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys* (Albany: State University of New York Press): 43–58.
- 1997 'The Eschatological War', in *idem*, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge): 91–109.
- Collins, John J., and Devorah Dimant 1994–95 'A Thrice-Told Hymn', *JQR* 85: 151–55.
- Davies, Philip R. 2000 'War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness', *EncDSS* 2: 965–68.
- Delcor, Mathias 1978 'Livre de la guerre', in art. 'Qumrân', *DBSup* 9: 919–31.
- Dimant, Devorah 1984 'Qumran Sectarian Literature', in M.E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (Assen: Van Gorcum): 483–550.
- 1994 'A Synoptic Comparison of Parallel Sections in 4Q491 11 and 4Q471B', *JQR* 85: 157–61.
- Eshel, Esther 1999 'The Identification of the "Speaker" of the Self-Glorification Hymn', in Parry and Ulrich (eds.): 619–36.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H.T. 2002 *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ, 42; Leiden: Brill).
- García-Martínez, Florentino 2002 'Old Texts and Modern Mirages: The "I" of Two Qumran Hymns', *ETL* 78: 321–39.
- Knohl, Israel 2000 *The Messiah before Jesus* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Lyons, William J. 1996 'Possessing the Land: The Qumran Sect and the Eschatological Victory', *DSD* 3: 131–51.
- 1999 'Clarifications Concerning 4Q285 and 11Q14 Arising from Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 23', *DSD* 6: 37–43.
- Nitzan, Bilha 1993 'Benedictions and Instructions for the Eschatological Community (11QBer; 4Q285)', *RevQ* 16: 77–90.
- Norton, Jonathan 2003 'Observations on the Official Material Reconstruction of *Sefer ha-Milhamah* (11Q14 and 4Q285)', *RevQ* 21: 3–28.
- O'Neill, John C. 2000 "'Who is Comparable to Me in My Glory?'" 4Q491 Fragment 11 (4Q491c) and the New Testament', *NovT* 42: 24–38.
- Smith, Morton 1990 'Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM^a', in Schiffman (ed.): 181–88.
- 1992 'Two Ascended to Heaven—Jesus and the Author of 4Q491', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Doubleday): 290–301.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. 2000 'Working with few Data: The Relation between 4Q285 and 11Q14', *DSD* 7: 49–55.
- Wise, Michael O. 1999 *The First Messiah: Investigating the Savior before Jesus* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco).
- 2000 'מי כמוני באל'מי—A Study of 4Q491c, 4Q471b, 4Q427 7 and 1QH^a 25:35–26:10', *DSD* 7: 173–219.

3.1. The Problem

The textual evidences described in the previous chapters are witnesses to several different War Texts from the Qumran library, not necessarily stemming from a single matrix. Moreover, these texts are likely to be copies rather than originals. On the basis of this material, different views about the origin, literary history and function of these compositions have been suggested. All of them take 1QM as their starting point, since this manuscript is the only one to preserve an almost continuous text of a significant length. Among the questions addressed are the following: Is 1QM a unified composition, written by a single author, but using sources? Or, on the other hand, is it a late version of a work edited several times by different people? In what context was it conceived? For what purpose and use? Was it modelled after a known genre or is it a literary innovation? As one may expect in similar cases, no clear consensus has been achieved yet on these problems. This chapter reviews the most significant aspects of the debate, focusing especially on the kind of arguments used by scholars to support their views.

3.2. Internal Evidence in 1QM

In his very short presentation of 1QM, Sukenik (1955: 36) summarizes the contents of the scroll without raising the question of its composition; he apparently considers it as a single work. The unity of 1QM is also assumed by his son, Yigael Yadin, who took over the preparation of a full-scale commentary of this text after Sukenik's death. In his work, Yadin repeatedly speaks about 'the author' of the scroll (1962: 3, 6, 14–17, 243). But he also makes it clear that the contents of 1QM have been arranged

into four parts: the 'War Series' (1.1–2.14), the 'Battle Series' (2.1–9.16), the 'Ritual Serekh Series' (9.17–14.15) and the 'Kittim Series' (14.16–19.13). For each, the author would have used various 'sources' (1962: 7–17), reworked and arranged according to his overall purpose.

In his commentary on 1QM, Jean Carmignac (1958b: XI–XIV) stresses even more clearly the unity of the text: according to him, the author (none other than the Teacher of Righteousness, the leader of the Essenes) planned his work with precision, arranging in sequence chapters dealing with trumpets, standards, etc. However, Carmignac argues, the author follows a 'logic' which is not ours; for instance, he deals twice with the phases of the battle, drawing attention first to the trumpet signals (1QM 8 and 9.1–9), and then to the appropriate speeches (16–17). In spite of this, the unity of style is striking and suggests that the whole has been penned by a single person (Carmignac 1958b: XI–XII and n. 1).

But scholars have usually put more weight on the repetitions and discrepancies found in the different parts of 1QM. An obvious case of repetition is the presence of the same hymn in 12.8–16 and 19.1–8, with only minor variations. There seems to be a strong discrepancy between cols. 1 and 15–19, on the one hand, where the war against the Kittim and their allies takes place on one day, and col. 2, on the other hand, where a period of 40 years of war against all the nations of the world is anticipated. Trumpets are mentioned in different places of the scroll (2.16–3.11; 7.9–9.9; 14.3–18.6), but their number and names are not consistent. Precise rules are provided for the horsemen and their mounts (6.8–18), and they are expected to take part in the operations, especially in the pursuit (9.5); but they are not mentioned in the description of the war itself (15–19).

Different solutions have been offered to explain these and other anomalies. One is to view the last columns of 1QM as a supplement to the previous ones. On the basis of the repetition found in cols. 15–19, André Dupont-Sommer (1961: 166) considers this part of the document as an annexe to a main work consisting of an introduction (col. 1) and a principal rule (cols. 2–14); the 'annexe', in his view, 'is another recension, probably written by a different author' (see also Gaster 1976). A slightly different position is adopted by Chaim Rabin (1961). He also takes the repetitions as an indication of the composite character of 1QM; but he also notices that the reconstructed text of 1QM 15.4–6 provides the name of two books, namely a 'Book of the Rule of his Time' and a 'Book of the War'. According to Rabin, these writings are found in the earlier parts of the document, in reverse order: the 'Book of the War' extends from col. 1.1 to 9.16 and is immediately followed by the 'Book of God's Time' (from the end of col. 9 to 14.15). The last part of 1QM (from 14.16 to the end), for which Rabin suggests the name 'Book of Victory', would have been written

to amplify the preceding ones, as demonstrated by its use and expansions of several passages. In a similar fashion, Matthias Krieg (1985) views 1QM as made of three blocks (1; 2–14; 15–19), the last one being a late ‘Kultdrama’ used to enact the eschatological war in a ritual context.

In contrast, other students of 1QM view cols. 1 and 15–19 as the earliest parts of the scroll. In the introduction to his commentary, J.P.M. van der Ploeg (1959b: 7–22) draws attention to the tension between the 40 years of war anticipated in col. 2 and the single battle against the Kittim and their allies described in the rest of the scroll. He also notices many other tensions between the sections on organization and tactics (cols. 1.end–9.bottom) and those of the war against the Kittim (cols. 14.end–20.?). Comparing the parallel descriptions of manoeuvres found in cols. 8 and 16, van der Ploeg observes that the former is more elaborated than the latter; this could be the mark of a secondary development. These and other elements could be explained if a ‘primitive writing’ about the preparation, prayers and unfolding of the final battle against the Kittim had been filled with military details by a second writer, also responsible for the idea of a 40-year war. This writing would have consisted of the general introduction (col. 1 or part of it), the setting of the camp (15.1–3), the prayer of the chief priest (15.4–5 and the corresponding text found in cols. 10–12 or part of it), the priest’s speech before battle (15.6–16.1), and the following thanksgiving hymns (18.5–19.13). In van der Ploeg’s view, this apocalyptic writing would have been greatly enlarged by a second writer who would have turned it to a more technical rule.

The problem of the literary growth of 1QM is also addressed in a few chapters of the important study of the traditions about dualism in the Qumran texts by Peter von der Osten-Sacken (1969: 29–115). Osten-Sacken considers 1QM 1 as one of the earliest expressions of such a dualism in the Qumran scrolls. This column would derive from a combination of the topic of the end-time found in Dan. 11.40–45 with other biblical traditions about the Day of the Lord (Isa. 2.12; Amos 5.18, etc.) and about the Holy War (Josh. 6; 1 Sam. 4; etc.; 1969: 29–41). Taking up some of the observations already made by Jürgen Becker (1964: 43–50), Osten-Sacken then argues that 1QM 1.11–15 provides the framework according to which the eschatological battle is narrated in 1QM 15–19. In this part of 1QM, each engagement follows an almost identical pattern, which is also found in 1QM 7.1–9.9 and 14.2–18, a parallel war rule with a softer eschatological tone. These rules also share an overall structure which has its closest similarities in the books of Maccabees.¹ On

1. On the similarities between 1QM and the military practices of the Maccabees, see below, 4.6, pp. 81–83.

the basis of the scenario sketched in 1QM 1, the forerunners of the Qumran sect would have used these conventional elements to elaborate their own interpretation of the war against Israel's enemies as a Holy War of the end-time (Osten-Sacken 1969: 42–72). Osten-Sacken considers cols. 2–6 as later additions (1969: 50–51), as are a few passages which reflect sectarian and ethical developments in cols. 15–19 (1969: 88–115).

In an extensive study devoted exclusively to the structure and redactional history of 1QM, Philip Davies (1977) holds a quite different view. According to him, 1QM 1 'is largely redactional, and represents the latest stage in the development of 1QM' (1977: 21). Davies, like Rabin, takes 1QM 15.4–6 as a serious indication that different books have been incorporated in this composition. One of these books consists of cols. 2–9, 'a manual for the final war of Israel and the nations' (1977: 24) compiled from several sources assembled together through a series of headings (2.16; 3.13; 4.9; 9.10). The sources identified by Davies, sometimes tentatively, are the following: *details of Temple service* (2.1–6—'tentative'); *lists of trumpets* (2.16–3.11) and *banners* (3.13–4.end) *with inscriptions* (these lists contain slight discrepancies and are attributed to various hands from the same circles); *a military manual dealing with formations and manoeuvres* (5.3–4a,16-end; 6.8–11a; 9.10-end); *a description of weapons*, real or imaginary (5.4b–14); *a fragment of a description of a pitched battle* (5.end–6.6); *miscellaneous laws*, based on the Old Testament and possibly reflecting Jewish military practice (6.11b–7.7; perhaps from more than one source); *a priests' rule for battle* showing correct procedure before and after the fighting (7.9–9.9). This manual 'concentrates on the military aspects of the war, and does not deal, unless incidentally, with liturgy' (1977: 46–47).

Another fairly homogeneous ensemble is made up of cols. 15–19. But, Davies claims, its present state 'has been arrived at only through a fairly long process of development', as demonstrated by the survival in 1QM 14 of a fragment from an earlier recension (1977: 68). Davies examines successively the various components of 1QM 15–19. The *battle narratives* (1QM 16.3b–9; 17.10–15; 18.3b–5a), when compared with those found in 1QM 7.9–9.9, show similarities as well as differences; a likely explanation is that both documents go back to a common original which they developed in two independent ways (1977: 78). The *liturgical passages* (1QM 15.7b–16.1; 16.15b–17.9; 18.6b–19.8) are composed of two speeches and a hymn. Both speeches have an ethical and cosmic tone; but a strong dualistic dimension is added in the later. The hymn betrays a literary history of its own: an earlier 'thanksgiving for the destruction of the enemy' (1QM 18.6b–9) has been 'amended to a request for God to act, [...] reinforced by the addition of two originally independent hymns'

(1QM 18.end–19.2a and 2b–8; 1977: 82). The *framework* (1QM 15.2b–7a; 16.3a, 11–15a; 17.16–18.3a; 18.5b, 6a; 19.10–end) introduces several important features: a battle in seven stages, casualties, a final act of God, interventions of the chief priest and his subordinates, and probably the Kittim as the enemy; it also ‘casts over the whole document a formally dualistic light’ (1977: 83).

The material found in 1QM 10–14 (or perhaps only in 10–12) may be the liturgical book to which 1QM 15.5 referred as containing the ‘prayer of the appointed time for wa[r]’. But, at first glance, there is no coherent structure in it: ‘We have merely a series of hymns and prayers, of which most, but not all, deal with war in some way’ (1977: 91). According to Davies’s analysis, 1QM 10–12 contains no fewer than eight different hymns with various subject matters and forms (10.1–8a, 8b–16; 10.17–11.7a; 11.7b–12, 13–end; 12.1–5, 7–10a, 10b–16a). 1QM 13 is a complex arrangement of three different sections which have tensions between them (1–6, 7–13a, 13b–16; see also Duhaime 1977). 1QM 14 appears as an independent unit, already discussed in connection with 1QM 15–19.

In Davies’s view, these various components have been tied together, finally, by 1QM 1, an introduction which ‘enables us to see the meaning of the War Scroll taken as a whole’ (1977: 113). It comprises three sections. In the description of the first stage of the final war (1.1–3a), the lists of opponents include both general terms (Sons of Darkness, army of Belial) and specific names (Edom and Moab, the Ammonites, etc.); this combination is understood as a means used by the redactor to merge the enemies mentioned in 1QM 2–9 (various nations) with those found in 1QM 15–19 (the army of Belial). The second stage of the war, 1QM 1.3b–9a according to Davies’s division, corresponds to the battle described in 1QM 15–19 which ‘will bring about the final defeat of the Kittim’ (1977: 115); lines 8–9a, implying that ‘after the extermination of Belial, the time allotted to darkness has still to run until the ends of the world are filled with light’, are read as a reference ‘to the campaigns outlined in col. 2, in which the whole world is gradually conquered’ (1977: 119). This reconciles 1QM 2–9 and 15–19 and brings the summary of the final war to its end. The last section of the col. (1.9b–end) offers an overview of the Kittim war, which will be detailed in 15–19, making the connection with the account of the war against the nations which follows in col. 2 (1977: 120). Davies wonders if ‘any detailed description of the wars against the nations’ was to be found after 1QM 20, but judges it as unnecessary, since ‘the climax of the war is effectively reached’ with the defeat of the Kittim and the forces of Belial (1977: 121).

3.3. Evidence from Cave 4

A close comparison with the recensions of the War Texts found in Cave 4 also contributes to a demonstration that 1QM is the product of a complex redactional process. In his discussion of 1QM 2.1–6a, Davies (1977: 26 n. 6) observes that the chief priest is mentioned only here in 1QM 2–9 and his role is confined to the cult, whereas in 1QM 15–19, he reads prayers and delivers speeches to the troops before their engagement. Davies also explains the prominent part played by the laymen in the cult as the result of ‘some revision’ (1977: 27). The parallel text of 4Q471 War Scroll-like Text B frg. 1, which was not available to Davies, provides a striking confirmation of these remarks. As indicated above, this text precisely lacks the mention of the chief priest and his deputy and has no instructions for laymen to attend to the cult. On the basis of a careful comparison between the two texts, the editors of 4Q471 concluded that this earlier text has been expanded by the redactor of 1QM 2 (E. Eshel and H. Eshel 1992; 2000: 357–62; E. Eshel and H. Eshel in Pfann *et al.* 2000: 439).

The prayer of 4QM491a M^{a/a} frgs. 8–10 i is also shorter than the similar one found in 1QM 14.3–18. In his preliminary edition of these fragments, Hunzinger (1957) made a detailed study of the variations between the two texts. Besides orthographic and grammatical changes, which do not alter the meaning, there are eight cases where 1QM has a longer text against only one where it is shorter by a single letter (a *waw*—4QM^{a/a} frgs. 8–10 col. 1.3). Sometimes, the additions found in 1QM change the form of the hymn and break the parallelism found in 4QM^{a/a}. Many of these additions (here in italics) point towards the same tendency to qualify the notion of ‘people of God’ and to narrow it to a specific group, a ‘remnant’. The God of Israel is blessed as the one ‘who keeps mercy for his covenant and testimonies of deliverance for the people *whom he redeems*’ (14.4–5) and as the one who keeps ‘*the covenant for our fathers*’ (14.8) in the current generations: ‘*With all our generations*, You have shown through wonders your mercy for *the remna[nt of your inheritance]* during the dominion of Belial’ (14.9). Those who sing this hymn claim precisely to be ‘*the remna[nt of your people]*’ (14.8), ‘your *holy people*’, (14.12). In Hunzinger’s judgement, the additions of 1QM 14 demonstrate that ‘an older text, which originated outside Qumran, has been reworked according to the theology of the sect’ (1957: 149–50). Carmignac (1958b: 270–72) has raised a few objections to the chronological priority of these fragments of 4QM^{a/a} in relation to 1QM, mainly on the ground that in most cases, the longer text of 1QM may be based on biblical phrases; he nevertheless grants that these could have been inserted into the shorter text of 4QM^{a/a}.

A section of the narrative about the war against the Kittim found in 4Q491a M^{a/a} frg. 11 col. 2.8–24 may also be interpreted as a witness to an earlier stage in the composition of a similar passage in 1QM, as I have argued in a study of this text (Duhaime 1987: 46–51). A blank space separates this section of the text from the previous one. The text itself falls into three units. First, a rubric specifies that when there are casualties among the skirmishers engaged in combat, a new line is called to replace them (lines 8–12a); the chief priest addresses the reserve fighters to strengthen their hands (lines 12b–18); technical details about the operation itself conclude the development (lines 19–24). The text of the first part is duplicated almost exactly in 1QM 16.11–14; the only significant addition is the specification that the trumpets to be blown to call upon the reserve are the ‘trumpets of summoning’ (16.12). The instructions following the speech also have obvious similarities with the more detailed ones in 1QM 17.10–15. The real difference lies in the speech of the chief priest, which is much more elaborate in 1QM 16.15–17.9. The first part of the speech (16.15–17.3), containing a mention of the episode of ‘*the bloodshed [of Nadab] and Ab[i]hu*’, as well as God’s covenant with ‘*[Eleazar] and Ithamar*’, is completely lacking in 4QM^{a/a}. The second part (1QM 17.4–9) shares 17 terms in common with 4QM^{a/a} frg. 11 col. 2.12b–18, but shows five cases of transformation, four of which could be understood as a reinterpretation by 1QM of the fragmentary speech of 4QM^{a/a}. Hence, instead of a simple reference to ‘his (= God’s) redemptive help’ (4QM^{a/a} frg. 11 col. 2.14), one finds the statement that ‘*he has sent an everlasting help to the lot whom he has [re]deemed*’ (1QM 16.6), a way to introduce the archangel Michael, the leader of the hosts of heaven. Belial, the supernatural head of evil forces, is mentioned only by name in 4QM^{a/a} frg. 11 col. 2.18; this appears to have been transformed in the more elaborate expression ‘*commander of the dominion of wickedness*’ (1QM 17.5–6), etc. This part of the exhortation of the chief priest in 1QM (lines 4–9), in my view, is ‘better understood as a deliberate rewriting and replacement’ of the text witnessed by 4QM^{a/a} frg. 11 col. 2.12b–18 (Duhaime 1987: 51), in order to put it more clearly in the context of a sectarian dualism with cosmic and ethical dimensions. The reference to the opposite fates of the Sons of Aaron could also have been added as an illustration of the uncompromising commitment required by the present situation.

A slightly different picture emerges from a comparison between 4Q491b M^{a/b} frgs. 1–3 and a few parallel passages in 1QM (Duhaime 1990). The speech about the ‘princes’ of the congregation found in the first section of this (lines 1–5) has no clear connection with 1QM. A few units of the set of rules that follows (lines 6–20) have their counterparts in

1QM. The text of lines 6b-10, particularly, provides indications about purity in the camps and exclusion from the fighting troops, as does 1QM 7.3b-7. 4QM^{a/b} prohibits something to the woman, the young boy and the 'man stric[ken by an impurity of his flesh]', perhaps to approach '[the li]ne'; similar instructions are given about craftsmen, smelters and a third category of people (lines 6-7). The first two elements of the list appear in 1QM 7.3b-5a, but in reverse order ('*young boy and woman*'), and with the instruction that they shall not '*enter their camps when they (the troops) leave Jerusalem to go to battle until their return*'. As 4QM^{a/b}, 1QM mentions the '*man stricken by an impurity of his flesh*', but enumerates also *the lame, the blind, the crippled, and the man with a permanent blemish*, who are not allowed to '*go to battle*'. Conversely, the last three groups found in 4QM^{a/b} do not show up in 1QM. These similarities and differences are better explained if two scribes are using a common source; the purity requirements are interpreted in a practical way in 4QM^{a/b}, whereas they apparently receive a sharper and more extended application in 1QM. The same tendencies can be observed with regard to the 'place of the hand' (4QM^{a/b} frgs. 1-3 lines 7b-8 and 1QM 7.6b-7), and to the man who is not purified from a bodily discharge (4QM^{a/b} frgs. 1-3 line 10b and 1QM 7.5b-6a). The other rules found in 4QM^{a/b} frgs. 1-3 deal with the formation and movement of the troops (lines 11-17a), as well as with the vestments of the priests who direct them (lines 17b-18); where a comparison with 1QM is possible, similarities and differences occur in these cases as well, suggesting again that a common source, used independently, is being reworked more rigorously in 1QM than in 4QM^{a/b}. The observations, which point to a complex relationship between the two texts, would be compatible with the hypothesis that 1QM belongs to a rather late stage in an interpretative process of war traditions.

As part of a recent study of the recensions of the War Scroll, Esther and Hanan Eshel (2000) have made a comparative analysis of a few lines of the three versions of the prayer found in 1QM 12.7-16; 19.1-8 and 4Q492 M^b fig. 1. This hymn celebrates the presence of 'the glorious king' and his 'holy ones' in the midst of 'our numbered men'. It urges God to arise and to smite his foes and to fill the land with his glory. Zion and the other 'daughters of my people' are invited to rejoice and Israel is promised to 'reign for ever'. The text is preserved almost completely in 1QM 12, but only partially in the two other locations. On the basis of their examination, E. Eshel and H. Eshel consider the prayer of 4QM^b as 'identical with 1QM 19, whereas additions and changes are found in col. 12' (2000: 352). One of these is the transformation of the phrase 'gold in your palaces', reconstructed in 4QM^b fig. 1 5, into '*silver, gold and precious stones in your palaces*' in 1QM 12.12-13. The phrase 'Zion

rejoice greatly', found in all three versions, is followed by an additional phrase, '*O Jerusalem, show yourself amidst jubilation*', only in 1QM 12.13 and is totally absent from both 1QM 19 and 4QM^b. Another prayer probably followed this one in 1QM 12, whereas 1QM 19 and 4QM^b have the same indications for a gathering on the battlefield in the morning after a night of rest in the camp. E. Eshel and H. Eshel (2000: 354) note that 'col. 19 was found separated from the rest of the scroll and forms a separate sheet', even if its script 'seems to be identical' to that of col. 12. Instead of assuming that the same hymn was 'unintentionally inserted twice' in 1QM, they consider it 'more reasonable to conclude that we have here two different recensions of the War Scroll: one is found in col. 12 of 1QM and the other is represented in both 1QM col. 19 and 4QM^b'. The scribe of 1QM would perhaps have used the earlier copy (col. 19) 'when he revised his edition of the War Scroll'. This conclusion may be challenged for two reasons. One is that even if the two texts of 1QM 19 and 4QM^b are very close, they are not mere copies of one another; the first is probably a little longer than the second, as observed by Baillet (1982: 47–49; see above). It seems also quite an unusual practice for a scribe to preserve an earlier copy together with a revised text, but separated from it. An alternative view is to consider that the presence of two different forms of this text in 1QM is deliberate, even if its function remains elusive. The comparative study of these three witnesses provides, nevertheless, another confirmation that 1QM is the product of a redactional process which involved the reworking of earlier sources.

3.4. The Literary Genre of 1QM

In spite of the indications that 1QM has some sort of a literary history, the whole text, in its final shape, was probably intended as a rather coherent document, assembled according to accepted conventions and modelled after one of the genres available in the cultural environment of its redactor(s). For the Qumranites, it probably belonged to the general category of 'rule' (*serek*). In modern times, 1QM has often been associated with the apocalyptic literature, mainly in the first decades of Dead Sea Scrolls studies. A few interpreters rather see it as a sectarian liturgy. It has also been suggested that its contents and basic patterns might have been partially derived from Maccabaeal or Graeco-Roman military manuals.

The title of the War Text from Cave 1 is probably lost in a lacuna at its very beginning (1QM 1.1). Following Milik (1955: 598), Carmignac restores it as 'To/From the Wise, rule of the war' (1958b: 1), whereas Yadin prefers 'Th[is the book of the disposition of] the war' (1962: 257–

58). These reconstructions are based on a similar use of the word 'rule' or 'disposition' (*serek*) in the *Rule of the Community* (1QS 1.1; 5.1; 6.8) and the *Rule of the Congregation* (1Q28a or 1QSa 1.1, 6). The title '[Ru]le of the community and of [...]' appeared on the outside of the scroll containing these two documents and a third one, the *Words of Blessings* (1Q28b or 1Qsb), which was also given the name *Rule of Benedictions* even if the word *serek* is not used in it. This term is found many times in 1QM, where it refers, among other things, to instructions about specific items such as the standards (3.12; 4.9) and the arrangement and manoeuvres of fighting battalions (5.3; 9.9). Sets of rules are introduced in the same way in the *Damascus Document* (CD 10.4; 12.19, 22; 13.7; 14.3, 12).

The *Rule of the Community* and the *Damascus Document* are basically 'collections of various rules, regulations and religious instructions' concerning 'the actual life' of a sectarian community (Dimant 1984: 489–90); they have affinities with documents outlining the organization and rules of Graeco-Roman guilds (Larson 2000). The religious instructions which they include make them even closer to the early Church orders such as the *Didache* and the *Apostolic Constitutions* (Alexander 2000: 803). The exact function of these rules in the groups that compiled and transmitted them is still a matter of debate. Since different recensions continued to be copied and circulated simultaneously, it is likely that they were not considered exclusive and authoritative documents; they were rather resources which could be used by those in charge of these groups for various purposes related to their organization, the selection and integration of their members, the teaching of their essential doctrines, the preparation of their distinctive ceremonies, the making of their halakhic decisions, etc. (Metso 1997, 1999, 2000).

The *Rule of the Congregation* and 1QM embody the same kind of material, but within an eschatological context. The purpose of the latter was, according to Yadin (1962: 15), to provide 'a guide for the problems of the long-predicted war' which was about to take place. In Alexander's view, the spiritual leader of the sect, the *maskil*, 'was entrusted with the safekeeping of the book, with studying and teaching its contents, and with ensuring that it is implemented when the time comes' (2000: 802). The numerous copies of the text are interpreted as an indication that 'the members of the sect presumably took it literally and studied it as a manual to train themselves' (2000: 803).

Several commentators, especially earlier ones, do not consider 1QM as a 'rule' in the strict sense of the word; they rather link it with the apocalyptic literature, on the basis of its contents, sources, style and setting (see Duhaime 1984). Henri Michaud (1955) introduces the document as

a new apocalypse and constantly refers to it as such. The contents of the scroll apparently suggested this label: Michaud explains that col. 1 opens with a short historical recollection, as is the case in apocalyptic literature, and then describes a truly 'apocalyptic scene' of fight between heavenly hosts. The end-time is indeed envisioned as a war which has many 'apocalyptic' features: it will take place at the time appointed by God long ago; it will extend to the whole world and will be particularly violent, involving both men and angels belonging to the opposed forces of light and darkness. Yadin (1962: 14) also points to passages from 'the apocalyptic and eschatological parts of the Bible and of pseudepigraphic literature' as the main sources of this War Text: one has in mind especially the book of Daniel, chs. 38–39 of the book of Ezekiel, etc. Mathias Delcor (1974: 107) draws attention to the taste of the Qumranites for revelations and visions which resulted in the production of new apocalyptic works, among which he lists 1QM as the most important. 1QM also shares with the apocalyptic literature a preference for symbolic language, exuberant descriptions and larger-than-life events. Finally, this text and other related documents are likely to originate, as many apocalyptic works do, 'from men who lived in critical days [...] and who fiercely cherished hopes for imminent triumph' (Rowley 1957: 24).

This position has generally given way to a more nuanced assessment of the apocalyptic character of 1QM. Delcor himself, in his contribution on this writing for the *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, states that it is not a real apocalypse, since it lacks the revelatory element which defines this literary genre (Delcor 1978: 929). Delcor echoes here a view expressed 20 years earlier by Carmignac (1958b: XII) and shared by scholars who insist on restricting the term 'apocalypse' to 'a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality' (Collins 1979a: 9), relating either to 'the unfolding of history over several epochs' or to 'the mysteries of the heavenly world' (Collins 1997: 3). It usually culminates in the events of the end-time: the final destruction of evil and the radical transformation of the world. These events are part of the 'apocalyptic worldview' which can be found in works which are not presented as revelations through the mediation of a heavenly being and, therefore, do not have the formal characteristics of the genre. Yadin observes that this is precisely the case with 1QM: 'revelations and visions [...] appear solely in this scroll as a background and starting point for explaining the course of the war and for determining the methods of administration and warfare' (1962: 15). For this reason, as Rowland puts it, this work 'is related to the apocalypses', but 'can hardly justify the label' (1982: 42). Collins also concludes that the very subject of 1QM

'presupposes the typical apocalyptic view of history moving towards a crisis, which will be the occasion of divine intervention', even if the literary genre of the document is 'a rule book and not a revelation' (1997: 10).

Stressing the ritual elements of 1QM, a few authors prefer to understand this text as a liturgy for the holy war (Carmignac 1958b: XI-XII). In Carmignac's opinion, the writer builds his work as a curious dream mixing 'true utopia' and 'false realism': the troops are moving to the sound of trumpets, as if the battle was a liturgical event; most of the rules are based on biblical prescriptions and are to be observed carefully in order to prevent any offence against God or the angels; prayers repeatedly celebrate God's power and sanctity, whereas speeches boost the courage of the fighters, giving them the assurance of God's triumph. Robert North suggests something similar in his review of Yadin's commentary. He notices that the second half of 1QM (cols. 10-19) is a liturgy and that even the first half contains 'extensive rubrical passages' (especially cols. 3 and 7-8), which could be interpreted as the 'sacristan's manual for preparing paraphernalia'; the whole work would perhaps qualify as 'allegorical-dramatic-liturgical' composition, having its setting in the ritual rather than on the battlefield (North 1958: 84-85). Similarly, Eduard Nielsen (1961) asks whether the military rhetoric of this text could be simply a symbolic way, in a liturgical context, to talk about the religious life of the members of the Qumran community.

The liturgical dimension of 1QM has also been explored by Matthias Krieg, especially for cols. 15-19. These columns are interpreted as part of a cultic drama combining the scenario of 1QM 1.11-17, ritual elements borrowed from Num. 10.1-10, and parts of the speeches and prayers found in Deuteronomy 31-32. These were arranged in a symbolic representation of the eschatological war and of the definitive conquest of the land by the true Israel (Krieg 1985: 11). It was perhaps used as the basic script for a celebration of the covenant taking place in the sect every seventh year (cf. Deut. 31.9-13); whether it was simply read or really performed cannot be determined (Krieg 1985: 23-24). It constitutes the latest piece of a composition which already consisted of an older 'fable' (col. 1) already expanded into a 'rule' (cols. 2-9). Krieg believes that the whole document was completed by the Qumranites during the Roman period, perhaps under the influence of mystery cults flourishing at that time. The drama would have provided the sectarians with a kind of cultic realization of their eschatological expectations, in spite of their denial in the current reality. Krieg's proposal goes a little further than the rather vague observations made by Carmignac, North and Nielsen; but it would still need a more substantial demonstration and a comparison with similar

material to be really convincing. Apparently not aware of Krieg's work, John Zhu-En Wee (2003) has also recently argued that cols. 15–19 are 'a later version' of cols. 10–14 and 'were intended as a literary-liturgical work' possibly used 'as part of the regular ritual at Qumran' (2003: 283).

Yadin's commentary on 1QM rests on the assumption that the whole book is an authentic military manual, even if one of a special kind: 'The main purpose of the scroll', he argues, 'seems to consist in supplying the members of the sect with a detailed set of regulations and plans in accordance with which they were to act on the day of destiny appointed "from of old for a battle of annihilation of the Sons of Darkness"' (1962: 4). In order to do so, the author draws on various sources, including military ones. Yadin suggests that the lacuna in the text of 1QM 15.5–6 may be filled so as to read: '[...] he shall array all the formations, as writ[ten in the Book of Wa]r', which would then be 'a reference to a book of general military rules' (1962: 16), now lost. In his commentary, Yadin regularly mentions parallels from the books of the Maccabees, from Josephus, and from various Graeco-Roman works, namely those of Polybius and Vegetius; but he does not otherwise sustain his claim that 1QM is a military manual. A more precise statement is found in an article by K.M.T. Atkinson, who observes that the author of this scroll 'has drawn largely upon *Greek* tactical manuals of the kind which began to be produced from the end of the fifth century BCE, under the influence of the Athenian sophists and of Socrates' (1957–58: 291). Atkinson briefly identifies a few similarities between the general arrangement and the contents of 1QM and those found in an ancient tactical treatise by Asclepiodotus (1957–58: 293–97), but he does not conduct a systematic comparison of the two documents.

I have attempted to fill this gap by investigating the literary genre of the Graeco-Roman tactical treatise and the possible relation between 1QM and this particular type of military manual (Duhaime 1988). Three of them, written by Asclepiodotus, Aelian and Arrian between the first century BCE and the second century CE, have been preserved in medieval manuscripts.² The tactical treatises are collections of military rules dealing with the organization and equipment of the army, its various movements and the commands to be issued by the officers in charge. These matters were considered worthy of study not only in military but also in philosophical circles. All three authors of the surviving tactical treatises claim to be philosophers, and they probably transmit a similar tradition

2. Critical editions and translations of these treatises are found in Devine 1989; Kiechle 1964; Köchly and Rüstow 1969; C.H. Oldfather and W.H. Oldfather 1948; Poznanski 1992; Roos and Wirth 1967; Voto 1993.

which may go back, at least, to a lost treatise composed by Polybius in the second century BCE (Devine 1993: 333–34). In the days of Asclepiodotus (first century BCE), the fame of the Greek army belonged to the past; its military organization and strategy had more historical and philosophical interest than practical relevance. In his own version of the treatise (written between 106 and 113 CE), Aelian demonstrates more familiarity with mathematics than with military skills. Of the three writers, only the last, Arrian (c. 136–37 CE), had served in an army and could refer to his own experience either to exemplify or to update the traditional material.

The contents of the treatises are usually separated by headings and arranged in what appears to have been a conventional sequence (see Devine 1993: 319–20). The purpose of the book, the intended audience and the history of the discipline are stated in the preface or introduction (preserved only in Aelian's work). The treatise itself opens with a general view of the various branches of the army, followed by the identification of the land forces as the specific object of study. These are described in terms of their various equipment, their formations and uses in battle; a clear distinction is made between heavy and light infantry, targeteers, cavalry, etc.; the use of chariots and elephants is also discussed. Finally, the various movements of the troops on the battlefield and their formations for marching are explained, as is the proper manner to issue efficient commands for all these. In addition to the Hellenistic material found in all three, Arrian has deliberately supplemented his work with a long development about the exercises of the Roman cavalry of his days (32.3–44.3). Moreover, in a few manuscripts (particularly in the important Codex Laurentianus graecus 55.4, copied in the tenth century), this addition is followed by an 'Order of Battle against the Alani'.³ This short, self-contained piece, probably modelled after a similar section of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* (Bosworth 1993: 265), provides a series of instructions for an anticipated battle against the Alani invaders who were threatening the Cappadocian border. The document sets the initial disposition of all units and prescribes their movements as the battle unfolds until its successful completion, demonstrating how an ideal commander (as Arrian wishes to portray himself) has a perceptive vision of all possibilities and plans a winning strategy (Bosworth 1993: 272). It has been argued that the actual position of the Order at the end of the military manual is genuine and that Arrian added it to provide a vivid illustration of the techniques exposed in his adaptation of the traditional tactical treatise (Stadter 1978: 119).

There are similarities between 1QM and these three Graeco-Roman

3. See Bosworth 1993: 264–72; Dent 1974.

tactical treatises. The most striking parallel is found in the general arrangement of the first part, dealing with organization and tactics (cols. 1.end–9.bottom): the sections of the scroll, generally delineated with headings like those of Asclepiodotus's manual, discuss the divisions of the troops, their different categories, and the proper equipment for each. The scroll distinguishes, as the Graeco-Roman treatises do, between infantry, heavy and light, and cavalry; in both types of documents, the last rules are those explaining how to issue commands and perform various tactical manoeuvres. When compared with the actual sequence of the material in Arrian's version of the tactical treatise, the presence of war prayers in the second part of the scroll (cols. 9.end–14.bottom) and of the description of the war against the Kittim in the third (cols. 14.end–20.?) could be viewed as the result of a compilation. On the basis of these kinds of similarities, people familiar with tactical treatises would probably have identified 1QM as one of them, although of a special kind. Those who transmitted these treatises had some freedom to adapt them to their own needs and purposes; the war material from Qumran could similarly have been transmitted in various recensions and have served various purposes, as indicated by the diversity of the manuscripts found in the caves.

1QM also has, however, a few specific characteristics which differentiate it from the Graeco-Roman works. The overwhelming religious component of the document is unique and points to its setting in a priestly milieu. But the very fact that philosophers or mathematicians could have an interest in military strategy makes it all the more likely for Jewish priests to study the topic: after all, priests always had a very important role in military campaigns. The other particular feature of 1QM is its eschatological tone: what the troops are to be prepared for is the war of the end-time, one that they will fight along with supernatural forces and which will bring about the final reign of God and his elect. These elements make the War Scroll from Qumran, as it now stands, a document with a religious and utopian character completely lacking in its Graeco-Roman counterparts. This does not mean that it is entirely devoid of any authentic military material, especially in its first part. It simply indicates that the basic preoccupation of this composition, as found in Cave 1, is not about strategic matters, but religious ones.

The purposes and function of the Qumran War Texts may have changed with their different recensions, their various stages of redaction, and the contexts in which they were used. Despite the utopian character of the recension represented by 1QM, one cannot completely rule out the possibility that its material, or at least part of it, was once used by priests standing alongside real troops and trying to determine how they should be prepared and motivated according to the Torah requirements for military

operations interpreted as holy war. But the priests play such a pre-eminent role in the scroll that they apparently take precedence over the civilian authorities; this suggests that the document was perhaps meant as a claim by a particularly orthodox group of religious leaders to oppose what they considered an inappropriate way for civilian authorities of their days to conduct war. However, in the context of the Qumran community, a sectarian religious group apparently devoid of any military power and remote from the battlefield, the most likely function of this utopian tactical treatise was to support its members in the belief that they would soon be joined by the heavenly hosts for the war of the end-time, resulting in the annihilation of the forces of evil and the definitive restoration of peace and blessing in their land and in the whole world.

3.5. Summary

The internal evidence from 1QM suggests that this work has probably achieved its actual form through some kind of literary growth. Tensions and duplications between the main parts of the document (cols. 1; 2–9; 10–14; 15–19) indicate that these could have developed separately before being brought together by a redactor who eventually adjusted them, but only up to a certain point. There are also clues that some parts of the document (especially 2–9 and 10–14) are not homogeneous and integrate diverse elements which could have been circulated independently, perhaps in various forms. Osten-Sacken, Davies and others generally acknowledge these problems, but propose very different and sometimes opposite solutions to them. The precise history of this composition, then, still remains to be clarified.

A systematic comparison between 1QM and the various recensions of the War Text from Cave 4 is not available yet. From the five cases studied above, however, one can draw a few conclusions. In almost every instance, the manuscripts from Cave 4 provide a text shorter and probably earlier than their parallels in 1QM. In one case, it seems that a text found in Cave 4 (4Q492 M^b frg. 1) has even been expanded twice, both versions having found their way into 1QM (12.7–16; 19.1–8). But the situation is more complex for 1QM 16.11–17.15, in which, apparently, an earlier text (4Q491a M^{a/a} frg. 11 col. 2.8–24) could have been partly supplemented and partly substituted by another. Finally, the similarities and differences between 4Q491b M^{a/b} frgs. 1–3 and a few passages from 1QM (especially 7.3b–7) probably illustrate the reworking of similar sources by independent scribes, each having his own perspective. Despite the variety of the techniques at work, these examples tend to demonstrate that 1QM has

taken shape in a late stage of redaction of the war material circulating in the Qumran circle.

As it now stands, 1QM contains elements that are connected with those found in apocalyptic literature, but clearly it does not belong to the literary genre of the apocalypses. No compelling argument has been adduced, either, to support the identification of this document as a script for a cultic drama, in spite of a liturgical dimension that certainly associates it with priestly circles. In its current form, this composition is an eschatological rule that parallels, in a religious and utopian way, the genre of the Graeco-Roman tactical treatise. The people who put it together have adapted and shaped collections of rules, prayers and speeches, into a sort of guide-book for the priests and Levites in charge of leading the eschatological war, so that they can work out their future duties and perform them properly when these unprecedented events take place.

What the precise usage of this War Text was in the Qumran community remains unknown. But, as Schiffman (1989) has demonstrated, this group conceived of itself as an 'eschatological community' for which the end-time was 'a mirror of the present'. It implemented in its daily life some of the organizational patterns and practices described in the *Rule of the Congregation* and certainly did the same with a few of those found in 1QM and related documents.⁴ Furthermore, these texts define the present and future history in terms of a conflict between two clearly identified camps and leave no doubt about its final issue. This powerful and encompassing vision certainly contributed to legitimating the decision of the sectarians to cut themselves from a corrupted environment; it also provided them with a strong sense of identity as the true remnant of Israel, and helped them to consolidate their commitment to the Mosaic Law as interpreted and enforced in the community by its religious authorities. During its last years of existence, it may also have motivated part of the congregation to join the Great Revolt against Rome, interpreted as the real and ultimate confrontation with evil, in the feverish expectation of God's final act of salvation.

Further Reading on the Composition and Genre of 1QM

Alexander, Philip S. 2000 'Rules', *EncDSS* 2: 799–803.

Bosworth, A. Brian 1993 'Arrian and Rome: The Minor Works', *ANRW*, II.34.1: 264–72.

4. See Duhaime 1995: 88; Osten-Sacken 1969: 214–38. This point will receive further elaboration in the next chapter.

- Collins, John J. 1979a 'Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre', *Semeia* 14: 1–19.
- Davies, Philip R. 1977 *IQM, the War Scroll from Qumran: Its Structure and History* (BibOr, 32; Rome: Biblical Institute Press).
- 1999 'The Biblical and Qumranic Concept of War', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Richland, TX: Bibal Press): 275–306.
- Delcor, Mathias 1974 'Le milieu d'origine et le développement de l'apocalypse juive', in W.C. Van Unnik (ed.), *La littérature juive entre Tenach et Michna* (RechBibl, 9: Leiden: Brill): 101–17.
- Dent, Anthony 1974 'Arrians Array', *HT* 24: 570–74.
- Devine, Albert M. 1989 'Aelian's Manual of Hellenistic Military Tactics', *The Ancient World* 19: 31–64.
- 1993 'Arrian's *Tactica*', *ANRW*, II.34.1: 312–37.
- Duhaime, Jean 1977 'La rédaction de IQM XIII et l'évolution du dualisme à Qumrân', *RB* 84: 210–38.
- 1984 'La Règle de la Guerre de Qumrân et l'apocalyptique', *ScEs* 36: 67–88.
- 1987 'Dualistic Reworking in the Scrolls from Qumran', *CBQ* 49: 32–56.
- 1988 'The War Scroll from Qumran and the Greco-Roman Tactical Treatises', *RevQ* 13: 133–51.
- 1990 'Etude comparative de 4QM^a Fgg. 1–3 et IQM', *RevQ* 14: 459–72.
- Eshel, Esther, and Hanan Eshel 1992 '4Q471 1 and Ma'amadot in the War Scroll', in J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (eds.), *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March 1991* (STDJ, 11; Leiden: Brill): II, 611–20.
- 2000 'Recensions of the War Scroll', in Schiffman, Tov and Vanderkam (eds.): 351–63.
- Flusser, David 1980 'Apocalyptic Elements in the War Scroll', in A. Oppenheimer and V. Rappaport (eds.), *Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period (Abraham Shalit Memorial Volume)* (Jerusalem: Yad Ishak Ben-Zvi, Ministry of Defense): 434–52 (Hebrew), xxiv–xxv (English summary).
- Hunzinger, Claus-H. 1957 'Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milhamah aus Höhle 4 von Qumrân', *ZAW* 69: 131–51.
- Krieg, Matthias 1985 'Mo'ed Naqam — ein Kulturdrama aus Qumran: Beobachtungen an der Kriegerrolle', *TZ* 41: 3–30.
- Larson, Erik W. 2000 'Greco-Roman Guilds', *EncDSS* 1: 321–23.
- Nielsen, Eduard 1961 'La guerre considérée comme une religion et la religion comme une guerre', *ST* 15: 93–112.
- North, Robert 1958 '“Kittim” War or “Sectaries” Liturgy?', *Bib* 39: 84–93.
- Oldfather, Charles H., and William H. Oldfather 1948 [1923] *Aeneas Tacticus, Asclepiodotus, Onasander* (LCL; Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press): 227–340.
- Osten-Sacken, Peter von der 1969 *Gott und Belial: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran* (SUNT, 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Parker, James O. 1997 'The Genres of the Dead Sea War Scroll' (PhD diss., Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary).
- Ploeg, J.P.M. van der 1959a 'La composition littéraire de la Règle de la Guerre de

- Qumrân', in J. Coppens, A. Descamps and E. Massaux (eds.), *Sacra Pagina II. Miscellanea biblica Congressus Internationalis Catholici de re biblica* (BETL, 13; Gembloux: Duculot): II, 13–19.
- 1959b *Le rouleau de la Guerre traduit et annoté* (STDJ, 2; Leiden: Brill): 7–22.
- Poznanski, Lucien 1992 *Asclépiodote. Traité de tactique* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- Rabin, Chaim 1961 'The Literary Structure of the War Scroll', in Rabin and Yadin (eds.): 31–47 (Hebrew).
- Rowland, Christopher 1982 'What is Apocalyptic?', in *idem*, *The Open Heaven* (New York: Crossroad): 7–72.
- Rowley, Harold H. 1957 *Jewish Apocalyptic and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: University of London Athlone Press).
- Stadter, Phillip A. 1978 'The Ars Technica of Arrian: Tradition and Originality', *CP* 73: 117–28.
- Voto, James G. de 1993 *Flavius Arrianus: Tactical Handbook and The Expedition against the Alans* (Chicago: Ares).
- Wee, John Zhu-Em 2003 'A Model for the Composition and Purpose of columns XV–XIX of the War Scroll (19M)', *RevQ* 21: 261–83.
- Whitton, James 1979 'The Hebrew Tradition of "Holy War" with special reference to the Qumran Battle Scroll' (PhD diss., St Andrews).

4.1. Dating 1QM

When attempting to date a document like 1QM, one has to differentiate between the copy, the manuscript, the final form of the text, and the various traditions, sources or redactions which are embodied in it. The palaeographical study of the manuscript provides only a rough date for the copy of the text. The composition of such a text could have taken place long before its copy and its time has to be determined on other grounds. In the best cases, the dating is determined by clear references to a precise historical context. Clues may also be gathered from allusions to well-dated figures or events, mention of objects or customs typical of a particular culture at a given period, signs of literary dependence from, or influence upon, works associated with a specific time or context, etc. In the case of 1QM, the most relevant hints have been sought in the investigation of various questions: the relationship between col. 1 and Daniel 11–12; the identification of peoples or events to which the text may refer, especially the main enemy, the Kittim; the sequence of the war and of the military equipment and tactics to be used in it; the connections between this War Text and other documents from the Qumran library. When the composition of a document has gone through a complex process, as was apparently the case with 1QM, these bits of information may sometimes help to date only the section or the redactional level in which they are found rather than the final arrangement of the whole work. Because of their different selection and assessment of these data, scholars are divided on dating the composition of 1QM, whether during the Hellenistic period (Maccabaeal or Hasmonaeal), or only after the Roman takeover of the country in 63 BCE.

4.2. *Terminus a quo* and *terminus ad quem*

It is generally agreed that 1QM 1 has strong similarities with Daniel 11–12 and is dependent upon it (Carmignac 1958b); this will be explored in detail in the next section. The vision of Daniel 11–12 reviews, in symbolic language, historical events unfolding from the last years of the Persian empire (11.2) to the reign of the Seleucid king Antiochus IV (175–164 BCE; Dan. 11.21–45), under whom the end-time is to come (11.40–12.3). Antiochus is famous for his attempt to eradicate the Jewish religion and culture and to impose Hellenism in Palestine. The text of Dan. 11.31–35 clearly refers to these events, particularly to the desecration of the Temple in December 167 BCE and to the beginning of the Maccabean revolt. The description of the end-time, however, does not allude to recent events; it rather anticipates the immediate future; it foretells the death of the tyrant during an ultimate battle near Jerusalem (11.45), followed by the exaltation of the faithful. This optimistic scenario did not materialize, since Antiochus died in the East during the fall of 164 BCE (1 Macc. 6.16), before the expected encounter. The author is not aware of this fact, but, according to a likely interpretation of Dan. 9.27, he knows about the purification of the Temple by Judas Maccabaeus in December of the same year. From these observations, it is generally assumed that this part of the book of Daniel can safely be dated around the end of the year 164 BCE. 1QM 1 must have been written after this date, and the whole document, therefore, could not have taken its actual shape before this period. This provides the higher limit, or *terminus a quo*, for the composition of 1QM as we have it.

On the other hand, palaeographical study of 1QM has established that this manuscript was copied in the second half of the first century BCE. Fragments of a similar recension are preserved in 4Q496 M^f, which Baillet dates a few years before the middle of the first century BCE. Even if this fragmentary text from Cave 4 is not completely identical with 1QM, it suggests that the lower limit, or *terminus ad quem*, for the composition of this recension of the War Text is sometime during the pre-Herodian period. Various hints have been sought in 1QM, including a close scrutiny of its exact relationship with the book of Daniel, to try to achieve a more precise dating.

4.3. Relationship with the Book of Daniel

The relationship between 1QM 1 and the great vision found in Daniel 11–12 is the main indication for establishing the upper limit for the

composition of 1QM (*terminus a quo*). Scholars agree that there is a clear connection between the two texts; but they reconstruct the text differently, focusing on various aspects of it, and have their own agenda of study. In consequence, their conclusions about the date of 1QM vary.

The text of 1QM 1.1b-15 reads as follows:

1.1b The first attack of the Sons of Light will be launched against the lot of the Sons of Darkness, against the army of Belial, against the troop of Edom, Moab, the sons of Ammon 2 and [...] Philistia, and against the troops of the Kittim of Asshur, these being helped by those who violate the covenant. The sons of Levi, the sons of Judah, and the sons of Benjamin, the exiles of the wilderness, will wage war against them 3 [...] according to all their troops, when the sons of light in exile return from the wilderness of the peoples to encamp in the wilderness of Jerusalem. After the battle, they will depart from there. 4 [...] of the Kittim in Egypt. When his appointed time has arrived, he will march out with great fury to wage war against the kings of the north, his wrath aiming at exterminating and cutting off the horn 5 [Israel. And it will] be a time of salvation for God's people and a time of dominion for all the men of his lot, but of everlasting destruction for all the lot of Belial. There will be 6 [great] panic [among] the sons of Japhet, Asshur will fall down without rescue; the Kittim's dominion will come to an end, wickedness being subdued without a remnant; neither will there be an escape 7 [for any of the sons] of darkness. (*vacat*)

8 And [the sons of jus]tice will shine unto all the uttermost ends of the world, going on to shine till the end of all the times set for darkness. At the time set for God, his exalted greatness will shine for all 9 et[ernal] times, for peace and blessing, glory, joy, and long life for all the Sons of Light. On the day of the Kittim's fall, there will be clash and fierce carnage before the God of 10 Israel: this is indeed the day he has set long ago for a destructive war against the Sons of Darkness. On this (day) they will clash in a great carnage: the congregation of gods and the assembly of 11 men, the Sons of Light and the lot of darkness, will fight each other to (disclose?) the might of God, with the uproar of a large multitude and the war cry of gods and men, on the day of calamity. This (is) a time of 12 tribulation of [n all] the people whom God redeems: of all their tribulations, none was comparable to this, because of its hastening towards the end for an everlasting redemption. In the day of their war against the Kittim, 13 [they will go out to the] carnage. During the war, the Sons of Light will strengthen (for) three lots and smite wickedness, but (for) three (others) the army of Belial will gird itself for the return of the lot of 14 [light.] There will be skirmishing battalions to melt the heart and the might of God supporting the he[art] of the Sons of Light.] During the seventh lot, the great hand of God will subdue 15 [Belial and all] the angels of his dominion and for all the men of [his lot...] (*vacat*)

The section of the vision of Daniel relevant for comparison is the last, which describes the reign of Antiochus IV and the end-time (11.21–12.3).

Here are the most significant excerpts of this text (11.21–24, 29–35, 40–45; 12.1–3 adapted from the *NJB*):

11.21 'In his place will rise a wretch: royal honours will not be given to him, but rather he will insinuate himself into them at his pleasure and will gain possession of the kingdom by intrigue. 22 Armies will be utterly routed and crushed by him, the Prince of the covenant too. 23 Through his alliances he will act treacherously and, despite the smallness of his following, grow ever stronger. 24 At his pleasure, he will invade rich provinces, acting as his fathers or his fathers' fathers never acted, distributing among them plunder, spoil and wealth, plotting his stratagems against the fortresses – for a time.'

... 29. 'In due time, he will make his way southwards again, but this time the outcome will not be as before. 30 The ships of the Kittim will oppose him, and he will be worsted. He will retire and take furious action against the holy covenant and, as before, will favour those who forsake that holy covenant. 31 Forces of his will come and profane the Citadel-Sanctuary; they will abolish the perpetual sacrifice and install the appalling abomination there. 32 Those who violate the covenant he will seduce by his blandishments, but the people who know their God will stand firm and take action. 33 Those of the people who are wise leaders will instruct many; for some days, however, they will stumble from sword and flame, captivity and pillage. 34 And thus stumbling, little help will they receive, though many will be scheming in their support. 35 Of the wise leaders some will stumble, and so a number of them will be purged, purified and made clean—until the time of the End, for the appointed time is still to come.'

... 40 'When the time comes for the End, the king of the south will try conclusions with him; but the king of the north will come storming down on him with chariots, cavalry, and a large fleet. He will invade countries, overrun them and drive on. 41 He will invade the Land of Splendour, and many will fall; but Edom, Moab, and what remains of the sons of Ammon will escape him. 42 He will reach out to attack countries: Egypt will not escape him. 43 The gold and silver treasures and all the valuables of Egypt will lie in his power. Libyans and Cushites will be at his feet: 44 but reports coming from the East and the north will worry him, and he will march out in great fury to exterminate and completely destroy many. 45 He will pitch the tents of his royal headquarters between the sea and the mountains of the Holy Splendour. Yet he will come to his end—there will be no rescue for him.'

12.1 'At that time Michael will arise—the great Prince, defender of your people. That will be a time of tribulation, unparalleled since nations first came into existence. When that time comes, your own people will be spared—all those whose names are found written in the Book. 2 Of those who are sleeping in the Land of Dust, many will awaken, some to everlasting life, some to shame and everlasting disgrace. 3 Those who are

wise will shine as brightly as the expanse of the heavens, and those who have instructed many in uprightness, as bright as stars for all eternity.'

On the basis of the similarities between the two texts, J.P.M. van der Ploeg (1959b: 22–25) takes the religious wars under Antiochus IV, depicted in Daniel 11–12, as a starting point for his discussion of the date of 1QM. In 1QM 1.2, the 'Kittim of Asshur' are listed as part of the coalition of the Sons of Darkness, together with the 'troop of Edom, Moab, the sons of Ammon and [...] Philistia'. Two lines below (1.4), after a gap in the text, there is a reference to 'the Kittim in Egypt'. Sukenik (1955: 36 n. 14) reads these two expressions as 'appellations of the Ptolemies in Egypt and the Seleucids in Syria', heirs of Alexander the Great (cf. 1 Macc. 1.1; 8.5). Even if he is not so certain about the identity of the 'Kittim of Asshur', van der Ploeg also understands the beginning of 1.4 as the description of an attack by a king of the Ptolemies (the 'king of the Kittim in Egypt') against 'the kings [plural] of the north'. But this scenario is different from the one expected by Dan. 11.39–40, in which the aggressor is the king (singular) of the north. The author of 1QM would, then, have modified the presentation of the future events by reason of the death of Antiochus. According to van der Ploeg, therefore, this part of 1QM can be dated 'sometime after 164 BCE' (1959b: 23–24), without further precision.

Van der Ploeg's reconstruction of an attack by the king of Egypt is problematic. The phrase '...[...] the Kittim in Egypt' (1QM 1.4) does probably not designate a group of Kittim *of* Egypt different from the Kittim *of* Ashur (1.2). The next sentence says that someone 'shall march out ... to wage war against the kings of the north, his wrath (aiming) at exterminating and cutting the horn of [Israel]'. The restoration of the word 'Israel' is confirmed by 4Q496 M^f frg. 3 4. The aggressor, therefore, is most likely '[the king of] the Kittim' of Asshur, who would have gone 'into Egypt' after the first encounter with the Sons of Light (see e.g. Ibba 1998: 63–67).

Even if the scenario of the end-time does not involve the king of the Ptolemies, there remains a difference between the events anticipated in Daniel and 1QM, and van der Ploeg's explanation for it is plausible and is retained by recent commentators like Gmirkin (see the next section). Van der Ploeg's dating of this part of the text is not very precise, however, and he does not apply it to the whole document, but only to what he reconstructs as the earliest apocalyptic level. He does not see any indication that the final redactor reinterpreted the Kittim to designate the Romans and believes, consequently, that the composition of 1QM was completed before the Roman takeover of Palestine in 63 BCE. (1959b: 24).

As part of his inquiry into the contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to

our understanding of the book of Daniel, Alfred Mertens (1971) also analyses the use of Dan. 11.40–12.3 in 1QM 1. Among the obvious parallels between the two texts, Mertens draws attention to the following: ‘those who violate the covenant’ (Dan. 11.32 and 1QM 1.6); ‘Egypt will not escape him’ (Dan. 11.42) and ‘neither will be an escape’ (1QM 1.6); ‘he will march out in great fury to exterminate’ (Dan 11.44 and 1QM 1.4), ‘there will be no rescue for him’ (Dan 11.45) and ‘Asshur will fall down without rescue’ (1QM 1.6); ‘the king of the north’ (Dan. 11.41 and elsewhere in Dan. 11 for the Seleucid kings) and ‘the kings of the north’ (1QM 1.4). But these similar expressions do not necessarily refer to the same things. The idea that there will be no escape is applied to Egypt in Dan. 11.42, as a victim of the king of the north, but to those who compose the coalition of the Sons of Darkness in 1QM 1.4. The king of the north marches out with great fury in Dan. 11.44; but depending on the way the beginning of line 5 is filled, this might not be the case in 1QM 1.4: with many early commentators, Mertens takes it to be God who will march out ‘to cut off the horn of [Belia]’.¹ This reconstruction, however, is wrong: as demonstrated by the parallel text found in 4Q496 M^f frg. 3 4 (see above), the horn of Israel is the target, and the king of the Kittim is probably the aggressor. A few lines below, the text mentions that ‘[. . .]justice will shine’ (1QM 1.8) and that there will be ‘a time of tribulation’ (1QM 1.11–12; cf. 15.1). Daniel 12:1–3 has similar elements in a reverse order: after ‘a time of tribulation, unparalleled since nations first came into existence’ (Dan. 12.1), many will be awakened, and ‘those who are wise will shine’ (Dan. 12.3). There are also in 1QM 1 a few expressions found in other chapters of Daniel, for example, ‘the uproar of a large multitude’ (1QM 1.11, 17?), which echoes Dan. 10.6; but almost none in other narrative sections of 1QM.

In Mertens’s view, all this evidence suggests that 1QM 1 may go back to an apocalyptic ‘milieu’ in which Dan. 11.40–12.3, and perhaps other passages of the book of Daniel, circulated as a unified block. Mertens agrees with van der Ploeg that 1QM 1 was part of an early apocalyptic recension of the document; he would date it sometime in the second half of the second century BCE (1971: 83 n. 123). He is aware that Yadin dates 1QM in its present form, to the Roman period.¹ But this still leaves open the possibility that the author of 1QM, or at least of col. 1, refers to the events of the Maccabaeian period as they are represented in Daniel 11. There are enough differences between the two texts, however, to show that the author of 1QM 1, when borrowing many expressions to describe the end-time from Dan. 11.40–45, uses them in a different way.

1. Mertens 1971: 79. On this dating by Yadin, see below 4.7, pp. 85–90.

Peter von der Osten-Sacken studies the parallels between 1QM 1 and Daniel 11–12 in a few pages of his monograph on dualism (1969: 30–34). That a clear connection exists is demonstrated by the similarities in vocabulary and in the sequence of both narratives. But Osten-Sacken underscores important differences. In Dan. 11.40, ‘Edom, Moab and what remains of the sons of Ammon’ escape the invasion of the king of the north; in 1QM 1.1 they are allies of the Kittim of Asshur and part of the coalition of the Sons of Darkness. In Dan. 11.40, Antiochus IV is portrayed as the aggressive ‘king of the north’, whereas in 1QM 1.4 the plural expression ‘the kings of the north’ applies to victims assaulted by the wicked leader. Finally in Dan. 11.40–45, the people of Israel play merely a passive role, contrary to 1QM in which the Sons of Light take the initiative. In addition to this, 1QM 1 has imported elements from the Day of the Lord and holy war traditions (1969: 34–41). For Osten-Sacken, the best explanation for these data is that the author of 1QM knew the text of Daniel or the traditions which underline it, in a form very close to its final shape (1969: 31); consequently, 1QM is of a later date. The differences between the two texts prevent Osten-Sacken from immediately linking 1QM 1 to the historical events of the Maccabean period; but since this column served as a source for the more elaborate battle narratives found in cols. 15–19 (1969: 42–50), it must have its origin in the same group of Hasidim, close to the Maccabees (1969: 71–72). Osten-Sacken’s remarks on the parallels between 1QM 1 and Daniel 11–12 only confirm the *terminus a quo* for the earliest part of the War Scroll and not for its final composition.

One of the most extensive treatments of the relationship between 1QM 1 and Daniel 11–12 is found in Gregory K. Beale’s study on the use of Daniel in Jewish apocalyptic literature and in the book of Revelation (1984: 42–66). Beale is not really concerned with the date of 1QM. He simply notes that it is usually dated around 50 BCE–50 CE, even if a few scholars have argued for a date in the last half of the second century BCE (1984: 42 n. 61). He also takes for granted that the text has received its actual form within the Qumran group. The primary goal of his analysis is to understand the hermeneutical use of Daniel and of other biblical passages in this text. He finds in 1QM 1.1–15 more allusions (clear, probable or possible) to Daniel 11–12 (around 16) than to all other biblical books (13 altogether; 1984: 60 n. 89).

In the ‘initial phase of the war’ (1QM 1.1–3a), the list of enemies appears as a combination of Isa. 11.14 and Dan. 11.30, 41, by reason of a similar eschatological context. These names ‘are applied to the then contemporary nations, viewed by the Qumran sect as enemies whom they would have to defeat in the eschatological battle’ (1984: 67). The phrase

'these being helped by those who violate the covenant' (1QM 1.2) links Dan. 11.32 and 34, bringing out more explicitly the collaboration between the apostate Jews and the enemies (1984: 48). The 'concluding phase of the war' (1QM 1.3b-7) is ambiguous. Beale adopts Davies's interpretation of lines 4-5: Israel is 'the ones who advance into Egypt to fight the Kittim' and 'God is understood as the one who "in His time" (*bqsw*) brings about ultimate victory in the eschatological war'.² This would be a 'remolding' and a 'reverse application' of Dan. 7-8; 10.26; 11.11, 29-30, 40, 44-45. The extermination of the enemies (1QM 1.6) also refers to Dan. 11.42, 45, used 'generally with their original meaning' in this case (1984: 56). The 'results of the defeat' (1QM 1.8-9a) echoes Dan. 12.2-3 when it foretells that the '[the sons of jus]tice', as well as God's greatness, 'will shine', and that the Sons of Light will have 'long life'. The 'resummarization of the cosmic nature of the war' (1QM 1.9b-12a) clearly refers to the time of distress of Dan. 12.1, and 'the precise nature of the "distress" is understood as Israel's time of conflict and perseverance through a series of battles until victory is achieved' (1984: 59-60). No allusions are found in the last lines of the text (1QM 1.13-15).

In his conclusions, Beale stresses that 'the arrangement of the Daniel allusions reflects the thought-structure of Daniel 11-12, since in lines 1-6 allusions only from Daniel 11 appear and are followed in lines 8-12 by Daniel 12 references' (1984: 60). The abundance of references and their sequence indicate that the context of Daniel 11.30-12.1 'provides the unifying basis' of 1QM 1; but, according to Beale's reading and interpretation, 'most of the Daniel 11 phrases have been developed by re-applying them to the victory which the writer sees as being involved in Dan. 12.1-3 and not the pagan campaign of Daniel 11' (1984: 61). The portraying of the Sons of Light 'as the attackers rather than the attacked' is the result of this 'creative explanation of Dan. 12.1-3' (1984: 62-63). Daniel 11-12 is probably considered as a prophetic text by the writer, who 'develops it in an interpretative manner' in order to explain how this prophecy is to be 'realized in the near future in the writer's own community' (1984: 65-66).

Beale's conclusion would have to be nuanced on the basis of a more accurate reading of 1QM 1.4-5. But his view that the victory anticipated in Dan. 12.1-3 is the hermeneutic key to the re-application of the descriptive language of Daniel 11 is an important point. In a recent essay on the use of the Bible in 1QM, Dean O. Wenthe makes similar

2. Beale 1984: 51. See Davies 1977: 116-19. See also Mertens's interpretation, above.

observations and also concludes that references to Daniel 11 in 1QM 1.1–7 express the writer's 'awareness that the community faces a situation analogous to which was perceived as having been described by the book of Daniel', whereas the allusion to Dan. 12.1 in 1QM 1.8–15 'stresses the certainty of victory for the Sons of Light' (1998: 298).³ The freedom at work in this midrashic interpretation could mean that the group to whom the author belongs is remote from the events of the Maccabean period (see Davies 1977: 116). Dupont-Sommer, who favours a Roman date for 1QM, also makes the point that 'a considerable lapse of time was necessary for the Essene author to have been able to consider the book of Daniel as a canonical text' (1961: 167).

4.4. Historical References in 1QM 1–2

Because of its eschatological character and its dependence on the scenario found in Daniel 11–12, the final war described in 1QM 1–2 is often considered as devoid of historical references. Scholars have sometimes tried, however, to connect one detail or another with particular episodes during the Hellenistic or Roman period.⁴ The recent proposal by Russell Gmirkin (1998, 2000) deserves special attention. Gmirkin argues that 1QM 'must be viewed as historical as well as eschatological'; he seeks to date it by 'internal evidence', that is, by correlating with specific events several 'historical allusions' found in cols. 1–2 but which have escaped attention so far (1998: 172). The main line of his argument is that, like other eschatological works, these columns contain, hidden behind *ex eventu* prophecy, a retrospective of events up to the time of the author, followed by a genuine prospective section. If it can be identified, the point of junction between the two provides a precise dating for the text, as is the case for Daniel 10–12, the Apocalypse of Weeks (*I En.* 93.3–10), the Animal Apocalypse (*I En.* 85–90) and the book of *Jubilees*.⁵ These texts are 'the major extant historical works of the second century BCE' (1998: 175); they share the same eschatological elements as 1QM 1–2 (dualism, chronological determinism, etc.) and all view the present as 'characterized

3. Wenthe does not address the problem of the date of 1QM: he simply assumes that 'the stronger arguments' (the palaeography of the scroll and Yadin's analysis of the military equipments and tactics) 'point towards the Roman period' (1998: 291).

4. See e.g. Dupont-Sommer 1961: 169–73; Rost 1950; Segal 1965; Treves 1958.

5. There is always, of course, the possibility of an updating of the text through later interpolations. See for instance Gmirkin's discussion about the date of *Jubilees* (1998: 178 n. 27).

by extreme crisis', seen 'to immediately precede a final eschatological conflict' (1998: 179). Historically, they are all connected to 'the Hellenistic crisis of the 160s' (1998: 184) which is also the likely context of 1QM.

Gmirkin then analyses in detail the historical references in 1QM 1–2. The war is initiated by the Sons of Light against a series of opponents enumerated in 1QM 1.1–2a. Rather than providing a symbolic list of traditional enemies of Israel as Carmignac (1958b: 1–5) or Yadin (1962: 21–22) would have it, these lines are taken as a reference to successive battles or campaigns of Judas Maccabaeus in 164–163 BCE. Assuming that Belial represents Antiochus IV, Gmirkin tentatively interprets the 'army of Belial' as 'the forces of the Seleucid army', which Judas fought at Beth-Zur in late 164 (1998: 186). The next three names, Edom, Moab and Ammon, are connected with the campaign fought by Judas in early 163 (1 Macc. 5.1–8) against respectively 'the descendants of Esau in Idumea' (5.3), 'the sons of Baean' (5.4—probably Beth Meon in Moab) and 'the sons of Ammon' (5.6–8); the fourth, Philistia, is linked to a separate campaign in this area during the same year (1 Macc. 5.14–15, 66–68; Gmirkin 1998: 186–88). In this context, 'the troops of the Kittim of Asshur' are the forces of the Seleucids of Syria; more precisely, they might be 'the foreign troops garrisoned in the Acra' who were attacked by Judas right after the previous campaigns (1 Macc. 6.19–20) and received the collaboration of 'those who violate the covenant', that is, Jewish 'renegades' (1 Macc. 6.21; cf. 1.11, 15; Dan. 11.32; Gmirkin 1998: 188–91).

The components of the army of the Sons of Light are also detailed in 1QM 1.2b–3. These lines depict two different groups. The 'exiles of the wilderness' are understood as a gathering of Hasidim from Judaea (Levi, Judah and Benjamin), who had 'taken up residence in wilderness guerilla camps' (1 Macc. 2.42–44; Gmirkin 1998: 192). They are joined by Jews rescued from Gilead in Transjordan by Judas in 163 BCE, just before the siege of the Acra (1 Macc. 5.9, 24–52); these were reached through 'wilderness roads' (1 Macc. 5.24, 28) and may be characterized adequately as returning 'from the wilderness of the peoples'. The final sentence, 'they shall depart from there', is tentatively related to an episode of the siege (1 Macc. 6.21; Gmirkin 1998: 193).

The next lines (1QM 1.4–7) forecast the 'salvation for God's people' and the 'everlasting destruction for all the lot of Belial' (1.5). They mark the shift from retrospective to prospective: 'Clearly we have here left history behind and drifted into pure eschatology' (Gmirkin 1998: 194). The description of the final encounter is 'directly based on Daniel 11–12 and appears to anticipate the imminent fulfilment of that prophecy'

(1998: 195), which the author, however, had to update. In Dan. 11.40–12.1, the king of the north is expected to perish during a campaign against Judaea during the summer of 163 BCE, at the end of the ‘week of years’ following the murder of the ‘anointed prince’ Onias III in the summer of 170. But since Antiochus IV died during the fall of 164 in other circumstances, the prophecy could only be applied ‘to his successor young Antiochus V, and his general Lysias, who invaded Judaea at the head of a massive [...] force in the summer of 163 BCE’ (1998: 196). The Animal Apocalypse also anticipated this event (*1 En.* 90.16).

1QM 2 introduces a chronological frame of forty years for the war, five of which are sabbatical years. Lines 5–6 provide instructions for the cultic activities to be performed during the first sabbatical year, presumably six years after the beginning of the war. Gmirkin reads these lines as a ‘reference to the restoration of the Temple services’ and they are considered as ‘a direct historical allusion to the cleansing and rededication of the Temple under Judas Maccabaeus in December 164’ (1998: 199). It is the only occurrence of such an event since Ezra, and the year 164/163 BCE was a sabbatical one (1 Macc. 6.49, 53). In this scheme, the war extends from 170/169 (cf. 1 Macc. 1.20) to 131/130; its planning may ‘reflect unrealistic Maccabean ambitions to conquer the Seleucid empire in the aftermath of the restoration of the Temple’ (1998: 203). In this context, 1QM appears to have been ‘intended as the official war manual of the Maccabean army’ and cols. 2–9 ‘contained the blueprint for the professional reorganization of the Maccabean army in 164/63 after the restoration of the Temple’ (1998: 202).

Gmirkin’s conclusion is that 1QM 1 and 2 both contain reliable historical information up to 163 BCE and then ‘futuristic expectations’ that set the date of the final composition of 1QM to 163 BCE (1998: 204). According to him, the actual document was elaborated within less than a decade. Cols. 10–14 contain both early material, ‘pre-militant and probably pre-Maccabean’, dating to c. 170–166 BCE and ‘early Maccabean’, hymns and prayers (1998: 205). Cols. 15–19 are an ‘originally independent, coherent document’ which ‘appears to have been written in response to an impending major threat of military conflict with the Kittim, most likely the first Seleucid campaign under general Lysias in 164 BCE’ (1998: 206). Cols. 2–9 are a military manual ‘composed shortly after the Maccabean capture of Jerusalem and the restoration of the Temple in December 164’ when Judas reorganized his army (see Bar-Kochva 1989); it was probably first circulated independently (1998: 207). When the whole document was compiled, col. 1 was added as an introduction which reinterpreted the eschatological battle of cols. 15–19 in relation to Lysias’s expected invasion of Judaea in the summer of 163

BCE (1998: 207). The final version of 1QM, concludes Gmirkin, 'appears to constitute the official war manual of the Maccabean army of 163 BCE' (1998: 208). It was probably authored by the Hasidim, 'the military supporters of Judas Maccabaeus', who are to be identified with the Dead Sea Scrolls sect, in Gmirkin's view (Gmirkin 2000: 488).

Gmirkin's essay apparently accounts for all the data that he studies, but it leaves the reader sceptical, for several reasons. First, a large number of the 'historical allusions' found in 1QM 1 are concentrated in lines 1–3. In lines 1–2a, the names of the adversaries are listed, but no details of the encounters are provided. The whole argument, therefore, rests on the correlation between these names, all found in Daniel 11, and the enemies fought by the Maccabees. The very specific identification of the 'Kittim of Asshur' and 'those who violate the covenant' with the Seleucid troops stationed in the Acra and their Jewish allies cannot be demonstrated. Moreover, this enumeration is not complete: Gmirkin notices that there is a gap at the beginning of line 2, but he does not attempt to reconstruct the name that once stood there.⁶ In lines 2b–3, the listing of the Sons of Light is somewhat cryptic and its interpretation, again, is no more than likely. The predictive section (lines 4–7) lacks clarity as well, partly because of the lacunae at the beginning of lines 4 and 5; the identification with the expected battle against Lysias in the summer of 163 BCE is plausible, but remains uncertain. That the instructions for the cultic activities of the first sabbatical year imply an already-restored Temple is possible, but the text of 1QM 2.5–6 does not dictate that. Finally, Gmirkin's reconstruction of the redactional history of 1QM is a possibility worth exploring, but it still needs to be confirmed and nuanced by a thorough analysis of the text. His dating of the final redaction of the text depends largely on his hypothesis about cols. 1 and 2 and on the assumption that col. 1 was the last to have been composed; it is valid only if these premises are correct and does not leave room for any reinterpretation by the later generations who copied the document during the Roman period.

In the introduction to his critical edition of the 1QM, Giovanni Ibba devotes only a few pages to the problem of its dating (1998: 46–50). He also finds in 1QM 1–2 historical allusions which point to the Hellenistic period, but he does not try to connect every word to a specific episode of the revolt. He does not link the list of hostile nations (1.1–2) with the Maccabean campaigns, but he considers it a reference to traditional enemies of Israel (1998: 66). The phrase 'those who violate the covenant' (1.2) is said to designate Hellenizing Jews in general, as it does in Dan. 11.32; a comparable expression 'lawless men from Israel' is found in 1

6. See for instance the various suggestions listed by Ibba (1998: 67 n. 7).

Macc. 1.11. The 'Kittim of Asshur' are the Seleucids, but no mention is made of the troop stationed in the Acra.⁷ The phrase 'the desert of peoples' (1.3) is understood as a reference to the Syrian region (as in Ezek. 30.25), without being connected to the Maccabean rescue operations.

For Ibba, contrary to Gmirkin, the *ex eventu* prophecy continues beyond lines 1–3. The 'time of salvation' and 'dominion' for God's people (1.5) is read as an allusion to the conquest and purification of the Jerusalem Temple by Judas, as is the humiliation of wickedness (1.6). Lines 11b-12a refer to an unprecedented 'time of tribulation o[n al]l the people whom God redeems'. It is part of a prophecy in the parallel text of Dan. 12.11; but in 1 Macc. 9.27, a similar expression refers to past events. According to 1 Macc. 9.23–31, the death of Judas (160 BCE) was followed by the reappearance of the lawless everywhere in the country; headed by Bacchides, they began persecuting the faithful who then appointed Jonathan as their leader to fight back.

So, for Ibba, the author of 1QM 1 uses a technique of *vaticina ex eventu* in lines 1–7 and 11b-12a, whereas he formulates genuine predictions in lines 8–11a and 12b-15. The events following the death of Judas in 160 BCE provide the upper date for the writing of this text (*terminus a quo*). The lower date (*terminus ad quem*) is the sabbatical year anticipated in 1QM 2.5–6; since there was a first sabbatical year in 164, the next one is to take place in 157. Other clues are taken mainly from the comparison with other writings (see below) to establish that an early form of 1QM was composed at that time by a group of Hasidim who supported Jonathan during the first years of his command (1998: 50).

Ibba's alternative reading of 1QM 1–2 shows that the interpretation of a text either as an *ex eventu* prophecy or as a genuine one depends largely on the external material correlated with it. It also raises an interesting question: do the two types of prophecy have to follow one another in a rigid sequence or can they mix in a particular passage? And if they can mix, how can one be sure of the difference between them? Ibba ends up with a narrow date for the composition of 1QM (160 to 157 BCE); contrary to Gmirkin, however, he does not consider this to be the date of the final redaction, which, he thinks, was probably made later by the Qumran sectarians.

7. Ibba notices that the Hebrew has no word for 'Syria' and uses 'Assyria' instead; this can be seen in the prayer of Judas reported in 1 Macc. 1.39–41, which conforms to this use even if the Greek has a word for Syria.

4.5. The Kittim as the Main Enemy

Among the enemies of the Sons of Light, 1QM mentions the Kittim 18 times (1.2, 4, 6, 9, 12; 11.11; 15.2; 16.3, 6, 8, 9; 17.12, 14, 15; 18.2, 4; 19.10, 13). Since the Kittim are also known from various other sources (see Lim 2000), several attempts have been made to derive a date for the composition of 1QM by relating them to a particular group. The term 'Kittim' originated probably from the town of Citium, on the south-eastern coast of Cyprus. According to Gen. 10.4 and 1 Chron. 1.7, the Kittim are sons of Javan, son of Japhet, 'from which the coastland people spread'; by extension, the term designated the inhabitants of Cyprus and other Mediterranean islands or coastal lands (Num. 24.24; Jer. 2.10; Ezek. 27.6; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 1.128). They are identified with the Greeks from Macedonia in 1 Macc. 1.1 and 8.5, but with the Romans in Dan. 11.30 (so in LXX and Vulgate).⁸ The Kittim also appear in more elusive contexts in *Jubilees* (24.28–29; 37.10) and the *Testament of Simeon* (6.3). In the Dead Sea Scrolls, besides 1QM, they are found mainly in other War Texts (4Q285 Sefer ha-Milhamah frg. 5 [4], 6; 4Q491 M^{a/a} frg. 10 col. 2.11, 12; frg. 11 col. 2.1, [5], 7, 8, 19, [20]; frg. 13.[3], 5; 4Q492 M^b frg. 1 9, [12]; 4Q496 M^f frg. 3 col. 1.[6]; cf. 11Q14 Sefer ha-Milhamah frg. 1) and in the pesharim and related works (1QpHab 2.12, 14; 3.4, 9; 4.5, 10; 6.1, 10; 9.7; 1Q16 pPs frgs. 9–10 [1], 4; 4Q161 pIsa^a frgs. 8–10 5, 7, 8; 4Q169 pNah frgs. 1–2 3; frgs. 3–4 col. 1.3; 4Q247 peshar on the Apocalypse of Weeks 6; 4Q332 Historical Text D frg. 3 2).

As noted above, Sukenik (1955: 36 n. 14) reads the two expressions 'Kittim of Asshur' (1QM 1.2) and 'Kittim in Egypt' (1QM 1.4) as a designation of the Seleucids and the Ptolemies. He therefore concludes merely that the text has been composed after the division of Alexander's empire. Other interpreters of 1QM also understand 1QM 1.2–4 as a possible reference to the Ptolemies and the Seleucids.⁹ But in view of the parallel text from Cave 4, this identification is highly questionable. As a clue for a lower date, Sukenik draws attention to the expression 'chief priest' (*kwbn hrwš*: 2.1; 15.4; 16.13; 18.5; 19.11) to designate the chief religious authority; in his view, this predates the Hasmonaean dynasty, whose leaders took the title 'high priest' (*kwbn hgdwl*).

The Kittim are found frequently in the Habakkuk peshar from Qumran (see above). Dupont-Sommer has argued that several features of their

8. The *Targum Onqelos* and the Vulgate on Num. 24.24 also identify the Kittim as Romans.

9. See e.g. Collins 1997: 107; Lim 2000: 470–71; Osten-Sacken 1969: 29; Segal 1965: 141–42; Treves 1958: 419–20.

description in this document can refer only to the Romans, a view shared by many interpreters. This is the case especially for 1QpHab 6.2–5, in which Hab. 1.16, ‘he offers sacrifices to his net’, is interpreted of the Kittim who ‘offer sacrifices to their standards’, a practice well known in the Roman armies (Dupont-Sommer 1961: 262). Dupont-Sommer considers that the Kittim of 1QM are also the Romans. On the grounds that the Romans incorporated Syria as a province in 64 BCE, Dupont-Sommer explains ‘the Kittim of Asshur’ (1QM 1.2) as a designation of the Romans of Syria (1961: 170). 1QM 1.4 is read as a reference to the coming of ‘[the king] of the Kittim in Egypt’ and is tentatively related to Caesar’s expedition to that country in 48 BCE (Dupont-Sommer 1961: 170). Yadin (1962: 245) also uses 1QpHab 6.2–5 to identify the Kittim with the Romans. According to him, other passages in 1QM on the Kittim, such as those referring to the ‘Kittim of Asshur’ (1.2), the ‘Kittim in Egypt’ (1.4) or ‘the king of the Kittim’ (15.2), are not, however, decisive. External data demonstrate that ‘the name Kittim could have applied equally to the Greeks and the Romans, depending on the period and the context’ (1962: 25). The phrase ‘Kittim of Asshur’ is explained with reference to 1QM 11.11, where the Kittim are interpreted as Asshur ‘in the manner of the Pesharim’ (1962: 26). As for ‘the king of the Kittim’, this phrase could designate a Greek as well as a Roman ruler, at least from the time of Caesar (44 BCE; Yadin 1962: 331). The main argument to identify the Kittim with the Romans, then, remains the text of 1QpHab 6.2–5 for both Yadin and Dupont-Sommer; but it can be objected, as did Rowley (1956: 96), that the worship of standards is documented in Syria before the arrival of Romans. And even if the Romans were clearly meant, the argument seems rather weak, since it rests on a passage taken from a document which does not necessarily link the Kittim to the same group as 1QM.

Carmignac (1955a) has conducted a study of all 18 references to the Kittim in 1QM. Three texts, mentioning the ‘Kittim in Egypt’ (1.4; also 1.12; 19.13), are discarded because they are too fragmentary to provide valid information. In five cases, the Kittim are mentioned with Egypt, Asshur or the Sons of Japhet, but this does not tell us much: 1QM 1.2 is a symbolic list of traditional enemies of Israel (cf. Ps. 83.7–9) in which the construction ‘the Kittim of Asshur’ is exceptional and could indicate that the word ‘Kittim’ is used as a common rather than a proper noun; in 1.6 and 18.2, the three terms ‘Sons of Japhet, Asshur and Kittim’ seem more or less interchangeable as a designation of all enemies (see also 19.10); the interpretation of Isa. 31.8 which identifies Asshur with the Kittim (11.11) could be ‘a simple allegorical exegesis without any ground in reality’ (Carmignac 1955a: 740–41). Four times, the Kittim are correlated with

broader designations such as 'Sons of Darkness' (1.9), 'army of Belial' (15.2; cf. 16.3), and 'multitude of Belial' (18.3–4). Carmignac also draws attention to three series of texts from cols. 16–17 in which the word 'Kittim' corresponds to a more general term in a parallel sentence found in cols. 8–9, namely: 'the line of the Kittim' (16.6 and 17.2) and 'the line of the enemy' (8.3–4); 'to bring down among the slain of the Kittim' (16.8, cf. 17.14) and 'to bring down among the slain' (in 9.1), 'the battle against the Kittim shall still be conducted' (16.9; 17.15) and 'to conduct the battle' (9.2). According to information provided by Hunzinger, a variant to the expression '[the mi]ghty men of the Kittim' (1QM 19.10) reads 'the mighty men of the peoples' in a fragment from Cave 4 (4Q492 M^b frg. 1 9; Carmignac 1955a: 745, n. 7); but Baillet correctly rejects this reading and considers the texts identical (1982: 45–49). Carmignac concludes that 'Kittim' has become for the Qumranites a common name to designate the enemies, almost equivalent to (foreign) 'peoples' (*mym*) or (pagan) 'nations' (*gwym*); this general meaning would also apply to the use of the term in the Habakkuk pesher. Therefore it is impossible to identify the Kittim with any specific group. Carmignac's observations are important; but his conclusion may be valid only if 1QM is read as a unified document, either composed by a single author as he claims, or resulting from a systematic compilation and edition of various sources.

A quite different opinion is expressed by Davies (1977), in observations scattered throughout his reconstruction of the redaction of 1QM. Contrary to Carmignac, Davies views cols. 2–9 as an older document, mainly from the Maccabaeian period (1977: 66–67), and cols. 15–19 as a later composition. In this hypothesis, the mention of the Kittim in texts from cols. 15–19 is understood as one of the general terms used to name the enemy in 7.9–9.9 (1977: 89). A similar phenomenon is observed when cols. 15–19 are compared with the earlier recension found in col. 14, which also lacks a proper name for the enemy (1977: 71). According to Davies, the Kittim found in 15–19 are the Romans, 'the human counterpart of the dominion of Belial', whose advent prompted the production of this 'new, and greatly revised, war-rule' (1977: 89). That their leader is presented as 'the king of the Kittim' (15.2) constitutes no objection, even during the period of the Roman republic, since in a cryptic document like 1QM, the term could have been used freely 'to denote "general" or "consul"' (1977: 89). Other occurrences of 'Kittim' receive only brief comments. The mention of the 'Kittim of Asshur' (1.2) is explained as part of a list of nations displaced from the beginning of col. 2; in its former context, it applied 'very plausibly to the Seleucid dynasty' (1977: 59), but in 1QM 1, 'it might have been re-interpreted to refer to the Roman legions of Syria' (1977: 118). Davies also reads the 'Kittim in

Egypt' (1.4) as a designation of 'the Roman legions stationed there' (1977: 118). The other occurrences of Kittim in col. 1 (lines 6 and 9) do not have additional qualification (1977: 26), and therefore refer to the Romans, as in 15–19. The only mention of the term outside cols. 1 and 15–19 is found in 11.11–12, which is considered as a late interpolation in a Maccabaeen hymn (1977: 97–98). Davies, then, relates all references to the Kittim to the Romans, except the phrase 'Kittim of Asshur' (1.2), which was once connected to the Seleucids, but reinterpreted to designate the Romans in the final redaction of the text, when these became the dominant power in the country. Davies's observations are sometimes sketchy and his conclusions are not always adequately supported; but he certainly raises important problems and points probably to the right direction when he looks for their solution.

The question of the identity of the Kittim in 1QM and in the pesharim has been taken up recently by Hanan Eshel (2001). He first states that 'by the end of the second century BCE, there was a dispute about the identification of the Kittim in Judea' (Eshel 2001: 29), as demonstrated by the contrasting statements of 1 Maccabees (1.1 and 8.5), where the Kittim are the Macedonians, and of Daniel (11.29–30), where they could only be the Romans. A mixed picture also emerges in the Qumran compositions which mention the Kittim. In the non-sectarian pesher on the Apocalypse of Weeks (4Q247), a reference to the 'kin[g] of the Kittim' is part of a sequence in which it probably refers to a Hellenistic king (2001: 32). The Kittim are also the Greeks in two sectarian documents, 1QM and 4Q161 pesher to Isaiah^a (and possibly in 4Q285 and 11Q14 Sefer ha-Milhamah); but they are the Romans in two others, the later pesharim on Habakkuk (1QpHab) and on Nahum (4Q169). Eshel observes that in 1QM the Kittim are correlated with Asshur (1.2; 11.11–12; 18.2) but not with Egypt, since 1QM 1.4 refers only to the coming of [the king of] the Kittim *in* Egypt and not to the Kittim *of* Egypt. This 'king of the Kittim', probably mentioned in 1.4 and also found in 15.2, designates a Seleucid king (2001: 32–37). Eshel also argues from 'the clear connection between the *War Scroll* and the end of the book of Daniel' (2001: 37) to support his dating of 1QM in the last part of the second century BCE. According to Eshel, the later pesharim demonstrate that 'a shift in the historical concept of the Qumran community had taken place' (2001: 43). Eshel suggests that the pesharim ceased to be copied sometime after 63 BCE perhaps 'because it is always easier to correct and update oral traditions' (2001: 44). Eshel's remark that the Qumranites could have identified the Kittim with the Greeks at one point and the Romans at another makes good sense. If his view that the Kittim of 1QM are Greeks is correct, however, one may wonder why members of the community still copied this

recension of the War Text after having shifted the reference of Kittim to the Romans. One possible explanation is that they could also have updated their interpretation of the Kittim in 1QM, as Davies claims they did.

4.6. The Sequence of the War

The similarities between the scroll and the religious and military practices of the Maccabees have also been used as an indication of the date of composition of 1QM, or at least parts of this document. Osten-Sacken and Davies have paid particular attention to this aspect.

Osten-Sacken (1969: 55–72) notices that several battle narratives found in the books of the Maccabees contain elements borrowed from the ancient biblical tradition of holy war. There is a concentration of such elements in the episode of the encounter between the troops of Judas Maccabaeus and those of Georgias at Emmaus (1 Macc. 3.44–4.25). As the Seleucid general establishes his camp in the Emmaus area, Judas and his brothers summon an assembly in Mizpah for prayer and fasting (3.44–47). Then the ‘book of the law’ is opened, and priestly garments are brought, with first-fruits and tithes (3.48–49). A prayer is addressed to God, trumpets are sounded and a great shout is raised, to invoke God’s remembrance (3.50–54). Leaders are appointed to command the thousands, hundreds, fifties and tens (3.55). Those who fit the requirements of Deut. 20.5–9 for exemption are sent back home and the camp is pitched south of Emmaus (3.56–57). The troops are exhorted to show bravery (3.58–60). The battle takes place on the following day. It unfolds as follows (after Osten-Sacken 1969: 63–64):

1. Before the beginning of the battle, the troops are strengthened with words in the style of Deut. 20.3–4 (4.8–11).
2. Trumpets are sounded during the battle (4.12–13).
3. The enemies are beaten and flee (4.14).
4. During the flight, the stragglers are executed (4.15).
5. New encounter between the two armies; the enemies flee without fighting (4.16–22).
6. The enemy camp is plundered (4.23).
7. Thanksgiving hymns are sung as the troops return (4.24).

Osten-Sacken finds a similar scenario in 1QM. He has identified two war rules in this document, namely 7.1–9.9 + 14.2–18 and 15–19. They share the same overall structure, reconstructed in Table 4. With only one exception, (number 5, ‘the new encounter’), all elements of the Emmaus

Table 4. The sequence of the war in 1QM 7.1-9.9 + 14.2-18 and 1QM 15-19

7.1-9.9 + 14.2-14	15-19
1. Prescriptions about the military camps (7.1-7)	1. - - -
2. Approach of the enemy; the seven priests march out (7.9-10a)	2. Approach of the enemy (15.1-3); the priest takes position (15.4a)
3. Description of the priests' garments (7.10b-11)	3. The chief priest reads the prayer for war (15.4b-5a)
4. The first priest strengthens the hands for the battle (7.12a)	4. The chief priest arrays the battle lines (15.5b-6a)
5. The six other priests: (a) List of trumpets (7.12b-13) (b) Instructions for Levites and officers (7.14-15a)	5. The assigned priest strengthens the hands for battle (with speeches; 15.6b-16.1)
6. Engagement led by trumpets (7.15b-8.3a)	6. Engagement led by trumpets (16.3-9,13a)
7. Victory over the enemy (9.3a)	7. Victory over the enemy (18.1-3a)
8. Gathering of the fighting troops and pursuit of the enemy until its annihilation (9.3b-7a)	8. Gathering of the fighting troops and division for the annihilation of the enemy (18.3b-5a)
9. Return with thanksgiving hymn (14.2a)	9. Thanksgiving hymn and return to the camp (18.5b-19.9a)
10. New hymn on the morning after battle (14.2b-18)	10. New hymn on the morning after battle (19.9b-?)

battle have almost exact parallels in the scenario anticipated in 1QM (nos. 4 to 9—after Osten-Sacken 1969: 61-62).

According to Osten-Sacken, the redactors of these two war rules have probably reworked independently from a common basic scheme, and it is not possible to determine which version is older (1969: 60 n. 1). Various elements from this sequence have their origin in the biblical traditions about the holy war. The hymn found in 1QM 10.1-8a echoes the prescriptions of Deuteronomy about the camps (Deut. 23.10-15; cf. also 1QM 7.1-7), a speech of Moses to Israel about its confrontation with the nations (Deut. 7.21-22), and the prescriptions about trumpets to be used when waging war (Num. 10.1-10). But their arrangement into a narrative sequence is not found in the Bible itself, as demonstrated by a comparison with the Chronicler's report of the battle of Jehoshaphat against a coalition of enemies (2 Chron. 20). As illustrated by the Emmaus episode, the Maccabean circle is the most likely milieu in which these traditions took the shape in which they are found in 1QM, probably before the existence of the Qumran community itself (Osten-Sacken 1969: 67). The strong actions taken by the Maccabees to liberate their land are the most likely background for the 'aggressive' role

envisioned for Israel in the war of the end-time in 1QM, as already suggested by Segal (1965: 138–40).¹⁰

Osten-Sacken identifies differences, however, between the wars of the Maccabees and the one expected in 1QM. The Maccabees did not consider their war as an eschatological one. They did not await the return of diaspora Jews before setting out to battle (cf. 1QM 1.2). Already during Mattathias's days, they had decided to defend themselves if they were attacked on the sabbath day (1 Macc. 2.41), whereas 1QM 2 has a prescription forbidding war during the sabbatical year (which perhaps implies the sabbath day as well, Osten-Sacken suggests). The Maccabees do not seem to have set special rules for the purity of the camps, contrary to 1QM 7.1–7. These differences suggest, in Osten-Sacken's view (1969: 68–69), that 1QM, or at least its older part, may have had its origin in a group close to the Maccabees, such as the Hasidaeans (or Hasidim, 1 Macc. 2.42; 7.13; 2 Macc. 14.16). Osten-Sacken notes, following Leonhard Rost (1955), that 1QM lacks some characteristics of typically sectarian documents from Qumran, despite having connections with them; it could therefore have been shaped by the forerunners of this community before its creation (1969: 72).

4.7. **Military Equipment and Tactics**

1QM not only describes the general course of the battle: it also provides numerous descriptions of military equipment, mostly weapons, and tactics. Scholars have studied them carefully and have attempted to date the scroll by comparison with similar material known from Hellenistic or Roman sources. Two early essays, based on partial information about 1QM, agree that the weapons and tactics found in 1QM have parallels in the Hellenistic period and point to a date of composition close to the Maccabaeen revolt. J.G. Février (1950) made his suggestion on the basis of col. 8 alone, after its preliminary publication by Sukenik (1948). He noticed that the skirmishers cross the lines of the heavy infantry to cast their weapons, under the protection of the cavalry or chariots. This implies that 'gates' or spaces can be opened in the front line for these troops to operate. The Greek phalanx usually formed a single front line, without intervals. Février, however, finds a few Hellenistic parallels to the formation described in 1QM. According to 1 Macc. 16.7, Judas also

10. In his (unpublished) dissertation, James Whitton also recognizes 'the general influence of Maccabaeen warfare on 1QM, especially in relation to the common taking up of traditional elements of holy war theory and practice' (1979: 238).

mixed the cavalry with the infantry when he put Cendebaeus to flight near Modein. The use of such spaces in the line is also documented in the third and second centuries BCE in Hellenistic armies, and was part of the defensive strategy of Scipio against Hannibal at Zama (Février 1950: 58). The arrangement requires a good signal system, as is found in 1QM 8 and also in the battles of the Maccabees (1 Macc. 4.13; 7.45). Février does not go as far as saying that 1QM was a Maccabean military manual, but only that it has connections with the way the Maccabees were waging war, probably instructed by Jewish officers who had once served under the Ptolemies.

Also on the basis of Sukenik's preliminary publications (1948, 1950), Michael Avi-Yonah (1952) reached the conclusion that this 'military allegory' is to be given a 'Late Maccabean, but pre-Roman dating' (1952: 5). According to him, 'one can find in the Maccabean wars a parallel for each of the operations ordered by the trumpet-signals' of 1QM 8 (1952: 4). Additional indications are provided by 'exceptions from common military practices'; two such exceptions are the importance attached to 'spoilers' and 'collectors of booty' in 1QM, which Avi-Yonah connects with the practices of the Maccabees in the earlier phase of the war, when they were badly armed and needed to capture equipment from the enemy. The mention of ambush similarly echoes the guerrilla phase of the Maccabean revolt (1952: 4). Avi-Yonah also links with the late Maccabean period various details mentioned in Sukenik's summary such as the list of opponents, the general description of the war as 'a series of success followed by reverse and then by a recovery', the 'fact that the army is led by a high priest' and the 'existence of a Jewish phalanx' (1952: 5). He finds no indication in col. 8 'of practices derived from the Romans' (1952: 4). Part of Avi-Yonah's interpretation rests on his understanding of the expression *diglê bēnayim* (1QM 8.4) as a reference to phalanxes, rather than to 'skirmishing battalions' (cf. 1QM 6.1, 4); but this does not affect the basic line of his argument.

Against this view, a Roman date for 1QM was also strongly advocated very early on the basis of a study of its military equipment and tactics. Coherent with his identification of the Kittim as the Romans, Dupont-Sommer argues that '[...] in its broad outline, the work most strikingly reflects the art of war as practised by the Roman legions; it was from this art that the Jewish visionary drew his inspiration when he described the army of the sons of light, and not from the Seleucids' (1961: 167). Dupont-Sommer does not detail this statement in his introduction, but rather in notes to his translation of the text. For instance, it is suggested that the standards (4.15–17) are like the Roman *signa* (1961: 177). Commenting upon the description of the frontal formation (5.3–4),

Dupont-Sommer explains: 'Each line consists of one thousand men, the strength of a battalion. The seven lines (= 7000 men) face the enemy; they appear to be arranged in depth, one behind the other (cf. 5.16). These seven lines seem to constitute the great tactical unit analogous to the Roman legion' (1961: 167). The movements of the tactical units reported in 5.16–6.5 'have nothing in common with those of the Macedonian phalanxes, whose formation was extremely rigid; without copying them exactly, their flexibility is reminiscent of the tactics of the Roman army' (1961: 179). A similar observation is made about the sequence of operations depicted in 7.9–9.9 (1961: 182). The disposition of the horsemen on each side of the line (6.8–16) also 'conforms to Roman custom', such as their round shield, 'the *clipeus* of the Roman cavalrymen' (1961: 179). There are a few exceptions, however. One is the sword of the heavy infantry (5.11–14), which does not match the Roman *gladius*: 'The description of the *kidon* as given in this paragraph does not allow us, I think, to identify it with the straight sword, the *gladius* of the Roman legionary example'; as Dupont-Sommer reads it, the sword of 1QM is 'curved like a scimitar, or better still, like a "harp"' (1961: 178. See Molin 1956). For a full demonstration of the 'Roman thesis', the reader is referred to the Hebrew edition of Yadin's commentary, which appeared in 1955, seven years before the revised English edition of 1962.

Being a military expert as well as an exegete, Yadin devotes many chapters of his lengthy introduction to the study of the banners, trumpets, weapons, tactics and organization of the army of the Sons of Light. The results of his analysis are summarized, with other relevant data, in a short discussion of the date of the document and the identity of the sect (ch. 10, pp. 243–46). The date of the composition (as opposed to the date of the copy or the deposit of the text in the cave) may be established by concentrating 'on matters not supplied by the other scrolls' (1962: 244). The military data and related information, found mainly in cols. 2–9 (the 'Battle *Serekb* Series' in Yadin's terms), are suitable for that purpose. Yadin (1962: 245) summarizes his finds in a table of 22 items (see Table 5). For each, he specifies, with a positive or a negative sign, if it fits the pre-Roman (Hellenistic–Hasmonaean) or the Roman period, and, when possible, which part of this period.¹¹ Except the first four, all items have to do with the military equipment, organization and strategy.¹²

All 18 military items covered by this summary could apply to the Roman period; for the pre-Roman period, by contrast, there is only one

11. The parenthesis indicates doubts.

12. Items # 1–3 summarize the data on the Kittim (see above) and # 4 the discussion on the name Sariel in the place of Uriel in 1QM 9.15.

Table 5. Hellenistic and Roman parallels to the military data found in 1QM according to Yadin

Subject	Pre-Roman Hellenistic- Hasmonaean		Roman		
	Whole Period	2 nd century 100– 63 BCE	Whole Period	63 BCE– 1 CE	1–70 CE
5. Use of banner in battles	(–)		+		
6. Use of trumpets for signalling	(–)		+		
7. The oblong rectangular infantry shield and its measurements	–		+	+	+
8. The round shield of the (heavy) cavalry	+			+	–
9. Shin-guard for the (heavy) cavalry only	–		+		
10. Shape and measurements of the sword	–		+		
11. Method of girding the sword				+ (Caesar) (+) (Augustus)	
12. Absence of dagger				+	
13. Measurements of spear	(–)		(+)		
14. Absence of chariots	–		+		
15. Absence of elephants	–		+		
16. 'Battle intervals'	–		+		
17. Distinction and use of 'skirmishing battalions' and 'front formations'	–		+		
18. Structure and number of the front formation	–			+ Caesar	
19. 'The replacement for battle'	–		+		
20. Numbers of 'frontal arrays'	–		(+)		
21. Types of cavalry	–		+		
22. The 'towers' and tactical formations	(–)		(+)		

positive indicator (# 8), four partially negative (# 5–6, 13, 22), and eleven negative (# 7, 9–10, 14–21; items # 11–12 are not marked for that period, but are presumably negative as well). Yadin concludes, therefore, 'with all due reserve', that 1QM 'was composed after the Roman conquest but before the end of Herod's reign' (1962: 245–46).

It is not possible here to go through every detail of Yadin's sometimes brilliant analysis. Quite often, he seems to have a good case, especially when it comes to the organization and tactics. Battle intervals (# 16) are probably what is meant by the 'gates' of 1QM (3.1, 7; 7.8–9, 15, 16–17;

8.3–4; 9.14; 16.2–3); they ‘correspond to the famous *intervalla* of the battle order of the Roman legions’ and their use is ‘typical for the Roman system of warfare, in contrast to the solid Hellenistic phalanx’ (1962: 148). The division between ‘skirmishing battalions’ and ‘front formations’ (# 17; 1QM 5.3–6.7) was frequent during both periods in the Hellenistic and Roman armies; but Yadin specifies that ‘the structure of the serried phalanx, especially at the period of the Diadochi, ruled out any movement of light units amongst the phalanx, while the structure of the Roman army was especially suited to it’ (1962: 161). Yadin identifies the *degel* with the Roman *cohors* and finds numerous points of resemblance between the skirmishing battalion in 1QM and the organization of the auxiliary cohort (1962: 161–62). The ‘front formation’ (# 18) was made of 21,000 men (three groups of 1,000 x 7), to whom were added 7,000 skirmishers (1QM 5.3–4; 9.3–5). These numbers compare well with the organization of the Roman army at the time of Caesar (1962: 162–76). The ‘replacement for battle’ or ‘reserve’ (# 19; 1QM 16.11–12) was an innovation of the Roman army (1962: 174) and also points to a Roman date. The number of the ‘frontal array’ (# 20; 1QM 5.3–4) corresponds to the Roman legion, but not in ‘structural details’ (1962: 175). The various types of cavalry (# 21; 1QM 6.8–18), heavy and light, and their strategic use ‘can only be understood in the light of the organization of the cavalry in the Roman army from the beginning of the first century BCE onwards’ (1962: 181). Finally, the ‘towers’ and tactical formations (# 22; 1QM 9.10–12) are matched with those of the Roman army as described by Gallus and Vegetius (1962: 183–97); the ‘tower’, particularly, corresponds to the Roman *testudo* (1962: 187–90).

But more than once, things are not as simple as they look in this neat summary. In the case of signal instruments, Yadin finds data for both periods, but interprets the evidence in favour of the Roman. In 1QM 3.13–4.17, one banner (# 5) is provided ‘for every single unit according to the needs of battle’ (1962: 64). This system points to the extensive use of *signa* by the Roman armies, as opposed to the silence of the Hebrew Bible (except Num. 2.2) about the presence of similar instruments in the armies of Israel, and the lack of information about their use in the armies of Alexander and of the Hasmonaeans. Trumpets (# 6; 1QM 2.16–3.11 etc.) were sounded, in the armies of the Hellenistic period, ‘at the beginning of battle as well as during pursuit’, as documented by the books of the Maccabees (1 Macc. 4.13; 7.45; 9.12; 2 Macc. 15.25); but there are no indications that they were used for ‘definite signals at different stages of the battle’ (1962: 111), as in 1QM (2.16–3.11 etc.) and in the Roman armies.

Data about weapons deserve much attention. The descriptions of the

shields are quite straightforward. The shield of the heavy infantry (# 7) is oblong, and it measures approximately 115 cm x 69 cm (1QM 4.4–6). According to Yadin, its shape and dimensions ‘agree with the *scutum* of the Roman army’ (1962: 116), as witnessed by a find from Dura Europos (102 cm x 83 cm) and by measurements provided by Polybius (120 cm x 75 cm). Nothing similar exists in the Hellenistic armies. Yadin also discusses the material and the decoration of the shield (1962: 115–20) and adduces parallels from the Roman period as well. 1QM 6.15 mentions that the shield of the heavy cavalry (# 8) has a round shape, but does not provide other details. The Greek armies were commonly equipped with this kind of shield, varying in size (1962: 121); but, under the name *parma* or *clipeus*, it was also the ‘typical shield of the Roman cavalry’ until the time of Julius Caesar (1962: 121).

The description of the sword or *kidon* (# 10–11; 1QM 5.11–14) raises numerous problems that Yadin discusses extensively (1962: 124–31). This weapon is one and a half cubits long and four fingers broad (5.12–13). A cubit of 45.8 cm (1962: 116 n. 2) means a long sword of 68.7 cm x 6 cm. It has ‘lips straight up to the point, two on either side’ (5.12). Yadin explains that the edges of the sword are its ‘mouths’, and the ‘curving slope from the full thickness to the cutting edge’ is the lips. The sword is therefore a double-edged sword with two pairs of lips; this excludes a ‘sickle sword’ (1962: 125). The text continues as follows, in Yadin’s translation: ‘The belly (*beten*) shall be four thumbs, and four handbreaths up to the belly, the belly being tied (*meruggelet*) on both sides with thongs of five handbreadths.’ Yadin denies that the ‘belly’ could be the middle part of the sword since in his view the sword is said to be straight and of a uniform width (1962: 126). He understands *meruggelet* as ‘tied’ and argues that the ‘belly’ is the scabbard, a little wider than the sword (4 thumbs = 7.6 cm). He admits that there are no parallels for the identification of the ‘belly’ with the scabbard, but explains that the scabbard contains ‘the sword like an embryo in the womb’. In his view, the phrase ‘the scabbard being tied on both sides with thongs of five handbreaths’ (5.14) ‘indicates the method of girding on the sword’, that is, suspending it over the leg rather than attaching it directly to the belt (1962: 126 fig. 3, 127 fig. 4). On the basis of this interpretation, Yadin assumes that the sword is the *gladius* of the Roman army, which it fits in shape and measurements. For the method of attaching it, he quotes P. Couissin: ‘[. . .] in the first century BCE, until the time of Augustus, it was customary to carry the sword solely by means of straps, as described in the scroll [. . .]’ (quoted in Yadin 1962: 129, with fig.).

In his summary, Yadin considers his identification of the sword as a clear indicator of the Roman period; the girding method would point to

the first half of it, up to Augustus. But, as can be seen, the whole argument rests on a difficult text which has received other interpretations. I have recently adopted a different translation for the same passage: 'The belly (shall be) four thumbs; four palms to the belly, and the belly, bent downwards, here and there, five palms' (1QM 5.13–14; Duhaime 1995: 109).¹³ In this hypothesis, the blade is four fingers wide and has a straight shape of four palms' length, from the handle up to the 'belly'; the lower part covers five palms down to the tip and is a little wider (four thumbs); the sword has a total length of nine palms, or one and a half cubits (67.5 cm). This part of equipment is not the Roman *gladius*, but looks more like the older hoplite sword, a slashing weapon still in use in the later Macedonian army (360–140 BCE).¹⁴ If so, the Roman parallel evaporates.

The measurements of the spear (# 13) are another problematic case, since they do not agree with any known weapon. According to 1QM 5.7, the spear of the front formation is seven cubits long (= 320 cm), 'of which the blade and socket were 22,9 cm' (Yadin 1962: 136). It cannot be either the Greek *sarissa*, which was much longer (1962: 139), nor the Roman *pilum*, which was more than one metre shorter (1962: 138). The closest parallel would be the Roman *hasta*, a spear heavier and larger than the *pilum*, used from the time of Marius onwards (c. 110 BCE); but the weapon of the scroll is still about 90 cm longer (1962: 139). Since there is no exact parallel, Yadin suggests that the spear of 1QM may be from a 'transitional stage' (1962: 139). In the summary, however, this discussion is obliterated and the measurement of the spear is considered as an indicator of the Roman period.

Yadin also argues from the absence of dagger (# 12), chariots (# 13) and elephants (# 14). At the time of the Diadochi, the men of the Greek phalanx were equipped with a short sword; the long sword of 1QM is quite different and no dagger is recorded. This absence is understood as 'due to its use in the first century BCE being restricted to officers' (1962: 129 n. 1). There are no chariots, either: 1QM 9.6–7 (*rekeb* refers to horses with riders, since the scroll uses *markebot* for the chariots of Pharaoh [11.10]). In Yadin's view, this 'points definitely to the Roman period' (1962: 179). Elephants were 'typical of the Seleucid warfare' (1962: 179 n. 2) and their absence is also interpreted as excluding the pre-Roman period.

Yadin's extensive analysis is very impressive and is generally considered the standard treatment on the topic. But in spite of its great merit, his

13. This translation is based on arguments summarized by Jongeling (1962: 161–67; especially 167).

14. For examples, see Connolly 1998: 63, 78 no. 1, and 103 no. 31.

demonstration rests on several presuppositions and, more than once, on hypothetical interpretations of unclear data.¹⁵

In his study of the armies of the Hasmonaeans and Herod, Israel Shatzman (1991: 212–14) briefly surveys Yadin's work. He agrees on several points, such as the similarity between the shield of the heavy infantry and the Roman *scutum*, the resemblance between the front formations ('composite, manoeuvrable units') and the 'articulate organization and way of fighting of the legion'. But he is not totally convinced by Yadin's arguments about the sword, the 'tower', the identification of the *degel* with the *cohors*, etc. Enough Roman evidence remains in this text, however, to testify 'to the deep impression the Roman army made on the native population of Judaea' (1991: 214) and to confirm that it served in part as a source of inspiration for the author, along with biblical and imaginative elements. In a more recent study, Shatzman (1996) has explored in more depth the military evidence of 1QM and compares it with data on Hellenistic and Roman armies of the republican and imperial periods; under closer scrutiny, the equipment, organization and strategy pictured in this text appear even more eclectic, but still informed by a knowledge of the Roman armies to a large extent (1996: 131), which tends to confirm that Yadin is basically correct, even if not in all details.¹⁶

A frequent criticism addressed to Yadin, however, is precisely his use of a division between pre-Roman and Roman periods, the turning point being the Roman occupation of Palestine in 63 BCE. This division implies that the Roman military equipment and tactics were unknown in Palestine before this date. But, as noted by Segal (1965: 143) and van der Ploeg (1959b: 9), Roman weaponry and strategy could have been known before the Romans' massive presence in the country. This possibility has been investigated by Russell Gmirkin (1996) in his first essay on the date of the War Texts.¹⁷ Gmirkin agrees with Yadin that the weaponry, tactics and military formations found in the War Texts are Roman, but he claims that 'the army described of the War Scroll is patterned after the legions of the second century BCE, before the reforms of Marius in 104, not later in the time of Caesar as Yadin held' (1996: 91). Marius's reforms brought important changes in various domains and these differences are visible in

15. See for instance the reservations expressed recently on Yadin's work by Ibba 1998: 38–41.

16. Guy Stiebel, a student of Shatzman's, will briefly discuss the weaponry of 1QM in his forthcoming dissertation on the Roman military equipment in Palestine.

17. See also Gmirkin's studies on the historical allusions in 1QM (1998—summarized above) and on the relation between this document and the Hasidim (2000).

the comparative material. Yadin did not pay much attention to that distinction and his chart 'omitted any information on the Roman army prior to 63 BCE' (Gmirkin 1996: 90).

Gmirkin begins with some historical background on the Roman legions. A first major reform of the army took place under Camillus around 350 BCE. Camillus was responsible for dividing the legion into smaller units and arranging the whole army in three ranks. The system was refined during the Second Punic War (218–201 BCE) by Scipio who also introduced the short Spanish sword (*gladius*) and the skirmishers as a class of warriors (*velites*). In Marius's reforms of 104–103 BCE, the divisions of the three ranks (*hastati*, *principes* and *triarii*) were consolidated in 'an army of uniform age and weaponry' (1996: 92). The cavalry and skirmishing units were composed of auxiliary troops. A cohort of 400–600 men became the basic tactical unit. This organization remained 'down to the time of Julius Caesar and Augustus'. Gmirkin (1996: 92) accepts Yadin's identification of the sword in 1QM with the *gladius* and concludes that this text must postdate the Second Punic War. But since there are inconsistencies 'between the weaponry of the post-Augustan army and that of the War Scroll' (1996: 93), the text must be dated before Augustus. Two options remain: pre Marius (209–104 BCE) or post-Marius (104–1 BCE).

Gmirkin then presents data on nine specific topics: conscription, heavy infantry, skirmishers, cavalry, reserve forces, coordination of infantry and cavalry, weapons, legionary tactics and miscellanea (rations and standards). In each case, he provides evidence relating to pre-Marius and post-Marius periods, plus evidence from the War Scroll. Polybius and, to a lesser extent, Livy document the pre-Marius period, while Sallust, Plutarch and Julius Caesar document the situation after the reform (1996: 93). Table 6 summarizes the data gathered by Gmirkin and his conclusion (M = War Scroll).

In nine cases out of fourteen, the data of the War Texts have closer similarities to those of the pre-Marius period. The army of 1QM (# 1) better matches the citizen army of the pre-Marius period, which had no foreign auxiliary troops and in which tasks were assigned according to age and wealth. The heavy infantry (# 2) consists in both cases of legions of 3,000 men, arranged in three battalions of 1,000. Like Shatzman, Gmirkin rejects Yadin's identification of the battalion (*degel*) with the cohort: this tactical unit introduced by Marius was made up of 600 men and decreased to 300–400 at the time of Caesar; it increased to 1,000 only by the end of the first century CE (Gmirkin 1996: 97–101). Attached to the legion, the skirmishers (# 3) are the youngest soldiers; they are arranged in three thin lines with different equipment in the pre-Marius

Table 6. Pre- and post-Marius parallels to the military data of the War Texts according to Gmirkin

Topic	Pre-Marius (209–104 BCE)	Post-Marius (104–1 BCE)	War Scroll (1QM) and other War Texts	Analysis and conclusion
1. Conscription	Citizen army with military service from age 17, lasting 10–20 years. Class division according to age and wealth.	A more professional army. Foreign auxiliaries and skirmishers. No age or class division.	No foreign auxiliaries. Service from age 25 to 60 (30–50 for combatants). Age and class division.	M age, duration of service, class division are closer to pre-Marius.
2. Heavy infantry	Each legion = 3,000 men. Arranged in 3 fixed lines: <i>hastati</i> = 20 cent. of 60 (200 wide x 6 deep) <i>principes</i> = idem <i>triarii</i> = 10 cent. of 60.	Marius: legion of 6,000. Arranged in 1 to 4 lines: 10 cohorts x 600 (100 wide x 6 deep). Uniform weaponry. After Marius, 3,000–4,000.	Legion of 3,000. Arranged in 3 lines: each line = 20 cent. of 50 (200 wide x 5 deep).	M is closer to pre-Marius. Yadin's identification with cohort is unconvincing.
3. Skirmishers (<i>velites</i>)	Each legion = 1,200 skirm. Youngest conscripts. 3 thin lines (different weapons). Performed added tasks.	No fixed ratio. Foreign auxiliaries. Add. tasks by non-combatant.	Each legion = 1,000 skirm. Youngest combatants. 3 groups (diff. weapons).	M fits pre-Marius. Excludes post-Marius.
4. Cavalry	Cav. per legion (4,200): Roman leg.: 300 cav. Ital. auxil. leg.: 900 cav. Divided into heavy and light.	Independent units. Foreign auxiliaries.	6,000 cav. for 28,000 inf. 200 cav. per leg. of 4,000 200 cav. per 1,000 skirm. 3,200 mobile cav. Heavy and light.	Ratio of M total cavalry = ratio of cavalry of Ital. auxil. leg. : 3/14. M fits pre-Marius. Yadin is wrong.
5. Reserve forces (<i>subsidia</i>)	<i>Subsidia</i> = since Camillus (<i>hastati, principes, triarii</i>).	Still plays an important role in strategy.	Concept of reserve found only in 1QM 15–19; not behind 7 lots of the battle.	M fits both periods. Yadin is wrong.
6. Coordination of infantry / cavalry	Fight together (cavalry gives lift to skirmishers).	Combined units (Marius, Scipio, Caesar).	Light cavalry protects skirmishers, but no indication of combined units (<i>contra</i> Yadin).	[Not useful for dating M] Yadin is unconvincing.

7. Weapons:				
7.1 Rectangular shield (<i>scutum</i>)	Polybius (c. 160 BCE) 120 x 75 cm.	Dura Europos 102 x 83 cm.	Heavy infantry 115 x 69 cm.	M and Polybius almost identical.
7.2 Spanish sword (<i>gladius</i>)	Adopted c. 200 BCE. Suspended with straps.	Still in use. Suspended with straps.	<i>kidon</i> = <i>gladius</i> Suspended with straps.	M fits both periods.
7.3 Javelin (<i>hasta velitaris</i>)	Used from second century BCE. By <i>velites</i> (Capua: 7 jav.)	Used by auxiliary troops.	Javelin = <i>hasta velitaris</i> .	Closest parallel in pre-Marius.
7.4 Greaves	Infantry (Polybius), but only wealthiest soldiers?	Not for infantry except those of centurion rank.	Omission for infantry. Heavy cavalry only.	M omission = negligible value for dating.
7.5 Catapult + ballista	Commonplace since second Punic War (c. 200 BCE).	[Commonplace.]	4QM ^c 5.	Fits both periods. Not useful for dating M.
8. Legionary tactics	Vegetius (from Cato?) Cannae (212); Zama (202).	[-]	1QM 9.10–12.	M could be copied from mil. man. second century BCE.
9. Miscellanea:				
9.1 <i>Rations preparation</i>	[Non-combatants.]	Soldiers.	Non-combatants.	M excludes post-Marius.
9.2 <i>Standard</i>	[No legionary standard.]	Legionary standard.	No legionary standard.	M excludes post-Marius.

army and 1QM (6.1–6: seven lines engage in three groups of two, three and two lines). For the cavalry (# 4), Gmirkin rejects Yadin's reconstruction and proposes his own. In his interpretation, 1QM matches the pre-Marius army a little better than the post-Marius one; he draws attention particularly to the high number of the total cavalry in 1QM: 6,000 horsemen for 28,000 infantry, a ratio of 3 for 14, identical to the ratio of cavalry for the Italian auxiliary legions (1996: 107).

In the case of weapons and tactics, Gmirkin's distinction between the two Roman periods allows him to match the shield of the heavy infantry (# 7.1) with the rectangular shield described by Polybius before Marius's reform rather than with the specimen of the later period found in Dura Europos. Gmirkin agrees with Yadin that the javelin (# 7.3) must be identified with the *hasta velitaris*, but notes that, in the post-Marius period, this was used by auxiliary troops not directly attached to the legion, contrary to what is found in the pre-Marius army and in 1QM. In Gmirkin's view, Yadin correctly related the tactics of 1QM (# 8) to Roman antecedents, but all the examples that he provides are from the pre-Marius period: the major source of information is Vegetius, who

probably copied Cato, and the examples of two battles (Cannae and Zama) which occurred in the late third century BCE (1996: 122–23).

In two instances, the data of 1QM fit both periods and are not very helpful. The Roman army used reserve forces (# 5) continuously at least from the time of Camillus. Gmirkin accepts Yadin's identification of the *kidon* with the Spanish sword (# 7.2), but observes that it was introduced during the Second Punic War (c. 200 BCE) and still used after Marius's reform; its attachment by straps is also found in Vegetius's description (c. 160 BCE) (1996: 120–21). A third case is similar: a War Text from Cave 4 (4Q493 M^c 5) mentions the catapult and ballista (# 7.5); but these were also 'commonplace' in both periods.

Two other items are also considered as not useful for dating 1QM, for various reasons. In the Roman armies of both periods, the actions of the light infantry and the cavalry were coordinated (# 6). Yadin has attempted to demonstrate that their counterparts in 1QM also engaged in combined units. Gmirkin is not convinced; in his view, 1QM only mentions the protection of the skirmishers by the cavalry, which 'is simply Roman routine tactics' (1996: 117). The mention of greaves for the heavy cavalry and their omission for the infantry (# 7.4) is also 'of negligible value', since, apparently 'only a small fraction of the Roman infantry' wore them during the two periods (1996: 121).

Gmirkin finds three elements that, according to him, exclude the post-Marius period. One is that the skirmishers (# 3) of this period were no longer regular soldiers attached to the legion (as in the pre-Marius period and in 1QM), but auxiliary and independent troops (1996: 104). Secondly, in 1QM meal preparation (# 9.1) is done by non-combatants, as was the case presumably in the pre-Marius period, but not after (1996: 123). Thirdly, Marius introduced a new standard for the whole legion (# 9.2), which is lacking in 1QM (1996: 123).

From his detailed comparison, Gmirkin concludes that there are 'close systematic parallels' between 1QM and the Roman legions before the reforms of Marius, but 'no hint' of many innovations made by him (1996: 124). He remarks that the evidence for weaponry is found only in 1QM 3–9, 'a sub-distinct document', and that the comparative material is 'directly useful in dating only this section of the scroll' (1996: 94). But since this section includes probably 'the latest strata of material' in the document, 'this points to a second century date for the War Scroll as a whole' (1996: 124). The scope can be narrowed on both sides. The dependence of several sections of 1QM on Daniel 11–12 brings down the upper date to after 165 BCE (1996: 124–25), whereas the exclusively Jewish composition of the army 'argues for a date before the time of Hyrcanus (135–105 BCE), when mercenaries began to be used' (1996:

125). But since after Judas (165—161 BCE), the leadership cooperates with the Seleucids, whereas 1QM ‘expresses strong opposition to all foreigners, and to the Syrians specifically’, the document must have been ‘composed during the time of Judas Maccabeus’ (1996: 125). This document is closely related to the organization of the professional army set up by Judas after the restoration of the Temple, and demonstrates that it was modelled after the Roman army and used Roman weapons and tactics (1996: 127–29). Combining these results with his exploration of historical allusions in 1QM (1998—see above), Gmirkin suggests an even more precise dating and does not hesitate to present 1QM as ‘the official war manual of the Maccabaeen army as of summer 163 BCE’ (2000: 488).

Gmirkin’s study breaks the barrier set by Yadin in his identification of the weaponry, organization and tactics of 1QM as parallel to the Roman art of war. His demonstration supports the hypothesis that the army envisioned in 1QM is equipped and arranged after the model of a Roman counterpart of the second rather than the first century BCE. Not all the details of Gmirkin’s argument are equally convincing and he sometimes seems to stretch the evidence to make his point (e.g. about the ratio of the cavalry, # 4). He does not address with the same scrutiny all the topics studied by Yadin, either. He is very concise on a few points, like the rations (# 9.1) and the legionary standard (# 9.2). The cumulative effect of his argument is nevertheless quite persuasive and needs to be taken into account.

4.8. Relationship with Other Qumran Texts

The relationship between 1QM and other Qumran texts (see Duhaime 1995: 88) has been explored by a few scholars, either in order to set the date of the War Scroll or to establish an early *terminus ad quem*. Carmignac (1957; 1958b: XIII–XIV), who considers this War Text to be a single composition, points to numerous similarities between it and other documents from Cave 1, namely the Rule of the Community (1QS), the Rule of the Congregation (1QSa) and the Thanksgiving Hymns (1QH^a). He identifies the author of all these texts as the Righteous Teacher (or Teacher of Righteousness); the work would have been composed by the end of the Teacher’s life, around 110 BCE, in Carmignac’s opinion. But the date of the Teacher is itself a matter of debate. For instance, Ernest M. Laperrousaz (1986: 276–77) also attributes the composition of 1QM to the Teacher, but he dates it between 67 and 63 BCE, when the Teacher was presumably in exile in Damascus (see 1QM 1.2); Dupont-Sommer (1961: 167) suggests the same place of origin, but a date after 63 BCE.

To establish a relative chronology between 1QM and other Qumran texts is a complex issue, as may be illustrated by Osten-Sacken's attempt to trace the development of the dualistic traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Osten-Sacken (1969) has focused his attention on the connections between 1QM and other dualistic texts (see Duhaime 2000). The most obvious echoes are found in the section of the Rule of the Community currently labelled the 'Instruction on the two spirits' (1QS 3.13–4.26; Osten-Sacken 1969: 116–89). This text is for the Instructor to teach to the Sons of Light the eternal design of God on each creature (3.13–17a). Humanity is called to dominate the world, guided by two spirits, 'truth and deceit' (3.17b–19). These spirits have their respective origin in light and darkness, two realms under the respective command of a Prince of Light and an Angel of Darkness (3.20–25a). Even if he has made both, God takes pleasure in the spirit of light and hates the spirit of darkness (3.25b–4.1). The spirits incline humans to act in truth or deceit, which translates in opposite attitudes and behaviours (4.2–6a, 9–11a); these two ways lead respectively to peace, enduring life and glory (4.6b–8) or, in contrast, to a total destruction after bitter suffering and shame (4.11b–14). The last sections of the Instruction provide additional details on the opposition between the spirits (4.15–18a), the promise of eschatological purification for humanity (4.18b–23a), and the fight between the spirits within the human heart (4.23b–26).

In Osten-Sacken's view, a few sections of the Instruction are directly influenced by 1QM. The most obvious is the section about the division between the realms of light and darkness (3.20–25a). It implies the same basic structure as the war of the end-time and portrays two figures of leadership, the Prince of Light and the Angel of Darkness, which are also found in 1QM 13.7–13a under the names Michael and Belial. Other parallels in the vocabulary with 1QM make it clear that the two texts are related ('mysteries of God', 1QS 3.23 and 1QM 3.9; 16.11, 16; 'God of Israel', 1QS 3.24 and 1QM 1.9; 13.1, 2, 13, etc.; 'spirits of his lot', 1QS 3.24 and 1QM 13.2, 4, 11–12; see Osten-Sacken 1969: 116–20). A few phrases of the lists of virtues and vices and their corresponding rewards and punishments are also found in 1QM and could be derived from it as well (1969: 120–23). This suggests that the older part of the Instruction (1QS 3.13–4.14) represents a transposition in the ethical domain of the eschatological dualism found in 1QM. The Instruction also borrows from other sources, namely the Hymns (1QHodayot^a), which provide for the concept of God's design for every being (1QS 3.15–17a; cf. 1QH^a 9.19), his relationship to the spirits (1QS 3.25–4.1), and the stress on ethics and anthropology in the description of the two ways and their related destinies (1QS 4.2–14; Osten-Sacken 1969: 124–69). No traces of 1QM appear in

the later parts of the text (1QS 4.14–23a, 23b–26; Osten-Sacken 1969: 170–89).

Osten-Sacken's analysis, if correct, tends to confirm that 1QM is a text from the Hellenistic period, since it antedates 1QS which has been copied, according to its palaeography, around 100–75 BCE.¹⁸ Moreover, the contacts between the eschatological dualism of 1QM and its secondary interpretation in the Instruction are found only in the older part of the text (3.13–4.14) and not in the later ones (4.15–26), which would tend to push back the date even further than the palaeography suggests. But things are perhaps different. It has been argued that the whole section which serves to anchor Osten-Sacken's thesis may be an addition to the text, as could be the corresponding part about Michael and Belial in 1QM 13.7–13a (Duhaime 1987). Without this section, the ethical dualism found in the Instruction, instead of being a secondary interpretation of the eschatological dualism of 1QM, could have its origin in the wisdom tradition (see Duhaime 2003). This would change completely the value of the Instruction for a relative dating of 1QM and perhaps even the relationship between the two texts would work in the opposite direction. This type of analysis rests on several hypotheses and, consequently, can probably shed little light on the dating of 1QM.

Among other observations used to support an early date for 1QM is that it lacks several characteristics typical of later works. Among other things, the term *yahad* is used seven times in the War Scroll (e.g. 1QM 13.11–12), but never designates a separate community as in the Rule of the Community (1QS), the Thanksgiving Hymns (1QH^a) or the Damascus Document (CD). The congregation referred to in 1QM seems to be the whole of Israel (see 1QM 1–2, etc.), with its 12 tribes, rather than a separate community. This would tend to confirm that this text was composed before the installation of such a community at Qumran, hence in the Hellenistic period.

4.9. Summary and Assessment

When it comes to the date of 1QM, the only data that one really can take for granted are: an upper date (*terminus a quo*) around 164 BCE, based on the dependence of 1QM 1 on Daniel 11–12 and the events of the Maccabean period related there; a lower date (*terminus ad quem*) around

18. A fragmentary copy of the Instruction is also found in a manuscript from Cave 4 (4Q257 papS^c frg. 3a i, 3b), dated in the same period (Alexander and Vermes 1997: 69, 77–80).

the middle of the first century BCE, derived from the palaeography of the manuscript.

The detailed studies of the relationship between 1QM 1 and Daniel 11–12 confirm the dependence of the War Scroll upon the great vision of Daniel and, consequently, the *terminus a quo* for its composition. But they do not allow for a more precise setting of the *terminus ad quem*. The text of Daniel 11–12 has been reinterpreted in such a way that it is not easy to determine how the writer stands in relation to the Maccabean period. In the best case, the writer is quite close to the milieu in which Daniel was written and simply updates the vision of the end-time to account for the death of Antiochus, as van der Ploeg suggests. Since the writer also attributes more initiative to the Sons of Light and makes free use of the phrases that he borrows from this text, he may be remote from its initial context and re-applying it to what he considers to be a similar situation, either in the Hellenistic or in the Roman period. Finally it is not clear if 1QM 1 belongs to an early redactional stratum (van der Ploeg, Osten-Sacken) or to a late one (Davies); the conclusion about the date of redaction of this column may be applied to the final composition only in the latter case.

The search for historical allusions in 1QM 1–2 is inconclusive. In spite of a detailed demonstration, Gmirkin's proposal to date this text in the summer of 163 BCE fails to convince, mainly because it rests on too narrow a basis. The names of two participants in the war (1QM 1.1–3) are not exclusive to the Maccabean period and their connection with it is possible, but not necessary. The text has gaps at a few critical points and is open to various reconstructions, particularly in the predictive section (lines 4–7). The link between 1QM 2.5–6 and the purification of the Temple is no more than a possibility. In fact, using a different selection of external references, Ibba offers an alternative reading of the same elements and suggests a dating around 160–157 BCE for 1QM 1–2. Gmirkin and Ibba also have diverging views on the implication of their respective reconstructions for dating the final composition of 1QM: Gmirkin generalizes it to the whole document, but Ibba takes it only as relevant to date its earliest recension.

Attempts to identify the Kittim so as to date 1QM do not deliver a simple answer either. The phrases 'Kittim of Asshur' (1.2) and 'Kittim in Egypt' (1.4) are not parallel and need not be taken as a direct reference to the Seleucids and the Ptolemies, as Sukenik first did. It has been argued that the 'Kittim of Asshur' could have been either the Seleucids or the Romans, after their takeover of Syria. The correlation between Asshur and the Kittim found in 11.11 does not explain who they are. In other instances where the Kittim and Asshur are associated (1.6; 18.2; 19.10), it

is not clear that they are identical. The reference to the 'king of the Kittim' (1.[4]; 15.2) would obviously fit a Seleucid king, but one cannot completely exclude an extended use of the term to designate a Roman leader. Other mentions of the Kittim are too vague to lead to any significant conclusion. Davies's suggestion that the term was added in cols. 15–19 to determine the anonymous enemy found in earlier redactional levels (7.9–9.9; 14) is attractive, even if the statement that this happened as a response to the Roman invasion of the country needs more substantiation. The substitution of names could alternatively be the result of an application, in the narrative of the war against the Kittim (15–19), of the generic instructions stated in the corresponding sections of the organizational part of the document (7.9–9.9) and of the collection of prayers (14). Eshel's study shows that the term 'Kittim' was probably used to designate the Seleucids in certain documents from Qumran and the Romans in others, as do external sources; but it does not make a very convincing case for 1QM. Without concluding, as Carmignac does, that 'Kittim' was considered a common noun, one may believe that its meaning in 1QM has been left ambiguous on purpose, so that texts which once designated the Seleucids could now be related to the Romans. If so, earlier strands of the documents would be from the Hellenistic period, whereas the final composition would be from the Roman. The fact that many copies of this War Text were in circulation during the later period certainly suggests that the Romans were considered, at that time, as the main enemy designated by this text (see Alexander 2003).

Osten-Sacken's analysis of the sequence of the war in 1QM also adduces arguments to date this document close to the wars of the Maccabees. He makes the distinction between two more or less contemporary war rules in 1QM (7–9 + 14, and 15–19) that, despite their differences, show similarities in their general sequence with the traditions of the holy war as they were revived in Maccabean circles. If they have their origin in these circles, then the strands of redaction in which they are found could be from this period, even if the final arrangement of the text has been made later. But, as mentioned above, Davies has another explanation on this particular point. He considers 'the procedure for the pitched battle (7.9–9.9)' to be part of an older military manual, perhaps of Hasmonaeen origin, showing traces of Maccabean warfare (1977: 65). When compared with it, the war rule found in cols. 15–19 appears to be an independent writing put together as a response to the Roman occupation (1977: 74–78), as the reference to the Kittim rather than to a general enemy suggests (1977: 89). While both Osten-Sacken and Davies agree that these war rules are grounded in the holy war tradition reactivated during the Maccabean period, their conclusions

about their respective date, and consequently about the final composition of 1QM, are very different.

Yadin's examination of the military equipment and tactics in 1QM leads him to conclude that they reflect the Roman art of war, and, consequently, that the text is to be dated after 63 BCE. This conclusion, however, rests on parallels between data in 1QM which sometimes need highly speculative interpretation and which do not always match exactly the comparative equipment, organization or tactics of the Roman armies. Even granting that most of Yadin's analysis is reliable, the dating of 1QM after the Roman takeover of Palestine would still not be demonstrated. If the Roman parallels probably fit better the art of war of the second century BCE, as Gmirkin argues quite persuasively, the War Texts, particularly 1QM 3–9, could have been composed before the Roman occupation of the country. More questionable is Gmirkin's dating of the whole of 1QM on the basis of a study of a single section of it (cols. 3–9). Davies also dates the components of 1QM 2–9 from about the same period, on the basis of similarities to the organization, tactics and practices of the Maccabaeen army, and in the absence of major sectarian indications; he attributes the production of 'the bulk of the material' found in this manual to 'a circle of idealists' in the period 'immediately following the Maccabaeen successes' (1977: 66). Later in the Hasmonaeen period, a compiler would have 'assembled various passages from these writings' and subordinated them 'to an overall eschatological scheme' to produce a 'single coherent document' (1977: 66). But, for reasons already mentioned, Davies argues for a much longer redactional story of 1QM and considers that the final composition of this document did not take place before the Roman period. Were this the case, Gmirkin's strong statement that 1QM was 'the' official military manual of the Maccabaeen army organized after 164 would certainly need to be revised.

Finally, the relationship of 1QM *milhamah* to other Qumran texts has not been fully explored. A major essay in this direction is Osten-Sacken's attempt to ground in the eschatological dualism of 1QM all other forms of dualism found at Qumran and to consider them as later developments of it. But different views can be opposed to Osten-Sacken's reconstruction, as is the case with his analysis of the relationship between 1QM and the Instruction on the two spirits (1QS 3.13–4.26). Other observations have been made which suggest that the War Text in 1QM could be originally a pre-sectarian document, but they have not generated a large consensus.

All things considered, the date of the composition of 1QM as we have it remains quite elusive. Many indications point to the Hellenistic period, in a setting close to Maccabaeen circles, and there seems no real objection. In

this hypothesis, 1QM 1 would have been written very early after Daniel 11–12 and the Kittim would be the Greeks; the weaponry and strategy would have been described after Roman parallels already available and the document would have been assembled within a very short period of time. But no argument for this dating seems really compelling, either; and the text could be a late composition or reworking from the Roman period. In this case, the vision of Daniel 11–12 would have been reinterpreted to fit the expectations of a group under occupation by the Romans, the Kittim of the time, whose weapons and tactics could be observed almost on a daily basis. The document would have eventually incorporated early material and slightly updated it.

The difficulties encountered when trying to put a more precise date on the document may be frustrating, but they are probably significant. The lack of explicit reference to a specific context may even have been deliberate, allowing for each generation of readers, in its own situation, to appropriate the contents and power of this work. Such a motive would explain why War Texts, perhaps of older Hasidaean origin, but eventually expanded and updated over the years, were found in several recensions and copies, most of them from the Roman period, in the library of Qumran.

Further Reading on the Date of 1QM

- Alexander, Philip. S. 2003 'The Evil Empire: The Qumran Eschatological War Cycle and the Origins of Jewish Opposition to Rome', in Paul *et al.* (eds.): 17–31.
- Atkinson, K.M.T. 1957–58 'The Historical Setting of the War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness', *BJRL* 40: 272–97.
- Avi-Yonah, Michael 1952 'The War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness and Maccabean Warfare', *IEJ* 2: 1–5.
- Beale, Gregory K. 1984 *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of John* (New York: University Press of America).
- Carmignac, Jean 1955a 'Les Kittim dans la Guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils des ténèbres', *NRTb* 77: 725–48.
- Connolly, Peter 1998 *Greece and Rome at War* (London: Greenhill Books).
- Davies, Philip R. 1977 *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran: Its Structure and History* (BibOr, 32; Rome: Biblical Institute Press).
- Duhaime, Jean, 1987 'Dualistic Reworking in the Scrolls from Qumran', *CBQ* 49: 32–56.
- 2003 'Cohérence structurelle et tensions internes dans l'Instruction sur les deux esprits (1QS III 13 – IV 26)', in F. García Martínez (ed.), *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Tradition* (BETL, 168; Leuven: Peeters): 103–31.
- Dupont-Sommer, André 1961 *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (trans. G. Vermes; Oxford: Basil Blackwell).
- Eshel, Hanan 2001 'The Kittim in the War Scroll and in the Pesharim', in D. Goldblatt,

- A. Pinnick and D.R. Schwartz (eds.), *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ, 37; Leiden: Brill): 29–44.
- Février, J.-G. 1950 'La tactique hellénistique dans un texte de (Ayin Fashkha)', *Sem* 3: 53–59.
- Gazov-Ginsberg, Anatole M. 1965 'The Structure of the Army of the Sons of Light', *RevQ* 5: 163–76.
- Gmirkin, Russell 1996 'The War Scroll and Roman Weaponry Reconsidered', *DSD* 3: 89–129.
- 1998 'Historical Allusions in the War Scroll', *DSD* 5: 172–214.
- 2000 'The War Scroll, the Hasidim, and the Maccabean Conflict', in Schiffman, Tov and Vanderkam (eds.): 486–96.
- Grintz, J.M. 1961 'The Scroll of Light and Darkness: Its Time and Authors', in Rabin and Yadin (eds.): 11–17 (Hebrew).
- Ibba, Giovanni 1998 *Il 'Rotolo della Guerra': Edizione critica* (Turin: Silvio Samorani): 46–50.
- Lim, Timothy H. 2000 'Kittim', *EncDSS* 1: 469–71.
- Mertens, Alfred 1971 *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte des Texte vom Toten Meer* (SBM, 12; Stuttgart: Echter).
- Molin, G. 1956 'What is a kidon?', *JSS* 1: 334–37.
- Osten-Sacken, Peter von der 1969 *Gott und Belial: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran* (SUNT, 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Ploeg, J.P.M. van der 1959b *Le rouleau de la Guerre traduit et annoté* (STDJ, 2; Leiden: Brill).
- Rowley, Harold H. 1956 'The Kittim and the Dead Sea Scrolls', *PEQ* 88: 92–109.
- Segal, Moshe H. 1965 'The Qumran War Scroll and the Date of its Composition', in Ch. Rabin (ed.), *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ScrHier, 4; Jerusalem: Magnes Press): 138–43.
- Shatzman, Israel 1991 *The Armies of the Hasmoneans and Herod: From Hellenistic to Roman Frameworks* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr).
- 1996 'On the Army in the Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness', in I.M. Gafni, A. Oppenheimer and D.R. Schwartz (eds.), *The Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman World: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern* (Jerusalem: The Historical Society of Israel, [Hebrew]): 105–31.
- Treves, Marco 1958 'The Date of the War of the Sons of Light', *VT* 8: 419–29.
- Wacholder, Ben-Zion 1983 *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (HUCM, 8; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College).

5.1. Overview

What we know as the 'Hebrew Bible' is one of the major sources of inspiration of the War Texts.¹ In 1QM, five explicit quotations are formally introduced at the beginning of the War Prayers (1QM 9.end–11.12). They recall essential features of the war. Laws of purity are to be strictly enforced because God stands in the midst of the camps (1QM 10.1–2 = Deut. 7.21–22). Israel should not be afraid of her enemy, since God himself does battle against them (1QM 10.2–5 = Deut. 20.2–5). Blowing trumpets is a way to be remembered before God and saved from the enemy (1QM 10.6–8 = Num. 10.9). The oracles of Num. 24.17–19 and Isa. 31.8, finally, are quoted as proof that the enemies are to be destroyed by the power of God (1QM 11.6–7, 11–12).

Besides these explicit quotations, Carmignac, Yadin and others have identified some 200 implicit quotations or allusions in the 280 lines or so preserved in 1QM; a few of these identifications are hypothetical and could be coincidental. There are quotations from almost every part of the Hebrew Bible, but especially from the books of Numbers, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel and Psalms.

As mentioned previously, the overview of the war (1QM 1.1–7) draws on at least five verses from Daniel 11 (vv. 11, 32, 42, 44–45). The list of peoples found in 1QM 2.10–13 offers similarities with Gen. 10.22–23;

1. For 1QM, an early study of the question was done by Carmignac (1956) and a more recent one by Wenthe (1998). See also the lists of biblical references in Carmignac 1958b: 276–81; van der Ploeg 1959b: 196–98; Yadin 1962: 357–63. No such study exists for the manuscripts from Cave 4. A previous version of this section, along with a summary of the relation of the War Texts to other literatures, is found in Duhaime 1995: 87–91.

25.1–4, 12–16; 1 Chronicles 1, and related texts. The use of trumpets and banners (1QM 2.16–3.11 and 3.13–4.17) has antecedents in Num. 10.2 and 2.2 respectively; their slogans are of biblical inspiration as well (e.g. 1QM 4.6 cf. Deut. 33.21; Isa. 58.2; Pss. 19.2; 117.2, etc.). The laws about exclusion and purity in the camps (1QM 7.3–7, cf. 4QM^a frgs. 1–3 6–10) are applied from Deut. 23.10–15, etc. Prophetic and psalmic influences are strong, but not exclusive, in prayers such as 1QM 12.7–16, portraying the triumph of Yahweh the glorious King, in which one finds, among others, expressions recalling Isa. 6.3; 28.2; 34.1; 48.20; 49.23; 54.12; 60.5, 10–11, 14; Jer. 4.3; 49.32; Ezek. 23.40; 29.19; 38.9, 12–13, 16; Pss. 24.7–10, 18; 42.5; 47.2; 97.8; 118.15–16; 145.11–13, etc. Speeches of exhortation and prayers during the battle are equally patterned after biblical phraseology (cf. 1QM 15.4–16.1 and Gen. 3.16; Deut. 20. 2–5; 31.6; 1 Sam. 18.17; 25.28; 2 Sam. 2.7; Isa. 29.15; 51.6; Jer. 21.29; 51.6; Hag. 1.11; Ps. 37.2). These intertexts deserve a more elaborate treatment than the space available here. But an analysis of 1QM 11.1–12, a prayer of biblical inspiration, will provide a significant illustration of the biblical intertextuality found in the War Texts.²

5.2. A Prayer of Biblical Inspiration: 1QM 11.1–12

5.2.1. The Text and its Structure

1QM 10–12 preserves a prayer to be recited in the camp, on the eve of the battle.³ A portion of this text, 11.1–12, refers to the encounter between Goliath and David (11.1–3a), as well as to other acts of salvation during Israel's history (11.3b–4); it also contains two of the five explicit quotations found in 1QM (11.6–7, 11–12), and at least one implicit one (11.7b–11a), as well as references and allusions of various kinds. The text of 1QM 11.1–12, slightly restored and set out here according to its structure, reads as follows:⁴

11.1a **Indeed, yours is the war!**

2. For a general introduction to intertextuality, see O'Day 1999; Piegay-Gros 1996. On intertextuality in the Bible, ancient Jewish literature, and the Dead Sea Scrolls, see Bernstein 2000a, 2000b; Campbell 1995; Chazon 2003; Dimant 1988; Fishbane 1985, 1988; Fitzmyer 1974; Gabrion 1979; Nitzan 2003; Pate 1971; Swanson 1995; Wenthe 1998. A French preliminary version of this study is found in Duhaime 2002.

3. See above, pp. 17–18.

4. I use, with slight variations, the translation found in Duhaime 1995: 119. Bold characters indicate significant repetitions within the text.

1b With the power of your hands their corpses have been dashed into pieces with none to bury (them).

1c Goliath of Gath, a mighty man of worth, 2a you did deliver into the hand of your servant David, for he trusted in your great name and not in a sword or a spear.

2b **Yours is the war!**

2c The 3a Philistines, he humiliated many times by your holy name

3b You have also saved us many times by the hand of our kings 4a on account of your mercy and not according to our works, in which we have done evil, and (not according to) our sinful deeds.

4b **Yours is the war,**

4c and the strength is from you, 5a (it is) not ours. Neither our power nor the force of our hands have done worthily except by your power and with the vigour of your great worth.

5b **So have you told 6a to us long ago, saying:**

6b 'A star shall come forth out of Jacob, a sceptre shall rise from Israel. It shall smite the forehead of Moab, and <crush> all the sons of Sheth. 7a It shall rule from Jacob and destroy the survivor of the city. The enemy shall become a possession and Israel shall do worthily.'

7b Through the hand of your anointed ones, 8 seers of decrees, **you have told us** the [appointed ti]mes of the wars of your hands, to cover yourself with glory against our enemies, to bring down the troops of Belial, the seven 9a nations of vanity, by the hand of the poor whom you have redeemed [with pow]er and in peace for a wonderful might, and the melted heart (turned) to a doorway of hope.

9b You shall act against them as against the Pharaoh 10 and the officers of his chariots in the Re[d] Sea. The stricken spirits, you will kindle like a flaming torch in a sheaf, devouring wickedness: it does not turn away until 11a the extermination of guiltiness.

11b **Long ago**, you have put in re[serve a fixed ti]me for your mighty hand (to fight) against the Kittim, **saying:**

11c 'Asshur shall fall down by a sword of no man, a sword 12 of no human being shall devour him.'

The literary form of this prayer is that of a memorial, a remembrance of God's former deeds, but also of oracles predicting those to come. Even if the beginning is lost at the end of col. 10, the outline of the prayer is easily discernible and falls into two parts. The first one (10.end–11.5a) is made up of three units, arranged in the same way. The refrain '**Yours is the war**' (lines 1a, 2b, 4b) appears at the centre of three similar units. Before it, in

the last two instances there is a reference to one or several past events in which God acted powerfully to save Israel; one may assume that such was the case for the first unit as well. In all three, the refrain is followed by a comment upon these actions. In the second part (5b-12), these references are supported by a reminder of prophecies about God's future military actions, framed by two explicit quotations introduced in similar ways: 'So have you told to us **long ago, saying**' (5b-6a), and '**Long ago** you have put . . . **saying**' (11b). In the middle section, there is another reminder, this time simply indicated by the phrase '**you have told us**'. The two parts are linked by the use of a common vocabulary borrowed from the semantic field of warfare: 'hand' (1b, 2a, 3b, 5a, 7b, 8, 9a, 11b), 'power' (1b, 5a [2x], 9a), 'sword' (2a, 11c [2x]), 'war' (1a, 2b, 4b, 8), 'worth' (1c, 5a [2x], 7a).

5.2.2. 'Yours is the war!' (11.1-5a)

The refrain 'Yours is the war!' deserves attention first. God is portrayed quite frequently as a warrior in the Bible but the expression 'yours is the war' is not found literally. The closest formulation, however, appears in the David and Goliath episode, found in 1 Samuel 17. As he replies to the Philistine's defiant statement, the young shepherd claims that he will overcome him, thanks to God's help: '[. . .] *to the Lord is the war*, and he will give you into our hand' (1 Sam. 17.47). There is a similar affirmation in Chronicles' narrative of King Jehoshaphat's reign. Having learned that a coalition of enemies is coming against him for battle, the king is praying at the Temple, along with his people. Then the spirit of the Lord comes upon Jahaziel, a Levite, who delivers an exhortation to the crowd in the following terms: 'Listen, all Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem, and King Jehoshaphat: Thus says the Lord to you: "Do not fear or be dismayed at this great multitude; for *the war is not yours but God's*"' (2 Chron. 20.15). That God is a warrior is particularly evident at the crossing of the Red Sea and it is spelled out in Moses' song of victory celebrating this mighty act: 'The Lord is a warrior; the Lord is his name' (Exod. 15.3). With variations, this kind of statement is also found in other instances such as Isa. 42.13; Ps. 24.8. Since there is a reference to the story of David and Goliath at the centre of the section, and given the close similarity between this formulation and the one found in 1 Sam. 17.47, it is likely that this verse is the source of inspiration behind the refrain.

The first unit begins in the lost part of col. 10 and continues in 11.1ab. Granted that it was built on the same pattern as the next two, it probably recalled a former intervention of God to save Israel from her enemies. If the sequence of the three units is chronological, the event

recalled here would have taken place before the encounter between David and Goliath.

The phrase 'with the power of your hands their corpses have been dashed into pieces with none to bury (them)' has similarities to, rather than parallels with, a few biblical passages. The words 'power' and 'hand' are found together in the construct state in Isa. 10.13 which refers to the haughty pride of the king of Assyria, who will be punished by God for saying 'by the *power of my hand* I have done it, and by my wisdom, for I have understanding', whereas he is in fact nothing but 'the rod' of God's anger against Jerusalem (10.15). According to the book of Deuteronomy, Moses has in the past prevented the Israelites from boasting in this way over their enemies, reminding them that they owe their strength exclusively to God: 'Do not say to yourself, "My *power* and the might of my own *hand* have gotten me this wealth." But remember the Lord your God, for it is he who gives you *power* to get wealth, so that he may confirm his covenant that he swore to your ancestors, as he is doing today' (Deut. 8.17–18). In a similar way Psalm 44 credits God alone with having driven out the nations to plant Israel in the land: 'You with your own *hand* drove out the nations, but them [i.e. our ancestors] you planted; [...] for not by their own sword did they win the land, nor did their own arm give them victory; but your right (hand), and your arm, and the light of your countenance, for you delighted in them' (Ps. 44.2–3).

The word 'corpse' (*prg*), which is found in 22 instances in the Bible, shows up in David's reply to Goliath: '[...] and I will give the *corpses* of the Philistine army this very day to the birds of the air and to the wild animals of the earth [...]' (1 Sam. 17.46). The term is found in other war settings as well, namely when Jerusalem is mysteriously delivered from the Assyrians (2 Kgs 9.35 // Isa. 37.36), and later from the coalition against King Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. 20.24). The verb translated as 'dashed into pieces' (*prš*) is found only six times in the Hebrew Bible (2 Kgs 8.12; Isa. 13.16, 18; Hos. 10.14; 14.1; Nah. 3.10). Among these texts, the most significant is Hos. 10.14, where the northern kingdom is criticized for having trusted in its own power and in the multitude of its warriors (v. 13): its fortress shall be destroyed 'as Shalman destroyed Beth-arbel on the day of battle when mothers were *dashed into pieces* with their children' (v. 14). The image of dead bodies lying on the ground 'with none to bury them' calls to mind the story of Queen Jezebel's death (2 Kgs 9.10), as well as an oracle by Jeremiah about the forthcoming desolation of Jerusalem (Jer. 14.16), a tragedy depicted in similar terms in Ps. 79.2–3. In the later text, the bodies are given for food 'to the birds of the air' and to 'the wild animals of the earth': this is exactly what David intends to do with the corpses of the Philistine soldiers (1 Sam. 17.46).

Since the beginning of this first unit is lacking, it is almost impossible to identify the event or text that serves as its model. The vocabulary found after the refrain does not allow for a clear connection with any particular biblical text. It is not unlikely that Israel's liberation from Egypt was mentioned: this event reaches its climax when the Egyptian troops are annihilated in the Red Sea, so that their dead bodies are found lying on the shore, on the following day (Exod. 14.30–31). But the link between the two texts would be thematic rather than semantic. Moses' admonition to the people before their conquest of the land is also possibly in view (Deut. 7.17–18). In any case, the formulation of the refrain, as well as the two additional literary contacts between line 1b and 1 Sam. 17.46, strongly suggest that the story of David and Goliath may have exerted an influence on the redaction of this unit, even if it was depicting a different event.

The second unit (1c–3a) begins with the names of Goliath and David, followed by a summary of their encounter, clearly referring to 1 Samuel 17. Most of the vocabulary of the first part of the unit is borrowed from this chapter. The characterization of Goliath as 'Goliath of Gath' is found in 1 Sam. 17.4. The next part of the text has close similarities to 1 Sam. 17.45, 47: 'You come to me with *sword and spear* and javelin; but I come to you in *the name of the LORD* of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom you have defied. This very day the LORD *will deliver you into my hand* [. . .]. [. . .] the Lord does not save by *sword and spear*; for the battle is the Lord's and he will *give you into our hand*.' A few other terms found in 1QM are absent from 1 Samuel 17, but they show up in other parts of the story of David, suggesting that the composer of this prayer is familiar with it. For instance, the phrase 'mighty man of worth' is used to describe David (1 Sam. 16.18) and Saul (1 Sam. 9.1), rather than Goliath. David is qualified as 'servant' of God in many instances, namely when Abner reminds Israel's elders of God's promise to David, in order to persuade them to have him as their king: 'For some time past you have been seeking David as king over you. Now then bring it about; for the Lord has promised David: Through my *servant* David I will save my people Israel from the hand of the Philistines, and from all their enemies' (2 Sam. 3.17–18). The verb 'trust' does not appear in 1 Samuel 17 either, but is found in other texts developing the theme of trusting in God rather than in one's strength. One example is Psalm 33, in which the believers, reminded that 'a king is not saved by his great army; a warrior is not delivered by his great strength' (v. 16), proclaim that their souls wait for God, their 'help and shield', and that their hearts rejoice because they '*trust* in his holy name' (vv. 20–21). The reference to the story of David and Goliath found here is a clear form of what Riffaterre (1980) has

labelled 'compulsory intertextuality' (*intertextualité obligatoire*): the argument of the text acquires all its strength only if the reader has in mind the story of the encounter between the two biblical characters. In 1QM, however, the details of the episode are left aside and attention is completely focused on its theological content so as to support the claim that the war belongs to God, who alone leads it to an outcome that he has already determined.

After the refrain that follows, the text refers to other victories of David over the Philistines. Similar terminology is found in the general summary of David's battles against Israel's neighbours: 'Some time afterward, David attacked the *Philistines and humiliated them*' (2 Sam. 8.1). However, the accent on 'your holy name' is lacking in this text, as it is in others where David's successes over the Philistines are mentioned (1 Sam. 19.8; 23.1–5; 2 Sam. 5.17–25; 21.15–19). This may refer once again to the story of David and Goliath (1 Sam. 17.45), in which the name of God plays a decisive role.

The last unit (3b–5a) recalls God's deeds of salvation in the time of the kings. The language is rather general, without any specific event being explicitly identified. But there is an insistence on the fact that God's motivation was his mercy, in spite of his people's 'sinful deeds'. Reference to the spectacular rescue of Jerusalem besieged by Sennacherib in the days of Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18–19 // Isa. 36–37) is unlikely, since this king is depicted as one of the most faithful to God among the kings of Judah (2 Kgs 18.3–6). The idea of divine salvation despite sins rather calls to mind the situation of the northern kingdom under kings like Jehoahaz (2 Kgs 13.1–9) and Jeroboam II (2 Kgs 14.23–28). Both are said to have done evil in the sight of God and to have caused Israel to sin (2 Kgs 13.2; 14.24). As a result, in the first case, God repeatedly gave Israel into the hand of the kings of Aram; but then, moved by the prayer of Jehoahaz, he saw the oppression which the Israelites had to bear and provided them with a saviour (2 Kgs 13.3–5). In the second case, God was again touched by the bitter condition of his people and granted salvation 'by the hand of Jeroboam' even though it was not deserved (2 Kgs 14.26–27). The lengthy prayer of Nehemiah 9 generalizes this pattern within the history of Israel, referring to repeated actions of salvation motivated by God's mercy in spite of the evil committed by the 'fathers' (see Neh. 9.26–28).

After the refrain (4b), one finds again a development about God's strength (4c–5a), which echoes the first unit (1b) and apparently also derives from Deut. 8.17–18. Synonyms are piled one upon the other to underscore that God's power and action are the exclusive source of Israel's salvation.

All things considered, the strongest elements for understanding this first part of the prayer lie in the story of David and Goliath. Its theological and

exemplary meaning is stressed in the summary given in the central unit. It has probably inspired the refrain of the section, 'yours is the battle', which encapsulates the very essence of its message. The first and third units may allude to other well-known biblical passages, but in a rather general fashion, so that the links between the texts remain rather thin.

5.2.3. 'The times of the wars of your hands' (11.5b-12)

The second part of the prayer includes two explicit quotations, one implicit one, and many unmistakable allusions. It begins with the formula 'so have you told us long ago, saying', which introduces the well-known oracle from Num. 24.17-19: '17 [...] *A star shall come forth out of Jacob, a sceptre shall rise from Israel; it shall smite the forehead of Moab, and crush all the sons of Seth.* 18 Edom will become a possession, Seir a possession of its enemies, and Israel shall do worthily. 19 *One out of Jacob shall rule,⁵ and destroy the survivors of the city.*'

This oracle is quoted without any mention of its specific context. Moreover, if the redactor was using a text similar to the later Masoretic recension, he would have changed its sequence: v. 17 is directly followed by v. 19; v. 18 appears at the end, but it lacks the mention of Edom and Seir (v. 18ab), and only its last part 'and Israel shall do worthily' is retained as a conclusion of the quotation. Such a rearrangement of the text may have been intended to divorce it from its context and interpret it in reference to the eschaton. It also draws attention to the phrase 'do worthily', which was already used in the first section (5b). The current unit could have been built as a comment upon that section.

The interpretation of the oracle raises an important question. It is found in two other instances at Qumran, each time conveying a messianic meaning. In the Damascus Document (7.18-19), the star and the sceptre are associated with two figures of leadership expected in the future, respectively the Interpreter of the Law and the Prince of the Congregation. A messianic interpretation is also suggested by the presence of these verses in the Testimonia (4Q175 9-13), between a passage referring to a future prophet similar to Moses (Deut. 18.18-19) and another about Levi (Deut. 33.8-11). There is no indication that such a messianic interpretation is implied here, even if the former section is strongly influenced by the story of David and Goliath.⁶ There is indeed in line 7b a reference to 'anointed ones' (i.e. to 'messiahs'), but the word clearly designates the former prophets rather than saviours to come. It seems that in this prayer

5. Or 'shall go down' (Syr. Targ.).

6. As observed also by Fitzmyer (1974: 43), Maier (1960: II, 127), Steudel (1966: 522-23), Wenche (1998: 308).

the oracle of Num. 24.17–19 is to be understood as forecasting an act of salvation that God himself will perform, and such an interpretation finds support in another section of Balaam's oracles, Num. 23.21, where God is acclaimed as the true king of Israel: 'The Lord their king is with them, acclaimed as a king among them.' God's kingship is also strongly emphasized in 1QM (e.g. 12.7–8); this could explain why the 'Prince of the Congregation' is assigned a rather minor role in the war (1QM 5.1; 4QM^f frg. 10).

The oracle of Num. 24.17–19 quoted here is cut from its original context and, as Fitzmyer puts it, 'accommodated' to a new one: 'The promise of messianic figures, which is the normal understanding of the verse [i.e. v.17], is here completely set aside in the new context of encouragement' (1974: 43). The text is now read as a prediction of the last days, forecasting the final war in which God will use his mighty power to fight against the enemies of the true Israel, the 'us' group which applies this oracle to its own situation.

The central unit (7b–11a) claims that God has already planned and foretold the war that is about to be fought; it also states that he will act in the near future as he did in the past. As just mentioned, it is clear that the 'anointed' are the prophets, as in Ps. 105.15 (// 1Chron. 16.22); but their characterization as 'seers of the decrees' is more ambiguous. It may also have its starting point in the figure of Balaam. The oracle just quoted is introduced by the description of Balaam as 'the man whose eye is clear', 'one who hears the words of God, and knows the knowledge of the Most High, *who sees the vision of the Almighty*' (Num. 24.15–16), a vision which is not for now, but for the future (Num. 24.17). In 1QM 11.7b–8, this future is understood as 'decrees' concerning the course of actions in the world or as 'appointed times' (*qsym*) for things that are to happen or to come to an end, implying that history is viewed within a sapiential or apocalyptic framework, similar to what is found in the second part of the book of Daniel (see Dan. 8.17; 10.14; 11.27, 35). This way of understanding the prophetic role legitimates the eschatological interpretation of the oracles integrated in this second part of the prayer.

The 'troops of Belial' are portrayed as 'the seven nations of vanity' (8–9a), a phrase found in Deut. 7.1 to designate the numerous nations living in the country that the Israelites are about to enter. According to Moses, Israel should not be afraid, since God will give these nations over to them. Crushed by his 'mighty hand' and 'outstretched arm' like the Pharaoh and the whole of Egypt (7.18–19), these nations will be eradicated (7.23–24), as a result of their wickedness (9.5). Those who used this prayer are sharing the same expectations: thanks to God's powerful action, they hope soon to get rid of all their enemies and to enjoy fully the land promised to

their ancestors. They portray themselves as a gathering of poor who have been redeemed by God, as melted hearts turned to a 'doorway of hope': these themes are also biblical ones (see e.g. 1 Sam. 2.8; Isa. 25.4; Zeph. 10.8; Pss. 9.19; 37.14), but only the phrase 'doorway of hope' is found literally in Hos. 2.17, within an oracle about the restoration of the covenant.

Following this reminder of what God has already 'told us', two comparisons are used to describe what God has in store for the enemy. The first, probably derived from Deut. 7.18–19, envisions for them the fate of the Pharaoh and his officers at the Red Sea. Its terminology, however, clearly refers to Exod. 15.4: '*Pharaoh's chariots* and his army he cast into the sea; his picked *officers* were sunk in the *Red Sea*.' The second comparison likens the recovery of the 'stricken spirits' to the burst of 'a flaming torch into a sheaf, devouring wickedness'. This time, one is presented with an implicit quotation from Zech. 12.6: 'On that day, I will make the leaders of Judah like a blazing pot in a pile of wood, *like a flaming torch among sheaves*; and they *shall devour* to the right and to the left all the surrounding peoples [...].' In the context of this oracle, it is specified that the inhabitants of Jerusalem have strength through the Lord of hosts (v. 5), who fuels their leaders with energy (v. 6) and makes the feeblest resident of the city a new David (v. 8); God himself will destroy all the nations who come against Jerusalem. The general line of Zechariah's oracle, namely the idea that the weakest will be changed to warriors as brave as David, may have facilitated the insertion of v. 6 in 1QM 11.10.

The references or implicit quotations of this central unit, then, point especially towards Deuteronomy 7, Exodus 14–15 and Zechariah 12. These three passages are unified by a common theme, found repeatedly in this prayer: God himself is fighting on behalf of his people. It is he who destroys the hostile nations, because of their wickedness. At the same time, he gives strength to the weakest among his faithful and enables them to take part in the battle.

The last unit (11b-12) consists of a formula of introduction, followed by an exact quotation of Isa. 31.8: '*Asshur shall fall down by a sword of no man; a sword of no human being shall devour him.*' The text of the prayer, however, quotes only a part of the verse. Assyria is mentioned, but not the historical context of the oracle, an imminent attack against Jerusalem. On the contrary, the introduction shifts the meaning of the oracle to provide, once again, an eschatological interpretation: it is now read as forecasting an intervention of God against the 'Kittim' in the near future.

The larger context of this oracle mirrors an underlying theology similar to what is expressed in 1QM 11. In Isa. 30.15, God says to his people that

they will find strength and salvation if they trust him (v. 15). He will show mercy to them (v. 18). It is he who will fight against Asshur (vv. 27–33); the force of his arm will be seen (v. 30). He will strike Asshur with his rod (vv. 31–32) and do battle against him (v. 32). His burning place has long been prepared, and he will kindle it with his breath (v. 33). In 31.1–3, those who go down to Egypt to find help are criticized. In 31.4–9, the prophet reaffirms that God ‘will come down to fight upon Mount Zion’ (v. 4) and to devour Asshur with a sword which is not of mortals (v. 8). The failure of Assyria to take Jerusalem in 701 (Isa. 36–38) has confirmed this oracle, which is read in 1QM 11 as an anticipation of the fate awaiting the contemporary enemy, the ‘Kittim’, who are not identified more precisely in the text. In addition to all these similarities between its context and the prayer of 1QM 11, the oracle itself stresses the fact that the sword that strikes Asshur is ‘not human’, paralleling the summary of the episode of David and Goliath (1c-2a). Isaiah’s oracle may have been brought into the prayer for these reasons.

The second part of the prayer, in sum, is arranged mainly around the oracles of Balaam and Isaiah against Israel’s enemies. These two prophecies, quoted explicitly at the beginning and at the end of the text, are taken out of their historical context to be related to the imminent eschatological war. If the interpretation of Num. 24.17–19 is correct, both insist on the supernatural character of the action that will destroy the most formidable adversaries, inflicting on them a defeat like that of Pharaoh and the Egyptian army. But if it is God who fights for his people, why does the text state at the same time that ‘Israel shall do worthily’ (11.7)? Zechariah’s oracle quoted in 11.10 may provide the answer: those who are seemingly weak and powerless in the face of a stronger enemy will turn to be ‘like a flaming torch’ and, as was David in his days, will become powerful instruments for God to ‘devour’ the wicked. Linked to Isaiah’s oracle by the very same verb, Zechariah’s one may suggest that it is by the transformation of the ‘stricken spirits’ into mighty warriors that God’s sword will ‘devour’ the new Asshur named ‘Kittim’. This is another way to express the conviction that Israel’s might springs from God’s unique power, as stated repeatedly in the first part, and above all in its closing statement (5a).

5.3. Summary

What we now call the ‘Hebrew Bible’ has exerted a pervasive influence on the authors of the War Texts. These and other ‘inspired books’ provided, according to them, a vision of the final struggle through which wickedness

will be eradicated and the kingship of God and Israel established for ever. They have attempted to deduce from them rules to be applied and procedures to be followed in order to ensure the proper participation of their community in this decisive event. Their dreams have been shaped by the memory of historical antecedents of salvation as well as by the prophetic expectations of victory. Their beliefs and hopes have repeatedly been expressed with the very words of their forerunners in faith.

The prayer of 1QM 11.1–12 provides a good example of the biblical intertextuality at work in the War Texts. It is made of a whole network of quotations (explicit or implicit), references and allusions to various texts, as well as phrases that may have been inspired by, if not borrowed from, one or another part of the Scriptures. As such, it illustrates what Daniel Patte (1975: 285) has labelled the ‘dense anthological style’ used over and over in 1QM and related documents. The text apparently most influential in its composition is the story of David and Goliath in 1 Samuel 17. Adduced through a clear reference and many allusions, it acts as a ‘base’ text which probably provided the refrain and the main theme of the first part (10.end–11.5a): the power to defeat the enemy belongs to God alone; one has to trust him, since it is he who does battle to save his people and destroy their opponents. David’s attitude serves as the model that his servants are urged to imitate during the final war. The issue of this struggle allows no doubt, since it has been planned long ago by the very God who will act with might to lead his true people to victory. By an interplay of associations based on similar vocabulary, themes or contexts, other ‘secondary’ significant biblical passages are brought into the picture to underscore the essential ideas of the prayer, especially in the second part. The most significant are the quotations of Num. 24.17–19 and Isa. 31.8; but other texts are also important, namely Exod. 15.3, 4; Deut. 7.1; 8.17–18; 2 Sam. 8.1; 2 Kgs 13.3–5; 14.26–27; Zech. 12.6. At a third, more remote level, the composition also integrates shorter biblical phrases which may be simple reminiscences of striking images having a value of their own; to this category belong the phrases found in Isa. 10.13; Jer. 14.16; Hos. 10.14; Pss. 33.20–21; 79.2–3; etc.

Contrary to what one may expect, the prayer does not implore God’s action. It rather states that he alone leads the battle, that he has provided irrefutable demonstrations of his power in the past, and that he has foretold long ago, through the prophets, the final war of extermination that he will soon fight. The faithful who are involved in the coming struggle have nothing to worry about, even if they are ‘poor’ whose heart has melted (11.9). They should be confident: their number may be too small and their weapons may look somewhat ridiculous, but they are fighting for a just cause and they are, indeed, the instruments of the might

of the God who will bring their apparently powerful enemy to total destruction and grant them the eschatological victory.

The text makes use of two strategies to strengthen this conviction. Looking towards the past, it recalls the liberation from Egypt, the triumph of David over Goliath, and God's acts of salvation during the time of the kings. It also gives an eschatological meaning to former predictions of victory over Edom and Moab, the seven nations of vanity, and the troops attacking Jerusalem (be they the Assyrians or the surrounding peoples): all these enemy embody the wickedness doomed to eradication. The combination of all these texts in the prayer amounts to a cumulative effect to provide a group of faithful with a satisfactory explanation for the frightening deployment and the apparent supremacy of the Greek or Roman forces in their time. This military rhetoric may have brought them comfort amidst great hardships and have given them the courage to put their trust in God when facing an overwhelming enemy. But was it sufficient to turn them into activists who would join to fight a desperate struggle such as the Great Revolt (66–73 CE)? It is not impossible, but probably undemonstrable.

Taken as a whole, the War Texts presented in this book may be read as witnessing both the power and the danger of religious imagination. History is replete with examples of situations where this type of imagination has been used either to legitimate destructive conflicts or sent to martyrdom troops equipped with nothing but the name of their God.⁷ The tragedy of 11 September 2001, as well as its aftermath, demonstrates that things have not improved much with the coming of a new millennium. Despite this, the very same religious imagination is also powerful enough to dream, beyond—and perhaps instead of—the 'times of the wars of God', of a day when he will gather in Zion many peoples who, in the well-known words of Isa. 2.4 'shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks'.

Further Reading on the War Texts and the Hebrew Bible

- Beale, Gregory K. 1984 *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of John* (New York: University Press of America).
- Bernstein, Moshe J. 2000a 'Interpretation of Scriptures', *EncDSS* 1: 376–82.
- 2000b 'Scriptures: Quotation and Use', *EncDSS* 2: 839–72.
- Carmignac, Jean 1956 'Les citations de l'Ancien Testament dans la Guerre des Fils de lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres', *RB* 63: 234–60; 375–90.

7. On the use of Bible to legitimate violence, see, among others: Collins 2003; Niditch 1993; Vervenne 1991.

- Fishbane, Michael 1988 'Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran', in Mulder and Sysling (eds.): 339–77.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1974 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament', in *idem, Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press): 3–58.
- Gabrion, Henri 1979 'L'interprétation de l'Écriture dans la littérature de Qumrân', *ANRW*, II.19.1: 779–848.
- Mertens, Alfred 1971 *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte des Texte vom Toten Meer* (SBM, 12; Stuttgart: Echter).
- O'Day, Gail R. 1999 'Intertextuality', in J.H. Hayes (ed.), *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (Nashville: Abingdon Press): I, 546–48.
- Patte, Daniel 1971 *Early Jewish Hermeneutics in Palestine* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press).
- Piegay-Gros, Nathalie 1996 *Introduction à l'intertextualité* (Paris: Dunod).
- Riffaterre, Michel 1980 'La trace de l'intertexte', *La Pensée* 215 (Oct.): 4–18.
- Stone, Michael E. and Esther G. Chazon (eds.) 1998 *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ, 28; Leiden: Brill).
- Wenthe, Dean O. 1998 'The Use of Scripture in 1QM', *DSD* 5: 290–319.

Cumulative Bibliography

- Abegg, Martin
- 1993 'The War Scroll from Cave 1 and 4: A Critical Edition' (PhD diss., Hebrew Union College).
 - 1994a 'Messianic Hope and 4Q285: A Reassessment', *JBL* 113: 81–91.
 - 1994b '4Q471: A Case of Mistaken Identity?', in J.C. Reeves and J. Kampen (eds.), *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (Leiden: Brill): 136–47.
 - 1997 'Who Ascended to Heaven and Returned to Tell the Tale?', in C.A. Evans and P. Flint (eds.), *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SDSSRL, 1; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans): 61–73.
- Alexander, Philip S.
- 1999–2000 'A Reconstruction and Reading of 4Q285 (4QSefer ha-Milhamah)', *RevQ* 19: 333–48.
 - 2000 'Rules', *EncDSS* 2: 799–803.
 - 2003 'The Evil Empire: The Qumran Eschatological War Cycle and the Origins of Jewish Opposition to Rome', in Paul *et al.* (eds.): 17–31.
- Alexander, Philip S., and Geza Vermes
- 1997 *Qumran Cave 4.XIX Serek Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (DJD, 26; Oxford: Clarendon).
- Asmussen, J.P.
- 1961 'Das iranische Lehnwort nashir in der Kriegerroll von Qumrân (1QM)', *ActOr* 26: 3–20.
- Atkinson, K.M.T.
- 1957–58 'The Historical Setting of the War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness', *BJRL* 40: 272–97.
- Avenary, Hanoch
- 1963 'Pseudo-Jerome Writings and Qumran Tradition', *RevQ* 4: 1–10.
- Avi-Yonah, Michael
- 1952 'The War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness and Maccabean Warfare', *IEJ* 2: 1–5.
- Baillet, Maurice
- 1964 'Débris de textes sur papyrus de la grotte 4 de Qumrân', *RB* 71: 353–71.
 - 1972 'Les manuscrits de la Règle de la Guerre de la Grotte 4 de Qumrân', *RB* 79: 217–26.
 - 1978 'Le volume VII de "Discoveries in the Judean Desert": Présentation', in Delcor (ed.): 75–89.
 - 1982 *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482 - 4Q520)* (DJD, 7; Oxford: Clarendon).
- Baillet, Maurice, *et al.*
- 1956 'Le travail d'édition de fragments manuscrits de Qumrân', *RB* 63: 47–67.

- Bardtke, Hans
 1955 'Die Kriegerrolle von Qumran übersetzt', *TLZ* 80: 401–20.
 1960 'Eine der Kriegerrolle von Qumrân verwandte Literaturgattung im Codex XXVIII der Leipziger Sammlung', in *Congress Volume, Oxford 1959* (VTSup, 7; Leiden: Brill): 292–308.
 1972 'Literaturbericht über Qumran VI. Teil I. Die Kriegerrolle 1QM', *TRu* 37: 97–120.
- Bar-Kochva, B.
 1989 *The Jewish Struggle against the Seleucids* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Barthélemy, Dominique, and Josef T. Milik
 1955 *Qumran Cave I* (DJD, 1; Oxford: Clarendon).
- Basch, Christophe
 2003 'Les rites de la guerre dans le judaïsme du deuxième Temple' (Diss; Paris: École Pratique des Hautes-Études).
- Bauckham, Richard
 1988 'The Book of Revelation as a Christian War Scroll', *Neot* 22: 17–40.
- Bauer, Johannes B.
 1958 'In 1Q Milhamah VII, 3 commentariolum', *RevQ* 1: 277–78.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M.
 1987 'The Sabbath Trumpets in 4Q493 M^c', *RevQ* 12: 555–59.
- Beale, Gregory K.
 1984 *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of John* (New York: University Press of America).
 1989 'The Old Testament Background of the Reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5–7 and its Bearing on the Literary Problem of 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1', *NTS* 35: 550–81.
- Becker, Jürgen
 1964 *Das Heil Gottes: Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und in Neuen Testament* (SUNT, 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Benoit, Pierre
 1990 'Qumran and the New Testament', in Murphy-O'Connor and Charlesworth (ed.): 1–30.
- Bernstein, Moshe J.
 2000a 'Interpretation of Scriptures', *EncDSS* 1: 376–82.
 2000b 'Scriptures: Quotation and Use', *EncDSS* 2: 839–72.
- Birnbaum, Solomon A.
 1971 *The Hebrew Scripts. I, Texts; II, Plates* (Leiden: Brill).
- Bosworth, A. Brian
 1993 'Arrian and Rome: The Minor Works', *ANRW*, II.34.1: 264–72.
- Braun, Herbert
 1966 *Qumran und das Neue Testament* (2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
- Broshi, Magen, and Devorah Dimant
 2000 'Qumran', *EncDSS* 2: 733–46.
- Bruce, F.F.
 1971 'War Scroll', *EncJud* 16: 1558–60.

- Burchard, Christoph
1957–65 *Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer* (BZAW, 76, 89; 2 vols. Berlin: Töpelmann).
- Burgmann, Hans
1988 *Die essenischen Gemeinde von Qumrân und Damaskus in der Zeit des Hasmonäer und Herodier (130 ante – 68 post)* (ANTI, 8; Berlin: Peter Lang).
- Bush, Frederic W.
1960 'Evidence from Milhamah and the Masoretic Text for a Penultimate Accent in Hebrew Verbal Forms', *RevQ* 2: 501–14.
- Campbell, Jonathan G.
1995 *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1–8, 19–20* (BZAW, 228; Berlin: W. de Gruyter).
- Caquot, André
1988 'Le service des anges', *RevQ* 13: 421–29.
- Carmignac, Jean
1955a 'Les Kittim dans la Guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils des ténèbres', *NRTb* 77: 725–48.
1955b 'Précisions apportées au vocabulaire de l'hébreu biblique par la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres', *VT* 5: 345–65.
1956 'Les citations de l'Ancien Testament dans la Guerre des Fils de lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres', *RB* 63: 234–60; 375–90.
1957 'Conjectures sur les écrits de Qumrân', *RSR* 31: 140–68.
1958a 'Concordance hébraïque de la Règle de la Guerre', *RevQ* 1: 7–49.
1958b *La Règle de la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils des Ténèbres: Texte restauré, traduit et commenté* (Paris: Letouzey & Ané).
1961 'La Règle de la Guerre', in J. Carmignac and P. Guilbert, *Les textes de Qumrân, I* (Autour de la Bible; Paris: Letouzey & Ané): 81–125.
1978 'La future intervention de Dieu selon la pensée de Qumrân', in Delcor (ed.): 219–29.
- Charlesworth, James H.
1990 'A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in 1QS 3:13 - 4:16 and the "Dualism", Contained in the Gospel of John', in Charlesworth (ed.): 76–106.
- Charlesworth, James H. (ed.)
1990 *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Crossroad).
- Chazon, Esther
2003 'The Use of the Bible as a Key to Meaning in Psalms from Qumran', in Paul *et al.* (eds.): 85–96.
- Chazon, Esther, *et al.*
1999 *Qumran Cave 4 XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (DJD, 29; Oxford: Clarendon).
- Collins, John J.
1975 'The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll: A Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic', *VT* 25: 596–612.
1979a 'Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre', *Semeia* 14: 1–19.

- 1979b 'Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM: A Reply to P.R. Davies', *VT* 29: 212–16.
- 1992 'Dead Sea Scrolls', *ABD* 2: 85–101.
- 1995a *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday).
- 1995b 'A Throne in Heavens: Apotheosis in Pre-Christian Judaism', in J.J. Collins and M. Fishbane (eds.), *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys* (Albany: State University of New York Press): 43–58.
- 1997 *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge).
- 2003 'The Zeal of Phinehas: The Bible and the Legitimation of Violence', *JBL* 122: 3–21.
- Collins, John J., and Devorah Dimant
1994–95 'A Thrice-Told Hymn', *JQR* 85: 151–55.
- Connolly, Peter
1998 *Greece and Rome at War* (London: Greenhill Books).
- Cross, Frank M.
1961 'The Development of Jewish Scripture', in G.E. Wright (ed.), *The Bible and the Ancient Near East (W.F. Albright Festschrift)* (New York: Doubleday): 133–202.
- Dain, Alphonse
1964 *Histoire du texte d'Elie le Tacticien des origines à la fin du Moyen Age* (Paris: Les Belles-Lettres).
- Davies, Philip R.
1977 *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran: Its Structure and History* (BibOr, 32; Rome: Biblical Institute Press).
- 1978 'Dualism and Eschatology in the Qumran War Scroll', *VT* 28: 28–36.
- 1980 'Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM: A Rejoinder', *VT* 30: 93–97.
- 1982 *Qumran* (Cities of the Biblical World; Guildford: Lutterworth Press).
- 1992 'War Rule (1QM)', *ABD* 6: 875–76.
- 1999 'The Biblical and Qumranic Concept of War', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Richland, TX: Bibal Press): 275–306.
- 2000 'War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness', *EncDSS* 2: 965–68.
- Delcor, Mathias
1955 'La guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres ou le "Manuel du parfait combattant"', *NRTb* 77: 372–99.
- 1974 'Le milieu d'origine et le développement de l'apocalypse juive', in W.C. Van Unnik (ed.), *La littérature juive entre Tenach et Michna* (RechBibl, 9; Leiden: Brill): 101–17.
- 1978 'Livre de la guerre', in art. 'Qumrán', *DBSup* 9: 919–31.
- Delcor, Mathias (ed.)
1978 *Qumrán, sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (BETL, 46; Paris: Duculot).
- Dent, Anthony
1974 'Arrians Array', *HT* 24: 570–74.

- Devine, Albert M.
 1989 'Aelian's Manual of Hellenistic Military Tactics', *The Ancient World* 19: 31–64.
 1993 'Arrian's *Tactica*', *ANRW*, II.34.1: 312–37.
- Dimant, Devorah
 1984 'Qumran Sectarian Literature', in M.E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (Assen: Van Gorcum): 483–550.
 1988 'Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha', in Mulder and Sysling (eds.): 379–419.
 1994 'A Synoptic Comparison of Parallel Sections in 4Q491 11 and 4Q471B', *JQR* 85: 157–61.
- Duhaime, Jean
 1977 'La rédaction de 1QM XIII et l'évolution du dualisme à Qumrân', *RB* 84: 210–38.
 1984 'La Règle de la Guerre de Qumrân et l'apocalyptique', *ScEs* 36: 67–88.
 1985 'La peur dans la Règle de la guerre de Qumrân', in A. Mettayer, J.M. Dufort (eds.), *La peur* (Héritage et Projet, 30; Montréal: Fides), 209–20.
 1987 'Dualistic Reworking in the Scrolls from Qumran', *CBQ* 49: 32–56.
 1988 'The War Scroll from Qumran and the Greco-Roman Tactical Treatises', *RevQ* 13: 133–51.
 1990 'Etude comparative de 4QM^a Fgg. 1–3 et 1QM', *RevQ* 14: 459–72.
 1995 'War Scroll', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls, II. Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press): 80–203.
 2000 'Dualism', *EncDSS* 1: 215–20.
 2002 '“Le temps des guerres de tes mains”: Étude intertextuelle de 1QM xi 1–12', in M. Gourgues and M. Talbot (eds.), *En ce temps-là... Conceptions et expériences bibliques du temps* (Sciences bibliques, 10; Montréal: Médiaspaul): 67–87.
 2003 'Cohérence structurelle et tensions internes dans l'Instruction sur les deux esprits (1QS III 13 – IV 26)', in F. García Martínez (ed.), *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Tradition* (BETL, 168; Leuven: Peeters): 103–31.
- Dupont-Sommer, André
 1961 *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (trans. G. Vermes; Oxford: Basil Blackwell).
- Eisenman, Robert H.
 1990 'Eschatological "Rain" Imagery in the War Scroll from Qumran and in the Letter of James', *JNES* 49: 173–84.
- Eisenman, Robert H., and James M. Robinson
 1991 *Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls I–II* (Washington, DC: Biblical Archeology Society).
- Eisenman, Robert H., and Michael Wise
 1992 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (Shaftesbury: Element Books).
- Eshel, Esther
 1999 'The Identification of the "Speaker" of the Self-Glorification Hymn', in Pary and Ulrich (eds.): 619–36.

- Eshel, Esther, and Hanan Eshel
 1992 '4Q471 1 and Ma'amadot in the War Scroll', in J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (eds.), *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March 1991* (STDJ, 11; Leiden: Brill): II, 611–20.
- 2000 'Recensions of the War Scroll', in Schiffman, Tov and Vanderkam (eds.): 351–63.
- Eshel, Hanan
 2001 'The Kittim in the War Scroll and in the Pesharim', in D. Goldblatt, A. Pinnick and D. R. Schwartz (eds.), *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ, 37; Leiden: Brill): 29–44.
- Fensham, Charles F.
 1964 '“Camp” in the New Testament and Milhamah', *RevQ* 4: 557–62.
- Février, J.-G.
 1950 'La tactique hellénistique dans un texte de (Ayin Fashkha)', *Sem* 3: 53–59.
- Fishbane, Michael
 1985 *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon).
 1988 'Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran', in Mulder and Sysling (eds.): 339–77.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A.
 1974 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament', in *idem, Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press): 3–58.
- 1990a 'A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of 1 Cor 11:10', in Murphy-O'Connor and Charlesworth (eds.): 31–47.
- 1990b *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study* (Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H.T.
 2002 *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ, 42; Leiden: Brill).
- Flusser, David
 1980 'Apocalyptic Elements in the War Scroll', in A. Oppenheimer and V. Rappaport (eds.), *Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period. (Abraham Shalit Memorial Volume)* (Jerusalem: Yad Ishak Ben-Zvi, Ministry of Defense): 434–52 (Hebrew), xxiv–xxv (English summary).
- 1988 'The Magnificat, the Benedictus, and the War Scroll', in *idem, Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem, Magnes Press): 126–49.
- Friedrich, Gerhard
 1971 '“SALPIGX” ', *TDNT* 7: 71–88.
- Gabrion, Henri
 1979 'L'interprétation de l'Écriture dans la littérature de Qumrân', *ANRW*, II.19.1: 779–848.
- García-Martínez, Florentino
 1984 [Rev. of Baillet 1982], *JSJ* 15: 157–64.

- 1988 'Estudios Qumranicos 1975–1985: Panorama Critico (III)', *EstBib* 46: 325–74.
- 2002 'Old Texts and Modern Mirages: The "I" of Two Qumran Hymns', *ETL* 78: 321–39.
- García-Martínez, Florentino, and Donald W. Parry.
1996 *A Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1970–1995* (STDJ, 19; Leiden: Brill).
- García-Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar
2000 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill).
- García-Martínez, Florentino, et al.
1998 *Qumran Cave 11.II* (DJD, 23; Oxford: Clarendon).
- Gaster, Theodor H.
1976 *The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday).
- Gazov-Ginsberg, Anatole M.
1965 'The Structure of the Army of the Sons of Light', *RevQ* 5: 163–76.
- Gmirkin, Russell
1996 'The War Scroll and Roman Weaponry Reconsidered', *DSD* 3: 89–129.
1998 'Historical Allusions in the War Scroll', *DSD* 5: 172–214.
2000 'The War Scroll, the Hasidim, and the Maccabean Conflict', in Schiffman, Tov and Vanderkam (eds.): 486–96.
- Gnilka, Joachim
1990 '2 Cor. 6.14–7.1 in the Light of the Qumran Texts and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', in Murphy-O'Connor and Charlesworth (eds.): 48–68.
- Grintz, J. M.
1961 'The Scroll of Light and Darkness: Its Time and Authors', in Rabin and Yadin (eds.): 11–17 (Hebrew).
- Habermann, Abraham M.
1959 *Megilloth Midbar Yehuda: The Scrolls from the Judean Desert* (Jerusalem: Machbaroth Lisefrut).
- Hengel, Martin
1978 'Qumrán und Hellenismus', in Delcor (ed.): 333–72.
- Hochmuth, E.
1959 'Die Gebete der Kriegerrolle' (Diss. theol.; Leipzig).
- Hunzinger, Claus-H.
1957 'Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milhamah aus Höhle 4 von Qumrán', *ZAW* 69: 131–51.
1960 'Milhamah', *RGG³* 4: 944–46.
- Huppenbauer, Hans W.
1959 *Der Mensch zwischen zwei Welten: Der Dualismus der Texte von Qumran (Höhle 1) und der Damaskusfragmente* (ATANT, 34; Zürich: Zwingli): 76–88.
- Hurvitz, Avi
1978 'The Description of the Clothes of Aaron and his Sons according to the War Scroll (1QM vii 9–10)', in Y. Avishur and J.J. Blau (eds.), *Mehqarim*

- (and) *Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Jerusalem: Rubenstein): 139–44 (Hebrew), 198 (English summary).
- Ibba, Giovanni
 1998 *Il 'Rotolo della Guerra': Edizione critica* (Turin: Silvio Samorani).
- Jongeling, Bastiaan
 1962 *Le rouleau de la guerre des manuscrits de Qumrân* (SSN, 4; Assen: Van Gorcum).
 1971 *A Classified Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1958–1969* (STDJ, 5; Leiden: Brill).
- Kiechle, Franz
 1964 'Die "Taktik" des Flavius Arrianus', *BRGK* 45: 87–129.
- Knohl, Israel
 2000 *The Messiah before Jesus* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Kobelski, Paul S.
 1981 *Melkizedek and Melchiresa* (CBQMS, 10; Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America).
- Köchly, H., and W. Rüstow.
 1969 [1855] *Griechische Kriegsschriftsteller I-II* (Osnabruck: Biblio V).
- Krieg, Matthias
 1985 'Mo'ed Naqam — ein Kulturdrama aus Qumran: Beobachtungen an der Kriegerrolle', *TZ* 41: 3–30.
- Kuhn, Karl G.
 1956 'Beiträge zum Verständnis der Kriegerrolle von Qumrân', *TLZ* 81: 25–30.
 1960 *Kondordanz zu den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Laperrousaz, Ernest M.
 1986 'Note sur l'évolution des conceptions de "guerre sainte" dans les manuscrits de la Mer Morte', *RevQ* 12: 271–78.
- Larson, Erik W.
 2000 'Greco-Roman Guilds', *EncDSS* 1: 321–23.
- LaSor, William S.
 1958 *A Classified Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls 1948–1957* (Pasadena, Ca: Fuller Theological Seminary).
- Le Déaut, Roger
 1981 'A propos du Targum d'Ex 3, 18: La Tôrah, arme secrète d'Israël', in M. Carrez, J. Doré and P. Grelot (eds.), *De la Torah au Messie: Études d'exégèse et d'herméneutique bibliques offertes à Henri Cazelles* (Paris: Desclée): 525–33.
- Leipoldt, J.
 1958 'Das Bild vom Kriege in der griechischen Welt', in G. Delling (ed.), *Gott und die Götter: Festschrift für E. Fascher zum 60. Geburtstag* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlag): 16–30.
- Lim, Timothy H.
 2000 'Kittim', *EncDSS* 1: 469–71.
- Lim, Timothy L., in consultation with Philip S. Alexander.
 1997 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library, 1* (Leiden: Brill).

- Lohse, Eduard
1971 *Die Texte aus Qumran hebräisch und deutsch* (Munich: Kosel Verlag).
- Luukkonen, Osmo, and Johan Westerlund
1997 'Sotakäärö (1QM)', in R. Sollam (ed.), *Qumranin kirjasto: Valikoima teoksia* (Helsinki: Helsinki University Press): 107–42.
- Lyons, William J.
1996 'Possessing the Land: The Qumran Sect and the Eschatological Victory', *DSD* 3: 131–51.
1999 'Clarifications Concerning 4Q285 and 11Q14 Arising from *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* 23', *DSD* 6: 37–43.
- Magness, Jodi
2002 *The Archeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
- Maier, Johann
1960 *Die Texte von Totem Meer* (2 vols.; Munich: E. Reinhardt).
1995–96 *Die Texte von Totem Meer* (3 vols.; Munich: E. Reinhardt).
- Martola, N.
1983 'The Priest Anointed for Battle', *Nordisk Judaistik. Scandinavian Jewish Studies* 4: 21–40.
- Mattila, Sharon L.
1994 'Two Contrasting Eschatologies at Qumran', *Bib* 75: 518–38.
- McDaniel, Thomas F.
1968 'Philological Studies in Lamentation. I', *Bib* 49: 45–48.
- Mertens, Alfred
1971 *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte des Texte vom Toten Meer* (SBM, 12; Stuttgart: Echter).
- Metso, Sarianna
1997 *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ, 21. Leiden: Brill).
1999 'In Search of the *Sitz im Leben* of the *Community Rule*', in Parry and Ulrich (eds.): 306–15.
2000 'The Redaction of the *Community Rule*', in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam (eds.): 377–84.
- Michaud, Henri
1955 'Une apocalypse nouvelle: La guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils des ténèbres', *Positions Luthériennes* 3: 64–76.
- Milik, Josef T.
1955 [Rev. of Sukenik 1955], *RB* 62: 597–601.
1959 *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (SBT, 26; London: SCM Press).
1972 'Milki-sedeq et Milkiresa' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens', *JJS* 23: 95–144.
- Molin, G.
1956 'What is a kidon?', *JSS* 1: 334–37.
- Moraldi, Luigi
1986 [1971] *I Manoscritti di Qumran* (Classici della Religione; Turin: Union Tipografico).

- Mulder, Martin J., and Harry Sysling (eds.)
 1988 *Mikra: Texts, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Assen: Van Gorcum).
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome
 1986 'The Judean Desert', in R.A. Kraft and G.W.E. Nickelsburg (eds.), *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters* (Atlanta: Scholars Press): 119-56.
 1992 'Qumran, Khirbet', *ABD* 5: 590-94
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome, and James H. Charlesworth (eds.).
 1990 *Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Crossroad).
- Mussner, Franz
 1957 'Einige Parallelen aus den Qumrantexten zur Areopagrede (Apg 17, 22-31)', *BZ* 1957: 125-30.
- Newsom, Carol
 1985 *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS, 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- Niditch, Susan
 1993 *War in the Hebrew Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Nielsen, Eduard
 1961 'La guerre considérée comme une religion et la religion comme une guerre', *ST* 15: 93-112.
- Nitzan, Bilha
 1993 'Benedictions and Instructions for the Eschatological Community (11QBer; 4Q285)', *RevQ* 16: 77-90.
 1995 '4QBerakhot^{a-c} (4Q286-290): A Covenantal Ceremony in the Light of Related Texts', *RevQ* 16: 487-506.
 2003 'Approaches to Biblical Exegesis in Qumran Literature', in Paul *et al.* (eds.): 347-65.
- North, Robert
 1958 '“Kittim” War or “Sectaries” Liturgy?', *Bib* 39: 84-93.
- Norton, Jonathan
 2003 'Observations on the Official Material Reconstruction of *Sefer ha-Milhamah* (11Q14 and 4Q285)', *RevQ* 21: 3-28.
- O'Day, Gail R.
 1999 'Intertextuality', in J.H. Hayes (ed.), *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (Nashville: Abingdon Press): I, 546-48.
- O'Neill, John C.
 2000 '“Who is Comparable to Me in My Glory?” 4Q491 Fragment 11 (4Q491c) and the New Testament', *NovT* 42: 24-38.
- Oldfather, Charles H., and William H. Oldfather
 1948 [1923] *Aeneas Tacticus, Asclepiodotus, Onasander* (LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press): 227-340.
- Olyan, Saul M.
 2001 'The Exegetical Dimensions of Restrictions on the Blind and the Lame in Texts from Qumran', *DSD* 8: 38-50.
- Orion Center
 1995- <<http://orion.mssc.huji.ac.il>> .

- Osten-Sacken, Peter von der
 1969 *Gott und Belial: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran* (SUNT, 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Parker, James O.
 1997 'The Genres of the Dead Sea War Scroll' (PhD diss., Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary).
- Parry, Donald W., and Eugene C. Ulrich (eds.)
 1999 *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (STDJ, 30; Leiden: Brill).
- Patte, Daniel
 1971 *Early Jewish Hermeneutics in Palestine* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press).
- Paul, Shalom M., et al. (eds.)
 2003 *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (VTSup, 94; Leiden: Brill).
- Pfann, Stephen J., et al.
 2000 *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI* (DJD, 36; Oxford: Clarendon).
- Philonenko, Marc
 1972 'Une règle essénienne dans le Coran (Sourates 24, 60 et 48, 17 = Règle de la Guerre VII, 4-5 et Règle de la Congrégation II, 6)', *Sem* 22: 49-52.
- Piegay-Gros, Nathalie
 1996 *Introduction à l'intertextualité* (Paris: Dunod).
- Pinnick, Avital
 2001 *The Orion Center Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls (1995-2000)* (STDJ, 41; Leiden: Brill).
- Ploeg, J. P. M. van der
 1955 'La règle de la guerre: Traduction et notes', *VT* 5: 373-420.
 1957 'La guerre sainte dans la Règle de la Guerre de Qumrân', in *Mélanges bibliques rédigés en l'honneur de A. Robert* (Paris: Bloud & Gay): 326-33.
 1959a 'La composition littéraire de la Règle de la Guerre de Qumrân', in J. Coppens, A Descamps and E. Massaux (eds.) *Sacra Pagina: Miscellanea biblica Congressus Internationalis Catholici de re biblica* (BETL, 13; Gembloux: Duculot): II, 13-19.
 1959b *Le rouleau de la Guerre traduit et annoté* (STDJ, 2; Leiden: Brill).
- Poznanski, Lucien
 1992 *Asclépiodote; Traité de tactique* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- Puech, Émile
 1988a [Rev. of Baillet 1982], *RB* 95: 404-16.
 1988b 'Quelques aspects de la restauration du Rouleau des Hymnes', *JJS* 39: 38-55.
- Qimron, Elisha
 1978 'The Location of an Insertion in the Scroll of the Sons of Light', *Lesonenu* 43: 77-79 (Hebrew).
 1986 *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS, 29; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- Rabin, Chaim
 1961 'The Literary Structure of the War Scroll', in Rabin and Yadin (eds.): 31-47 (Hebrew).

- Rabin, Chaim, and Yigael Yadin (eds.)
 1961 *Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of E.L. Sukenik* (Jerusalem: Hekal haSefer).
- Richter, Hans-Peter
 1988 *A Preliminary Concordance to the Hebrew and Aramaic Fragments from Qumran Cave II-X Including Especially the Unpublished Material from Cave 4* (printed from a card index prepared by J.A. Fitzmyer, W.G. Oxtoby and J. Texidor. Privately printed).
- Riffaterre, Michel
 1980 'La trace de l'intertexte', *La Pensée* 215 (Oct.): 4–18.
- Roos, A.G., and G. Wirth
 1967 [1928] *Flavii Arriani Quae exstant omnia* (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Rost, Leonhard
 1955 'Zum Buch der Kriege der Söhne des Lichts gegen die Söhne der Finsternis', *TLZ* 80: 205–208.
- Rowland, Christopher
 1982 *The Open Heaven* (New York: Crossroad).
- Rowley, Harold H.
 1956 'The Kittim and the Dead Sea Scrolls', *PEQ* 88: 92–109.
 1957 *Jewish Apocalyptic and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: University of London Athlone Press).
- Schiffman, Lawrence H.
 1988 'The Laws of War in the Temple Scroll', *RevQ* 13: 299–311.
 1989 *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SBLMS, 38: Atlanta; Scholars Press).
 1994 *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia and Jerusalem: Jewish Publication Society).
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. (ed.).
 1990 *Archeology and History of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (JSPSup, 8; Sheffield: JSOT Press).
- Schiffman, Lawrence H., Emmanuel Tov and James C. VanderKam (eds.)
 2000 *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after their Discovery*. (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society).
- Schroedel, Joachim
 1980 'Zur Bedeutung von Barûk in IQM XIII, 1–5', *BN* 13: 49–54.
- Schubert, Kurt
 1956 'Die ersten beiden Kolumnen der Kriegsrolle von Chirbet Qumran', in K. Schubert, J. Botterweck and J. Knobloch (eds.), *Vorderasiatische Studien (Festschrift Victor Christian)* (Vienna: Wissenschaftlichen Verbands Oesterreichs): 93–99.
- Segal, Moshe H.
 1965 'The Qumran War Scroll and the Date of its Composition', in Ch. Rabin (ed.), *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ScrHier, 4; Jerusalem: Magnes Press): 138–43.
- Seidel, Hans
 1956–57 'Horn und Trompete im alten Israel unter Berücksichtigung der Kriegsrolle von Qumran', *WZ* 6: 589–99.

- Shatzman, Israel
 1991 *The Armies of the Hasmoneans and Herod: From Hellenistic to Roman Frameworks* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr).
 1996 'On the Army in the Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness', in I.M. Gafni, A. Oppenheimer and D.R. Schwartz (eds.), *The Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman World: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern* (Jerusalem: The Historical Society of Israel, [Hebrew]) 105–31.
- Smith, Morton
 1990 'Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM^a', in Schiffman (ed.): 181–88.
 1992 'Two Ascended to Heaven—Jesus and the Author of 4Q491', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Doubleday): 290–301.
- Stadter, Phillip A.
 1978 'The Ars Tactica of Arrian: Tradition and Originality', *CP* 73: 117–28.
- Stegemann, Harmut
 1956 'Die Risse in der Kriegsrolle von Qumrân', *TLZ* 81: 205–10.
 1963 'Rekonstruktion der Hodajor' (PhD diss., University of Heidelberg).
 1990 'Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments', in Schiffman (ed.): 189–220.
 2000 'The Material Reconstruction of 1QHodayot', in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam (eds.): 272–84.
- Studel, Annette
 1996 'The Eternal Reign of the People of God: Collective Expectations in Qumran Text (4Q246 and 1QM)', *RevQ* 17: 507–25.
- Stone, Michael E., and Esther G. Chazon (eds.)
 1998 *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ, 28; Leiden: Brill).
- Strugnell, John
 1967 'Notes on 1QS 1, 17–18; 8, 3–4 and 1QM 17, 8–9', *CBQ* 29: 580–82.
- Sukenik, Eleazar L.
 1948 *Megilloth Genuzoth I* (Jerusalem, Bialik Foundation).
 1950 *Megilloth Genuzoth II* (Jerusalem, Bialik Foundation).
 1955 *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press [Hebrew 1954]).
- Sutcliffe, E.F.
 1960 'A Note on Milhamah 9, 1 and 16, 8', *Bib* 41: 66–69.
- Swanson, Dwight
 1995 *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT* (STDJ, 14; Leiden: Brill).
- Teicher, J.L.
 1958 'A Spurious Version of the War Scroll', *ZAW* 70: 257–58.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C.
 2000 'Working with few Data: The Relation between 4Q285 and 11Q14', *DSD* 7: 49–55.

- Tournay, Raymond J.
 1949 'Les anciens manuscrits hébreux récemment découverts', *RB* 56: 204–33.
- Tov, Emmanuel (ed.)
 1999 *The Dead Sea Scroll Electronic Reference Library*, 2 (Leiden: Brill).
- Tov, Emmanuel (ed.), with the collaboration of Stephen J. Pfann.
 1993 *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill).
- Treves, Marco
 1958 'The Date of the War of the Sons of Light', *VT* 8: 419–29.
- VanderKam, James C.
 1994 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
- VanderKam, James C., and Peter Flint
 2003 *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco).
- Vaux, Roland de
 1949a 'Post-scriptum: La cachette des manuscrits hébreux', *RB* 56: 234–37.
 1949b 'La grotte des manuscrits hébreux', *RB* 56: 586–609.
 1953 'Fouilles au Khirbet Qumrân: Rapport préliminaire', *RB* 60: 83–106, pl. II–VII.
 1956 'Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân: Rapport préliminaire sur les 3^e, 4^e, et 5^e campagnes', *RB* 63: 533–77, pl. III–XIII.
 1973 *Archeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Schweich Lectures 1959* (London: Oxford University Press [French 1961]).
- Vaux, Roland de, and Josef T. Milik.
 1977 *Qumrân grotte 4.II* (DJD, 6; Oxford: Clarendon).
- Vermes, Geza
 1975 'The Archangel Sariel: A Targumic Parallel to the Dea Sea Scrolls (1QM 9: 12–15)', in J. Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty* (Leiden: Brill): 159–66.
 1992 'The Oxford Forum for Qumran Research: Seminar on the Rule of War from Cave 4 (4Q285)', *JJS* 43: 85–90.
 1998 *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (New York: Penguin).
- Vermes, Geza, and Martin D. Goodman
 1989 *The Essenes: According to the Classical Sources* (Oxford Centre Textbooks, 1; Sheffield: JSOT Press).
- Vervenne, Marc
 1991 'Satanic Verses? Violence and War in the Bible', in R. Burggraave and M. Vervenne (eds.), *Swords into Plowshares: Theological Reflexions on Peace* (Leuven Theological & Pastoral Monographs, 8; Leuven: Peeters): 65–126.
- Voto, James G. de
 1993 *Flavius Arrianus: Tactical Handbook and The Expedition against the Alans* (Chicago: Ares).
- Wacholder, Ben-Zion
 1983 *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (HUCM, 8; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College).
- Wacholder, Ben Zion, and Martin G. Abegg (eds.)
 1991–92 *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew*

and Aramaic Texts from Cave 4 (3 vols.; Washington, DC: Biblical Archeology Society).

- Wee, John Zhu-En
 2003 'A Model for the Composition and Purpose of Columns XV-XIX of the War Scroll (1QM)', *RevQ* 21: 263–83.
- Wenthe, Dean O.
 1998 'The Use of Scripture in 1QM', *DSD* 5: 290–319.
- Werner, E.
 1957 'Musical Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls', *The Musical Quarterly* 43: 21–37.
- Whitton, James
 1979 'The Hebrew Tradition of "Holy War" with special reference to the Qumran Battle Scroll' (PhD diss., St Andrews).
- Wilford, J.N.
 1991 'Scroll Text Linked to Christianity', *International Herald Tribune* 9–10 Nov.: 6.
- Winter, Paul
 1956 'Twenty-six Priestly Courses', *VT* 6: 215–17.
- Wise, Michael O.
 1999 *The First Messiah: Investigating the Savior before Jesus* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco).
 2000 'מִן בְּמִוֶּנֶי בְּאֵל מִ' — A Study of 4Q491c, 4Q471b, 4Q427 7 and 1QH^a 25:35–26:10', *DSD* 7: 173–219.
- Wise, Michael O., Martin Abegg and Edward Cook
 1996 *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco).
- Woude, Adam S. van der
 1968 'Ein neuer Segenspruch aus Qumran (11QBer)', in S. Wagner (ed.), *Bibel und Qumran: Beiträge zur Erforschung der Beziehungen zwischen Bibel- und Qumranwissenschaft. Hans Bardkte zum 22.9.1966* (Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft): 253–58.
 1992 'Fünfzehn Jahre Qumran Forschung (1974–1988), III', *TLZ* 57: 12–16.
- Yadin, Yigael
 1962 *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (Oxford: Oxford University Press [Hebrew 1955]).
- Yarbro-Collins, Adela
 1990 'The Apocalypse (Revelation)', *NJBC*: 995–1016.
- Yzhar, Michael
 1967 *Bibliography of Hebrew Publications on the Dead Sea Scrolls 1948–1964* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

INDEXES

INDEX OF REFERENCES

BIBLE

- Genesis*
2.2 104
3.16 104
10.4 77
10.22-23 103
25.1-4 104
25.12-16 104
- Exodus*
14-15 112
14.30-31 108
15.3 106, 114
15.4 112, 114
- Numbers*
2.2 87
6.24-25 32
10.1-10 56, 82
10.2 104
10.9 103
23.21 111
24.15-16 111
24.17-19 103, 110-111, 113-114
24.17 111
24.24 77
31.27 29
- Deuteronomy*
7 112
7.1 111, 114
7.17-18 108
7.18-19 111-112
7.21-22 82, 103
- 7.23-24 111
8.17-18 107, 109, 114
9.5 111
18.18-19 110
20.2-5 103, 104
20.3-4 81
20.5-9 81
23.10-15 82, 104
31.6 104
31-32 56
33.8-11 110
33.21 104
- Joshua*
6 47
- 1 Samuel*
2.8 112
4 47
9.1 108
16.18 108
17 106-114
17.4 108
17.45 108-109
17.46 106-108
17.47 106, 108
18.17 104
19.8 109
23.1-5 109
25.28 104
- 2 Samuel*
2.7 104

3.17-18 108
 5.17-25 109
 8.1 109, 114
 21.15-19 109

2 Kings

8.12 107
 9.10 107
 9.35 107
 13.1-9 109
 13.2 109
 13.3-5 109, 114
 14.23-28 109
 14.24 109
 14.26-27 109, 114
 18-19 109
 18.3-6 109

1 Chronicles

1 104
 1.7 77
 16.22 111

2 Chronicles

20 82
 20.15 106
 20.24 107

Nehemiah

9.26-28 109

Psalms

9.19 112
 19.2 104
 24.7-10 104
 24.8 106
 24.18 104
 33.16 108
 33.20-21 108, 114
 37.2 104
 37.4 112
 42.5 104
 44.2-3 107
 47.2 104
 79.2-3 107, 114
 83.7-9 78
 97.8 104

105.15 111
 117.2 104
 118.15-16 104
 145.11-13 104

Isaiah

2.4
 2.12 47
 6.3 104
 10.13 107, 114
 10.15 107
 10.34-11.1 32, 34
 11.14 70
 13.16 107
 13.18 107
 25.4 112
 28.2 104
 29.15 104
 30.15 112
 30.18 112
 30.27-33 113
 30.30 113
 30.32-33 113
 31.1-3 113
 31.4-9 113
 31.8 78, 103, 112, 114
 34.1 104
 36-38 113
 36-37 109
 37.36 107
 42.13 106
 48.20 104
 49.23 104
 51.6 104
 54.12 104
 58.2 104
 60.5 104
 60.10-11 104
 60.14 104

Jeremiah

2.10 77
 4.3 104
 14.16 107, 114
 21.29 104
 49.32 104
 51.6 104

Ezekiel

27.6 77
 23.40 104
 29.19 104
 38.9 104
 38.12-13 104
 38.16 104

Daniel

7-8 71
 9.27 64
 10.6 69
 10.26 71
 11-12 64-73, 94, 97-98, 100
 11.11 71, 103
 11.29-30 71, 80
 11.30 77
 11.32 73, 75, 103
 11.39-40 68
 11.40-12.3 69
 11.40-12.1 74
 11.40-45 47
 11.40 71
 11.42 103
 11.44-45 71, 103

Hosea

2.17 112
 10.13-14 107
 10.14 114
 14.1 107

Amos

5.18 47

Nahum

3.10 107

Habakkuk

1.16 107

Zephania

10.8 112

Haggai

1.11 104

Zecharia

12 112
 12.5-8 112
 12.6 112, 114

1 Maccabees

1.1 68, 77, 80
 1.11 73-74
 1.15 73
 1.20 74
 2.42-44 73
 2.41 83
 2.42 83
 3.44-4.25 81
 4.13 84, 87
 5.1-8 73
 5.9 73
 5.14-15 73
 5.24-52 73
 5.24 73
 5.28 73
 5.66-68 73
 6.19-20 73
 6.21 73
 6.49 74
 6.53 74
 7.13 83
 7.45 84, 87
 8.5 68, 77, 80
 9.12 87
 9.23-31 76
 9.27 76
 16.7 83

2 Maccabees

14.16 83
 15.25 87

Sirach

50.26 35

QUMRAN

CD

7.18-19 110
 10.4 54
 12.19 54
 12.22 54

- 13.7 54
 14.3 54
 14.12 54
- IQH^a* 4, 36, 38, 41
 9.19 96
 26.6-17 7, 36-37, 40, 42
- IQIsa^b* 5
- IQM* 4-5, 7, 9, 10, 13, 20, 22, 25, 26, 32-33, 35, 40-43, 45-46, 54-56, 58-60, 64, 77, 79-81, 83-84, 90, 91
 1.1-9.16 46
 1-2 72-76, 97
 1.1-2.14 46
 1 21, 46-48, 64, 69-70, 74, 80, 94, 97-98, 100
 1.1-15 66-72
 1.1-7 103
 1.1-3a 49, 98
 1.1 53
 1.2 68, 77-80, 83, 95, 98
 1.3b-9a 49
 1.4-7 98
 1.4 68, 77-78, 80, 98-99
 1.5 22
 1.6 77-78, 80, 98
 1.7 22
 1.9b-end 49
 1.9 79-80, 96
 1.11-17 56
 1.11-15 47
 1.12 78
 1.15 22
 1.end-2.14 23
 2-14 46-47
 2-9 48, 49, 50, 56, 74, 79, 85, 100
 2-6 48
 2 21, 46-47, 49, 79, 83
 2.1-10 24
 2.1-6 48
 2.1-6a 50
 2.1 77
 2.5-6 98
 2.10-13 103
- 2.13 96
 2.14 23
 2.15-9.16 46
 2.16-3.11 46, 48, 87, 104
 2.16 48
 2.end-3.11 23
 3-9 94, 100
 3 56
 3.1 86
 3.7 87
 3.9 96
 3.12 54
 3.13-4.end 48
 3.13-4.17 23, 87, 104
 3.13 48
 4.4-6 88
 4.6 104
 4.9 48, 54
 4.15-17 84
 5.1-2 33
 5.1 111
 5.3-6.7 87
 5.3-4 84, 87
 5.3-4a 48
 5.3 54
 5.7 89
 5.11-14 85, 88
 5.12-13 88
 5.13-14 89
 5.16-6.5 85
 5.16-end 48
 5.16 85
 5.end-6.6 48
 6.1-6 93
 6.1 84
 6.4 84
 6.8-18 46
 6.8-11a 48
 6.11b-7.7 48
 6.15 88
 7-8 56
 7.1-7 83
 7.1-9.9 47, 81
 7.3-7 104
 7.3b-7 52, 60
 7.8-9 86
 7.9-9.9 46, 48, 79, 82, 85, 99

IQM – continued

- 7.15 87
 7.16–17 87
 8–9 79
 8 46–47, 83–84
 8.3–4 79, 87
 8.4 84
 9.1–9 46
 9.1 79
 9.3–5 87
 9.5 46
 9.6–7 89
 9.9 54
 9.10-end 48
 9.10–12 93
 9.10 48
 9.17–14.15 46
 9.end–14.15 46
 9.end–14.bottom 59
 9.end–11.12 103
 9.14 87
 9.15 85 n. 12
 10–19 55–56
 10–14 49, 56, 74
 10–12 47, 49, 104
 10.1–8a 49
 10.8b–16 49
 10.17–11.7a 49
 11.1–12 104–115
 11.7b–12 49
 11.7b–8 111
 11.10 89
 11.11–12 80
 11.11 77–78, 98
 11.13-end 49
 11.17 31
 12.1–5 49
 12.1 28, 30
 12.7–16 52–53, 60, 104
 12.7–10a 49
 12.7–8 111
 12.8–16 46
 12.10 35, 41
 12.10b–16a 49
 12.14 31
 13 49
 13.1–6 49
 13.1 96
 13.2 96
 13.4 96
 13.7–13a 49, 96–97
 13.7 31
 13.8–9 28, 30
 13.9–12 22
 13.11–12 96, 97
 13.13b–16 49
 14 6, 41, 48, 49, 79, 99
 14.2–18 47, 81–82
 14.3–18 26, 29, 50
 14.3–18.6 46
 14.7–8 31
 14.16–19.13 46
 14.end–20.? 59
 15–19 46–48, 49, 50, 56–57, 74, 79–82, 99
 15.1–3 47
 15.1 69
 15.2–7 26
 15.2 77–80, 99
 15.2b–7a 49
 15.4–16.1 104
 15.4–6 46, 48
 15.4–5 47
 15.4 77
 15.5–6 57
 15.5 49
 15.6–16.1 47
 15.7b–16.1 48
 16–17 46, 79
 16 47, 96
 16.2–3 87
 16.3–17.14 27
 16.3 77, 79
 16.3a 49
 16.3b–9 48
 16.6 77, 79
 16.8–16 26
 16.8 77, 79
 16.9 77, 79
 16.11–17.15, 60
 16.11–15a 49
 16.11–14 51
 16.11–12 87
 16.11 96
 16.13 77

- 16.15–17.9. 51
 16.15b–17.9 48
 17 27, 35
 17.2 79
 17.6–7 36
 17.10–15 48, 51
 17.12 77
 17.14 77, 79
 17.15 77, 79
 17.16–18.3a 49
 18.2 77–78, 80, 98
 18.4 77
 18.3–4 79
 18.3b–5a 48
 18.5–19.13 47
 18.5 77, 18.5b 49
 18.6a 49
 18.6b–19.8 48
 18.6b–9 48
 18.end–19.2a 49
 19 20–21
 19.1–8 46, 52–53, 60
 19.10–end 49
 19.10 77–79, 98
 19.11 77
 19.13 77–78
 20 49
- IQpHab*
 2.12 77
 2.14 77
 3.4 77
 3.9 77
 4.5 77
 4.10 77
 6.1 77
 6.2–5 78
 6.10 77
 9.7 77
- IQS*
 1.1 54
 3.13–4.26 96–97, 100
 5.1 54
 6.8 54
- IQ16 pPs*
 frg. 9–10 77
- IQ28a Sa*
 1.1 54
 1.6 54
IQ33 5, 9, 13–20
- 4Q161 pIsa^a* 80
 frg. 8–10 77
- 4Q169 pNah* 80
 frg. 1–2 77
 frg. 3–4 col. 1 77
- 4Q175 Testimonia*
 9–13 110
- 4Q247 peshar on the Apocalypse of Weeks*
 6 77, 80
- 4Q332 Historical Text D*
 frg. 3 77
- 4Q285 Sefer ha-Milhamah* 8–9, 13, 23,
 31–33, 35, 40–42, 80
 frg. 5 77
 frg. 7 34
 frg. 8 34
- 4Q427 H^a* 36, 41
 frg. 7 7, 37, 39, 43
 frg. 7 col. 1 40
- 4Q431 H^e* 36
 frg. 1 *see* 4Q471b frgs. 1a–d
- 4Q471 War Scroll-like Text B* 7–8, 9, 23–
 24, 40–41, 43, 50
- 4Q471a* 9
- 4Q471b frg. 1a–d* 7–9, 38–41, 43
- 4Q471c* 8–9
- 4Q491–496 M^{a–f}* 6–7, 9, 33

- 4Q491 M^a* 9, 24–30
 frgs. 1–3 104
 frgs. 6–10 104
 frgs. 29–30 29
 frg. 34 29
 frgs. 36–37 29
4Q491a M^{a/a} 25, 26–29, 40–41, 43, 50–51,
 60
 frg. 10 col. 2 77
 frg. 11 col. 2 77
 frg. 13 77
- 4Q491b M^{a/b}* 25, 28–30, 40–43, 51, 60
 frgs. 1–3 52
- 4Q491c M^{a/c}* 13, 25, 35–36, 39, 41–42
- 4Q492 M^b* 20, 40–42, 52–53, 60
 frg. 1 77, 79
- 4Q493 M^c* 30, 40–43, 93–94
- 4Q494 M^d* 21, 24, 40–42
- 4Q495 M^e* 21–22, 40–42
- 4Q496 M^f* 22–23, 40–42, 65, 68–69
 frg. 3 77
 frg. 10 111
- 4Q497 War Scroll-Like Text A* 6–7, 9, 31,
 40–41, 43
- 4Q499* 31
- 4Q505* 22
- 4Q506* 22
- 4Q509* 22
- 11Q14 Sefer ha-Milhamah* 9, 13, 23, 31,
 33, 40–42, 80
 frg. 1 col. 2 32

OTHER ANCIENT REFERENCES

Josephus
Ant. 1.128 77

Testament of Simeon
 6.3 77

Jubilees
 24.28–29 77
 37.10 77

INDEX OF AUTHORS

- Abegg M.G. 7–8, 24 n. 4, 25–26, 29, 36
 Alexander P.S. 9, 31 n. 31, 33, 54
 Atkinson K.M.T. 57
 Avigad N. 5
 Avi-Yonah M. 84

 Baillet M. 6–7, 13, 21–31, 35–36, 40 n. 21,
 42, 53, 65, 79
 Beale G.K. 70–71
 Becker J. 47
 Birnbaum S.A. 14

 Carmignac J. 46, 50, 53, 55–56, 73,
 78–79, 95, 99, 103
 Collins J.J. 55
 Couissin P. 88
 Cross F.M. 14

 Davies P.R. 48–50, 60, 71, 79–81, 99–100
 Delcor M. 55
 Duhaime, J. 51, 57, 89, 97
 Dupont-Sommer A. 46, 72, 77–78, 84–85

 Edh-Dhib M. 4
 Eisenman R.H. 8
 Eshel E. 7, 38–39, 52–53
 Eshel H. 7, 52–53, 80

 Février J.G. 83–84

 García-Martínez F. 9, 37, 40 n. 21
 Gmirkin R. 68, 72–76, 90–95, 98, 100

 Hunzinger C.-H. 6, 24, 50, 79

 Ibba G. 14 n. 3, 75–76, 98

 Jongeling, B. 89 n. 13

 Krieg M. 47, 56–57

 Lankester Harding G. 5
 Laperrousaz E.M. 95
 Lyons W. J. 35 n. 14

 Mertens A. 69
 Michaud H. 54–55
 Milik J.T. 6, 7 n. 3, 8–9, 14 n. 3, 53
 Mohamed A. 4

 Nielsen E. 56
 Nitzan, B. 33 n. 11
 North R. 56
 Norton J. 33, 34 n. 13

 Osten-Sacken P. von der 47–48, 60, 70,
 81–83, 96–97, 99–100

 Patte D. 114
 Ploeg J.P.M. van der 9, 47, 68, 90
 Puech E. 37

 Rabin C. 46, 48
 Robinson J.M. 8
 Rost L. 83
 Rowland C. 55
 Rowley H.H. 78

 Schiffman L.H. 61
 Schuller E. 8, 37, 39
 Segal M.H. 83, 90
 Shatzman I. 90–91
 Smith M. 36
 Stegemann H. 37, 39

- Stiebel G. 90 n. 16
Strugnell J. 7,
Sukenik E.L. 4-5, 8, 13-14, 36-37, 45, 77,
83-84
Tigchelaar E.J.C. 35 n. 14, 37
Vaux R de 5-6
Vermes G. 8-9
Wacholder B-Z. 8
Wee J.Z.-E. 57
Wenthe D.O. 71, 103 n. 1
Whitton J. 83 n. 10
Wise M.O. 37
Woude A.S. van der 8-9
Yadin Y. 5 n. 1, 45, 53-57, 73, 78, 85-95,
100, 103